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THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. We're going to get started, if we can get the parties and counsel in the room.

Okay. Good evening. This evening this is a special meeting of the board of commissioners, Thursday, December 7th, 2023, a conditional use hearing.

This is the conditional use application of the Trustees of Dorrance Hamilton 3/15/1996 Revocable Agreement of Trust seeking approval to develop the properties at 208 and 228 Strafford Avenue and 18 Forrest Lane, Wayne, under the density modification development provisions at Article XIX of the township zoning ordinance.

The property consists of approximately seven and a half acres, is in the R-4 Residence District, and consists of Delaware County Folio Number 36-01-00538-00; 36-01-00539-00; 36-01-00540-00; and 36-01-00236-02.

The application proposes 38 townhomes, common open space areas, new stormwater
management facilities, and related improvements.

I'm going to now ask everyone to join me with the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance)

THE PRESIDENT: At this point, I'm going to turn it over to the township solicitor, John Rice, to get us started.

MR. RICE: Thank you. Just a little bit of background of where we're at in this proceeding.

We were last here on this application August 10 th of this year, and the matter was continued generally at that time.

Some of the residents became parties. I have your names and contact info from that night. I'm going to go through that.

The applicant made a request to start up the hearing, which we've now advertised in the newspaper. Tonight's hearing was advertised twice.

It was advertised in the November 22 nd
and November $30 t h$ edition of the Delco County Daily Times. It's also been posted on the township's website.

So tonight is the second night basically of this application. Some of you may have been here for the first application.

But the first thing I'd like to do is just go through the party list, who's here, who's not here.

I received three e-mails this week from additional residents that are requesting party status.

I think at least one or two of them said that they would be here, but it wasn't clear to me about the third person. So if we can do that, and then I'll read your address.

I don't think, Mr. Broseman -- Mr. Broseman has the right, as the applicant's counsel, to ask questions, where you live, how far are you from the property, that kind of thing.

Mr. Marlier is here representing the
township in this application, and he, of course, also can ask questions of any of the parties and any of the witnesses.

So, Mr. Broseman, $I$ don't think we went through the parties last time. You didn't ask questions of any of the parties.

But let me just go through the list, and I'll see if you have any objection to any of them at that point.

If you want to ask questions, you'll need to come up to the podium, and Mr. Broseman or Mr. Marlier may have any questions for you.

So let me go through the list. First is Jennifer Pechet.

MS. PECHET: Pechet.
MR. RICE: Okay. And you live at 3 Madison Lane?

MS . PECHET: Yes.
MR. RICE: And how close is that to the property, the Hamilton property?

MS. PECHET: A couple hundred yards.
MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Broseman, do you have any questions?

MR. BROSEMAN: I do not.
MR. RICE: Any objection?
MR. BROSEMAN: NO.
MR. RICE: Mr. Marlier?
MR. MARLIER: Ms. Pechet, if you could just spell your last name, please.

MS. PECHET: $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{T}$.
MR. MARLIER: Thank you. No objection.

MR. RICE: Gregg Hess. Is Gregg here?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: His address is 66 Crestline Road. Mr. Broseman, you had this list for, I think, earlier this week.

Do you have any objection to, assuming Mr. Hess shows up at the next hearing, do you have any objection to him at this point?

MR. BROSEMAN: If you want to defer until then, that's fine, but I looked on the map where he is, and $I$ would object based on his location.

MR. LARKIN: What was the address again, please?

THE PRESIDENT: What is the address?
MR. RICE: The address is 66 Crestline Road. Okay. So we'll put Mr. Hess on hold until the next hearing.

MR. BROSEMAN: He's not here; right?
MR. RICE: Mary Ann Mahoney, 5 Grant Lane. Are you here? Ms. Mahoney?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: No objection. Brian Curley, $C-U-R-L-E-Y, 136$ Fairfield Lane.

Are you here, Mr. Curley?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, any objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: Is he here? I didn't hear.

MR. RICE: Pardon me?
THE PRESIDENT: He's not here.
MR. BROSEMAN: He's not here? Okay. If he's where I think he lives, 136

Fairfield Lane, $I$ don't have an objection, if he attends.

MR. RICE: No objection?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: Okay. No objection.
MR. BROSEMAN: Could I note, I think the people do have to eventually show up and participate.

MR. RICE: They do.
MR. BROSEMAN: So $I$ also note that. But if he does, $I$ don't object.

MR. RICE: Okay.
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Broseman, I'm going to ask you to speak closer to the mic so the people in the back can hear you.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'll bring it closer.
THE PRESIDENT: So if you would bring the mic closer to you, that's helpful. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Anyone that's not here
tonight will get a communication from my office.

You have to show up. You can't sit at home or, you know, not showing up is a reason not to be permitted to be a party. Okay.

Robby Wierman, W-I-E-R-M-A-N, 101 Lantoga Road, $L-A-N-T-O-G-A$, Lantoga Road.

Mr. Broseman, any objection? The person is not here.

MR. BROSEMAN: I would object if this person attends. I would object due to location.

MR. RICE: Okay. Amber Atwood Levy, L-E-V-Y, Radnor Conservancy. Ms. Levy, are you here?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman? I believe this person is representing the Radnor Conservancy.

Any objection?
MR. BROSEMAN: I would object, but I
guess for the people that aren't here, we should see if they show up and then -MR. RICE: I agree.

MR. BROSEMAN: -- address it if they're here.

MR. RICE: Let's see if they show up.
Louisa Hanshew, H-A-N-S-H-E-W, 219 Sugartown Road. Are you here?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. I'm not seeing Ms. Hanshew.

Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: That person is not here, and $I$ would object if she does attend.

MR. RICE: Okay. Joe Schuda? Mr. Schuda is here.

MR. BROSEMAN: No objection. MR. RICE: Mr. Schuda, no objection.

MR. BROSEMAN: No objection to $M r$.
Schuda.
MR. RICE: That's S-C-H-U-D-A, 14

Forrest Lane.
Gregory Szary, S-Z-A-R-Y, 6 Forrest Lane.

Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: Is he here?
MR. SZARY: Yes.
MR. BROSEMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I couldn't hear. No objection.

MR. RICE: Steve Rocci, R-O-C-C-I, 201 Bloomingdale Avenue.

Are you here, sir?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: Is he here?
MR. RICE: No.
MR. BROSEMAN: I would object.
MR. RICE: Peter Clark.
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Clark is not here.
Mr. Broseman, are you objecting?

MR. BROSEMAN: On your list it said, it didn't give any information even about an address.

MR. RICE: I have no address either.
MR. BROSEMAN: So I would object.
MR. RICE: Okay. Three people who contacted me by e-mail, Sharon and David Willis, 335 Strafford.

Are you here? They're both here.
Mr. Broseman, do you have any questions for Mr. and Mrs. Willis?

MR. BROSEMAN: Just where that address is in relation to the property.

MR. RICE: Okay. 335 Strafford. Please come up to the podium, please.

Mr. Broseman has some questions about where you live in relation to the property.

MS. WILLIS: It's about $a \operatorname{block}$ and $a$ half down the road towards Old Eagle School Road.

MR. BROSEMAN: Are you past --
MS. WILLIS: We're past the township line. We're in Tredyffrin.

MR. BROSEMAN: You're in Tredyffrin.

MS. WILLIS: And we were party last time.

MR. BROSEMAN: Are you past Grant Lane?

MS. WILLIS: Yes.
MR. BROSEMAN: Could I reserve on this?

I would like to get a map and look until next time to see how far the distance is.

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier, do you have any questions for the Willises?

MR. MARIIER: No. Based on the address, Mr. Solicitor, the potential party certainly would be impacted by any stormwater runoff, so $I$ have no objection to their having party status.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, you're going to reserve any objection one way or the other until you map it out?

MR. BROSEMAN: I would like to, yes.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: That will probably go for the other two that weren't on the list.

I didn't check out the address.
MR. RICE: Steven and Meghan Schery, S-C-H-E-R-Y, 9 Grant Lane.

MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: Cindy Hansen, $H-A-N-S-E-N$. I did not get an address today, but I believe I've just gotten an e-mail with an address.

THE PRESIDENT: She's here.
MS. HANSEN: I'm here.
MR. RICE: Oh, you're here. Okay. Could you come up to the podium and just state your address?

MS. HANSEN: 6 Hedgerow Lane, H-E-D-G-E-R-O-W. I live next to the other development.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: What do you mean, the other development?

MS. HANSEN: Where Mr. Halloway is developing. I live at the end of Hedgerow Lane.

MR. RICE: You have to speak into the microphone.

MS. HANSEN: I'm sorry. I live at the end of Hedgerow Lane.

MR. BROSEMAN: Could I reserve on this until $I$ can see it on a map?

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.
MS. HANSEN: You're welcome. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Okay. So that's all I have in terms of additional parties since August.

Mr. Broseman, do you want to address how you want to proceed tonight?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. I had contacted Mr. Rice about this. When we got this date, it was my understanding there were no other dates available.

We knew that one of our key witnesses and one of our earlier-on witnesses wouldn't be able to make it.

But then since that time, I learned after the election that two of the seven board of commissioner members will not be in office as this case proceeds in January.

So I feel that we would prefer not to start presenting our evidence until the full board, the newly-constituted board is seated in January. So $I$ would like to proceed in that fashion.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: And I also wanted to note an objection for the record at the appropriate time.

MR. RICE: An objection for the record?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: What objection?
MR. BROSEMAN: The objection would be, and $I$ didn't want to interrupt the flow earlier, and no disrespect to Mr. Marlier.

I learned that he had been appointed special counsel in this matter by the board of commissioners by seeing it on an agenda.

We weren't notified about that, and then I contacted you, Mr. Rice, and you gave me his name. Thank you for that.

I'm noting an objection for the record that -- and I don't know what Mr. Marlier
is going to be doing in the case, if he's going to be cross-examining witnesses, if he's going to be presenting evidence against this conditional use application. So that remains to be seen.

But the objection is that it's the board of commissioners that are sitting as the judge essentially in this quasi judicial hearing, and they have appointed Mr. Marlier.

And if they, through that appointment, are having the township oppose the application, $I$ feel that causes a due process issue for the applicant, among other issues. So $I$ wanted to note that for the record.

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier, do you want to address that?

MR. MARLIER: Yes, Mr. Rice. Thank you so much, and thank you, commissioners.

Again, my name is Noah Marlier, and you have hired me or approved my hire for the township as special counsel for this hearing.

It's not my understanding necessarily that I'm objecting to this application. I've been hired to represent the township's interest in this matter.

But I think more to the point, the case law, $I$ did not know this motion was going to, that Mr. Broseman was going to bring up this motion tonight, so I don't have the case law, but I'm pretty darn sure that the case law is very clear you have every right to hire special counsel in a situation like this.

I do have my own objections when the time is appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Rice.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, do you have any case law that says the board of commissioners can't appoint special counsel in a conditional use proceeding?

MR. BROSEMAN: I don't have any with me, and my objection is a little broader than that. I don't know that there's a problem appointing special counsel.

We have to see what's going to happen and if it's going to create a due process
issue. I am aware that --
MR. RICE: So special counsel is okay, as long as he doesn't ask difficult questions or oppose this application? I mean, is that what you're saying?

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm not saying that. I said I'm aware of a case that involved that, but $I$ was saying my objection is broader than that.

I don't want to -- at some point in the proceeding or at the end, $I$ can brief that issue.

MR. RICE: Okay. We'll probably have to do that at the end. So your objection is on the record. You've preserved whatever you need to preserve in terms of that objection.

We're going to be here more than probably a couple nights. So at the end of that, you can both, you know, the township and this counsel can address that. I don't see any issue with that.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. RICE: Just for the residents and for anybody else that's watching, what's been raised by Mr. Broseman is a due process issue.

The board of commissioners appoints special counsel to participate in the hearing.

He believes that could be a due process problem if he opposes the application on behalf of the township.

So there's been some cases that I'm aware out there that even though the Municipalities Planning Code permits this procedure, $I$ don't know whether the Pennsylvania Supreme Court dealt with it directly head on at this point.

But we intend to have a full and fair hearing. Mr. Marlier is here to represent the township's interest, which is that this conditional use application complies with the zoning ordinance, what's the standard for that.

And that's what $I$ think anybody that's
involved in this should be shooting for, but that will be briefed at the end of this. We could address that. There will be some legal argument on that.

But Mr. Broseman wants to put that on the record so it's preserved in the event that he doesn't like what the ultimate or his client doesn't like what the ultimate decision is that's at issue, which is pretty typical in a hearing like this.

So with that then, so you have no witnesses ready? I know your chief witness, your engineer, is unavailable, but there's no other witnesses in terms of tonight; is that correct, Mr. Broseman?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, that's correct. In addition to the witness not being available, the issue about having the new commissioners.

MR. RICE: So do we need to go off the record here and talk about the next date, the next night?

MR. MARLIER: Mr. Rice, if I could, just on the record, $I$ would note my own
objection, if $I$ may?
MR. RICE: Yes.
MR. MARLIER: For the record, and to preserve this at a future date, somewhat akin to Mr. Broseman's objection, I'm raising an objection to the application on the grounds of res judicata and collateral estoppel.

Reading over the application for this hearing tonight, it's extremely similar, almost identical to an application from just a few years ago that was ruled upon by this board.

The issues are the same: Stormwater issues, density issues, conditional use. The request is the same, a conditional use approval.

This has been ruled upon already by this board in rejecting or denying that conditional use.

The application just a couple years ago was 41 townhomes. Now it's 38. The open space was 15 percent a few years ago. Now it's a little bit more than that.

So it's very, very similar, very similar issues. It's been ruled upon. It's already gone up to Common Pleas here in Delaware County, and it's been ruled upon there.

They had fair hearings, multiple hearings to put up their application and put up witnesses, multiple witnesses at that.

So $I$ would raise at this time the issue of res judicata and collateral estoppel in opposition to this application being presented. Thank you.

MR. RICE: That's an issue that will be developed, $I$ guess, during testimony, Mr. Marlier, Mr. Broseman, and that's not something that will be ruled on tonight by the board.

MR. BROSEMAN: And I'll note for the record, as you might imagine, $I$ don't agree with those points.

MR. RICE: Right. Okay. Any other objections from anybody?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. So I guess we need to talk about some dates in January?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: And, Mr. Broseman, there's no issue with timing under the MPC and scheduling hearings. I know there's a 45-day clock between hearings.

I think you've waived that in the past, so there's no issue going forward.

MR. BROSEMAN: I've waived that in the past, but $I$ would like to see if we could get our hearing in 45 days.

MR. RICE: Yes. I'm just saying as of now.

MR. BROSEMAN: As of now, the timing is good. I wrote letters when I asked for the first continuance, $I$ wrote a letter and confirmed that extension that $I$ gave verbally at the hearing, and then $I$ wrote a second letter to Mr . White requesting that the hearing start up, and that was done within the 60 days that we had agreed to
this hearing.
So $I$ have no timing issues with what has happened thus far in this hearing. That's your question; correct?

MR. RICE: Yes. Well, just so everybody understands, there's an obligation to have the next hearing within 45 days from tonight.

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: So that's what I'm talking about.

So let's just go off the record for now, and the board, knowing that there will be three more commissioners who are not sitting here, we as a board are sitting here, we should discuss some dates in January.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. RICE: We're ready to go back on the record. There's been discussion about hearing dates.

I think we have an agreement that
tonight will be continued to January 29th and January 31st.

So there will be two nights. Both will be scheduled for this application starting at 6:30 in this room.

Mr. Broseman, you're in agreement with that?

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm in agreement with that, and $I$ would confirm for the record that the applicant agrees that those will be the dates, even though they are more than 45 days from this evening, and we appreciate the board working with us to find these dates.

MR. RICE: And you're waiving the 45-day requirement under the MPC?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier?
MR. MARLIER: I have no objection to the dates. They both work for me. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Is there anything else from the applicant?
Mr. Marlier, anything else?

MR. BROSEMAN: Nothing from me.
MR. MARLIER: Nothing, Mr. Solicitor.
MR. RICE: Okay. Any residents have any questions or comments? Is everybody clear?

Mr. Schuda, come up.
MR. BROSEMAN: While he's approaching, did we state that it is 6:30 p.m. here in this room?

MR. RICE: Yes.
MR. BROSEMAN: Just for the record.
MR. RICE: 6:30 p.m. in this room.
MR. SCHUDA: Joseph Schuda,
S-C-H-U-D-A, 14 Forrest Lane. Just a clarification.

You had a number of names you mentioned on the party list. Correct me if I'm wrong.

On the notice that went out announcing this meeting tonight, there were two addresses, $I$ believe, on that meeting notice, I thought, the 208 and a 60, some other address possibly.

MS. MYERS: There were two different
hearings.
MR. SCHUDA: I know. That's what I'm wondering, if, in fact, because none of those names are familiar to me that you mentioned. If you don't mind, if you could just e-mail me those names.

MR. RICE: The list?
MR. SCHUDA: Yes, of those folks. We'll send them, because some of the addresses are fairly remote, in my opinion.

I don't want to say they're not there, but $I$ don't know exactly where they're at either.
(Discussion off the record.)

-     -         - 

MR. SCHUDA: I just wanted to clarify, just in case they were responding to party status, which I'll have to look through our, you know --

MR. RICE: Are you talking about the other application?

MR. SCHUDA: I'm sorry?
MR. RICE: Are you talking about the
other application?
MR. SCHUDA: The other application that you read tonight for the party status.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, I had -- the names $I$ read tonight, 11 of them were from August.

MR. SCHUDA: Oh, really?
MR. RICE: Yes, because we were here in August for the first night.

MR. SCHUDA: Right. Okay. All right.
MR. RICE: And then I got, I received three e-mails this week.

MR. SCHUDA: Okay.
MR. RICE: Ms. Hansen is here.
MR. SCHUDA: Okay.
MR. RICE: But $I$ can send this to you.
MR. SCHUDA: If you don't mind. This way we can clarify whether they want to participate or not, and we'll --

MR. RICE: Well, I'm going to send a communication also. If they want to be a party to this hearing, they need to show up.

MR. SCHUDA: Exactly.

MR. RICE: You can do what you want to do with it, Mr. Schuda, but I'm going to tell them this is like, the first rule is to show up.

MR. SCHUDA: Hit them over the head. All right. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Okay. Yes? Come on up, please.

MS. HERMANS: My name is Kate Hermans, H-E-R-M-A-N-S. I actually live fairly far from the property at 505 Montgomery Lane.

I had a chance to communicate with Maggy offline on e-mail, and my name was not listed as someone who was opposed to this, so $I$ just wanted to speak up more, ask a question for clarification.

There were two announcements, this one, but also one associated around Bellevue and West Ave as well.

And my objection to this is that collectively the amount of properties that are being added and the impact to the township starts to have a much broader impact than just a select location as this
one.
And understanding sort of how that fits within the greater scheme of zoning and planning for the township $I$ think is important to understand.

I heard objections for anyone who's not living within spitting distance of the location, but $I$ think in aggregate it actually starts to impact the township much more broadly.

So I'm just curious as to how that process works. That's sort of a question for the council. Thank you for your time.

MR. RICE: Well, I'm not sure how to answer that. First of all I'd say that anybody that's involved in the application, any parties -- you're not a party at this point -- but the parties can't be contacting the commissioners directly.

They're the judges. So I'm going to reiterate that. I think I said that the first night. That's prohibited under state law.

That other application, 60 West
conditional use, is a totally separate application. It just happens to have been filed around the same time.

Both of these uses are identified in the township zoning ordinance as permitted uses.

So I would suggest you might want to get a copy of the zoning ordinance, take a look at it, it's online, it's available, and it's a -- there's two different types of uses.

One is, 60 West is in the Wayne Business Overlay District. It's treated differently because of its location.

This is a density modification use, which is a type of use that's permitted throughout the township with different densities, different design criteria.

But other than that, everything that happens like this in the township impacts the township across the board.

Any other questions from anyone?
MS. MYERS: Correct me if I'm wrong, but at the end of the conditional use
hearing in both cases, any Radnor resident is going to get a public participation time slot.

So that would be, in my opinion, your best way to get your issues put forward.

MR. RICE: And that will be, once all of the testimony and evidence and cross-examination is done, there will be a public comment period for these applications.

So you can stand up and you get five minutes and say whatever you want to say, what your opinion is, what you like, what you don't like.

Okay? Anything else? Okay. So with that --

THE PRESIDENT: Can $I$ get a motion to adjourn?

MS. MYERS: So moved.
THE PRESIDENT: Is there a second?
MR. RILEY: Second.
THE PRESIDENT: All in favor?

-     -         - 

(The Board unanimously responds aye.)

THE PRESIDENT: We're adjourned.

-     -         - 

(Proceedings concluded at 7:16 p.m.)

-     -         - 
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