## [J-130-2006] IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA MIDDLE DISTRICT

MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP	: No. 64 MAP 2006
v. THE LANDS OF JOSEF SEEGAR STONE, EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF SARA SEEGAR STONE, DECEASED, JOSEF SEEGAR STONE AND FRANCINE LIDA STONE, EXECUTORS OF THE ESTATE OF EZRA C. STONE, A/K/A EZRA STONE, DECEASED, AND JOSEF S. STONE AND FRANCINE LIDA STONE	<ul> <li>Appeal from the Order of the</li> <li>Commonwealth Court entered September</li> <li>15, 2005, at No. 2152 CD 2004, which</li> <li>affirmed the Order of the Court of</li> <li>Common Pleas of Bucks County entered</li> <li>September 28, 2004, at Nos. 2000-6119-</li> <li>25-6 and TPM22-005-007.</li> <li>882 A.2d 1066 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2005)</li> </ul>
APPEAL OF: JOSEF SEEGAR STONE	: : ARGUED: October 17, 2006

## **CONCURRING OPINION**

## MR. JUSTICE SAYLOR

## DECIDED: December 27, 2007

I join the majority opinion, subject only to a few modest differences. Primarily, I do not regard the finding that a taking is for recreational purposes as a pure conclusion of law. <u>See Majority Opinion, slip op.</u> at 10. Rather, I believe that there is a substantial factual dynamic, and therefore, I would treat it as a mixed question of fact and law. I am fully in line, however, with the majority's central conclusion that a more concrete plan is required to support a taking for recreational purposes than was put into place in this case, at least as reflected in the record presented.

Madame Justice Baldwin joins this concurring opinion.