# BEFORE THE RADNOR TOWNSHIP <br> BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS <br> DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA 

IN RE: Conditional Use Hearing of the Trustees of Dorrance Hamilton 3/15/1996 Revocable Agreement of Trust to Develop Properties at 208 and 228 Strafford Avenue and 18 Forrest Lane

Public hearing in the above matter held pursuant to notice on Monday, January 29, 2024, at the Radnor Township Municipal Building, 301 Iven Avenue, Wayne, Pennsylvania, commencing at 6:32 p.m., before Norma Gerrity, Professional Court Reporter.

BEFORE: MOIRA MULRONEY, Vice President
JAKE ABEL, Member
CATHERINE AGNEW, Member
JAMES COATES, Member
JACK LARKIN, Member
JIM RILEY, Member
JOHN RICE, ESQUIRE, Solicitor
APPEARANCES: GEORGE W. BROSEMAN, ESQUIRE, for the Applicant

NOAH MARLIER, ESQUIRE,
Special Counsel for Radnor Township
ALSO PRESENT: PEGGY HAGAN, Executive Assistant to Township Manager

NORMA GERRITY
Professional Court Reporter
14 Fetters Boulevard
Downingtown, PA 19335
610-246-2362

## I N D E X

```
APPIICANT WITNESS:
PAGE
CHARLES HOUDER
    By Mr. Broseman
    31
    By Mr. Marlier
    61,100
    By the Parties
    By the Commissioners
    7
    111
```

EXHIBITS
APPLICANT:
A-2 C. Houder CV
A-3 Prior Decision of Board
MARKED RECD
32 --
A-4 Neighbor Plan dated September
2023
48
--
51 --

MS. MULRONEY: Good evening. Hi.
Welcome. Thank you everyone for being here tonight. I will open this meeting.

It is the conditional use application of the Trustees of Dorrance Hamilton 3/15/1996 Revocable Agreement of Trust.

As we all know, they are seeking approval to develop the properties at 208 and 228 Strafford Avenue and 18 Forrest Lane in Wayne.

At this point, $I$ 'm going to turn it over to John Rice, he's our township solicitor, and he will help run the hearing for us, the commissioners, tonight.

We sit sort of as judges, so we'll be listening to the evidence as it's presented and ultimately make a decision. Our solicitor will be guiding us through the process.

John?
MR. RICE: Thank you. So just a
little bit of procedural background and how this is going to take place.

Some of you, I think, have been here
at some of the other hearings.
This is a conditional use hearing. It's like a zoning hearing board hearing.

A zoning application has been filed by the applicant. They're seeking to build I believe it's 38 townhomes on the property.

We met in August, and we met on December 7th. No testimony has occurred yet.

We're going to start the testimony tonight. There will be sworn witnesses that will be sworn in.

Mr. Broseman is representing the applicant. Mr. Marlier is representing the township's interest in this application.

Conditional use is like a special exception. It goes to a zoning hearing board.

If that would be approved, then there's still a whole land development process that would have to occur.

So I anticipate we're going to have at least three or four nights of testimony, maybe less, but we are scheduled tonight to
go, $I$ would suggest we would go tonight, if the board is okay with that, till

9:00 o'clock. That's two and a half hours. And then we are back here again Wednesday night at the same time at 6:30.

So the first thing $I$ want to do is go through all of the resident parties, because we had some discussion about that on December 9th. Several of the parties were not here.

If you want to become a party to the application, that means you have the right to ask questions of all the witnesses that the applicant calls or the township will call. You can cross-examine witnesses.

So as the witnesses are sworn in and testify, $I$ 'm going to call on each party, do you have any questions for this witness. You don't have to have questions. You can just pass.

But it's questions. It's not
statements. It's not, you know, I hate this, this is horrible, or this is the greatest thing I've ever seen. You're
going to have to ask questions of the witness.

He's going to call an engineer. He's going to call a planner, $I$ guess. I don't know who all Mr. Broseman will call, but that's the typical process.

You don't have to ask questions if you're a party. If you're just here because you live there and you have an interest, there will be public comment on this before the board makes a decision.

Once all the sworn testimony comes in, there will be a public comment period, so you can wait till then, which will not be tonight, it probably won't be Wednesday night, but whenever all the sworn testimony comes in, there will be public comment.

So any questions about party status at this point? Let me go through the list -yes, sir? You're going to have to come up to the microphone.

And, please, anybody that's coming up to the microphone, pull it toward you, and you have to speak into it.

MR. CURLEY: Thank You, Mr. Rice. I am Brian Curley, 136 Fairfield Lane in Wayne.

MR. RICE: Mr. Curley, let me stop you right there. I have your e-mail. I'm going to call on you shortly.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Okay. Okay. I'm going to go through the list, the residents that were here either in August or December are on a list, which $I$ sent a letter to all of you telling you that there is no objection from the applicant to your party status, but there is either an objection or a reservation from the applicant as to certain individuals.

So I'm going to go through the whole list and see who is here and who is not here tonight, and then anybody that $M r$. Broseman wants to ask a question of, you're going to need to come up, and he has the right to question your party status.

If you don't live within close proximity to the property, you're not
automatically a party.
Just being a township resident doesn't make you automatically a party. You have to be within some proximity, and the court cases aren't all that clear as to how close you have to be, but generally it's five, six, 700 feet within or close to the property.

And they are rules that we didn't make up. The township didn't make them up. They are the rules that the courts have established over the years in terms of party status in a zoning hearing.

If $y o u$ live in Tredyffrin, you have no shot. You're not a party. We've had a few Tredyffrin residents come to these.

But anyway, let's just go through that, and I'll start with the list that I have, and $I$ have at least two additional individuals, including Mr. Curley, that we'll get to at the end of this list.

So Jennifer Pechet, is she here? P-A-C-H-E-T?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's sick.

MR. RICE: She is here or she isn't here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She is sick.
MR. RICE: She is not here. Okay.
Well, there's no objection from Mr.
Broseman.
Gregg Hess? Mr. Broseman has an objection to your party status. Are you here? Gregg Hess, 66 Crestline Road?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, I assume you still have an objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: And what's the basis of the objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: I would want him to explain his interest in the matter.

Offhand, his property seems quite far away from the subject property.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, let's hold Mr. Hess in abeyance, and if he doesn't come on Wednesday night, $I$ think he's out at this
point.
You have to show up. First rule of anything. Showing up. Hopefully on time.

Mary Ann Mahoney? Is she here?
MS. MAHONEY: Yes, present.
MR. RICE: Okay. Thank you. There's no objection.

Brian Curley. Mr. Curley, you're already on my list, and there's no objection to you. Okay?

MR. CURLEY: Okay.
MR. RICE: Robby Wierman, 101 Lantoga Road. Are you here?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, I assume you have the same objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Proximity? And she is not here.

Amber Levy on behalf of the Radnor Conservancy?

MS . LEVY: Here.

MR. RICE: I know she is here. So, Ms. Levy, if you could come up, Mr. Broseman has an objection, and he may have some questions for you.

MR. BROSEMAN: I may not have an objection after $I$ ask some questions.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MS . LEVY: Shoot.
MR. BROSEMAN: Did you want to say something first?

MS. LEVY: Yes. I am Amber Atwood Levy, L-E-V-Y. I am the executive director for Radnor Conservancy.

We are a local nonprofit. We preserve and enhance open space and natural assets within the township and have been doing so for 20 years.

The organization was, has a foundation in response to development, so participating in the conversations is kind of what we do.

So, Mr. Broseman, I'm happy to answer any questions.

MR. BROSEMAN: As I recall from a
prior proceeding, is this -- am I remembering correctly that the Radnor Conservancy has offices basically right across Eagle Road from the property?

MS. LEVY: We do, yes.
MR. BROSEMAN: Okay. I don't have an objection to the Radnor Conservancy.

MR. RICE: So the conservancy is in as a party.

MS. LEVY: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Louisa Hanshew, 219
Sugartown Road. Are you here?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, I assume you still have an objection then; is that correct?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, I do.
MR. RICE: Okay. Joe Schuda? I see Mr. Schuda here.

Gregory Szary?
MR. SZARY: Here.
MR. RICE: Steven Rocci, R-O-C-C-I,

201 Bloomingdale Avenue. Are you here? Steven? Okay.
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, still the same objection? Proximity, I take it?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Peter Clark?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Not here. Do you still have an objection to him? Peter Clark?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. I'm not even sure I know where he lives or anything.

MR. RICE: I don't have an address on Peter Clark. So, Peter Clark, if you're listening, you are not a party unless you're here on Wednesday night and we can clear that up.

All we have -- $I$ believe all we ever got from Mr. Clark was an e-mail address, and that's not good enough.

Sharon and David Willis， 335 Strafford Avenue．Are you here？
（Raised hands．）

MR．RICE：Okay．Mr．Broseman，do you still have an objection to the Willises？ Or you had reserved an objection on December $9 t h$ ．

MR．BROSEMAN：I object．I believe they＇re in Tredyffrin Township．

MR．RICE：Is that correct？
MS．WILLIS：Yes．
MR．RICE：Okay．All right．And that＇s the objection．How far are they from the property？

Could we have either Mr．or Mrs．
Willis come up？
MS．WILLIS：Sharon Willis，
W－Iーエ－IーI－S．
MR．RICE：Okay．And，Ms．Willis，how far do you live from the property？

MS．WILLIS：We＇re about a block down on the way towards the train station，and
we were, well, we're six houses down from the intersection of Grant Lane and Hedgerow Lane, and we were parties to the last application.

MR. RICE: Okay. Okay. Mr. Broseman, do you still object on the basis that they're Tredyffrin residents?

And I realize what $I$ said earlier tonight, if you live in Tredyffrin, it might be a problem, but --

MR. BROSEMAN: I understand, but, yes. I think it's a little too remote. I'm not sure, I haven't heard any direct --

MS. WILLIS: We have rivers of mud in front of our house and lakes.

MR. RICE: Ms. Willis, hold on a minute.

MS. WILLIS: Okay.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, you still have a proximity objection; is that right?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, and I'm not sure of the direct, substantial, or immediate interest that they would have as opposed to other residents of Tredyffrin.

MR. RICE: Okay. So I'm going to recommend, I'm going to just recommend that till I map this out, because just being in another township isn't enough to disqualify somebody.

If you're right across the street or within a block, that's a different issue. So let's just hold you in reservation. I remember you from Hamilton-1.

MS. WILLIS: Yep. Okay.
MR. RICE: And, Mr. Broseman, we'll come back Wednesday night. I want to map out the address and see how close it is to the property.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'll check that as well. I don't have it on my map here.

MR. RICE: I mean, the Willises might be closer than some of the other folks that live in Radnor, as far as that goes.

MR. ABEL: Can $I$ ask a question?
MR. RICE: Sure.
MR. ABEL: So how was she able to be a party to the last, the previous commissioners hearing, but we're
questioning whether she can or can't be tonight?

MR. RICE: I suspect that there was no objection last time.

If the applicant doesn't object, then a person is in, as long as they are within close proximity. So tonight there's an objection.

MR. ABEL: Would that be in her favor, that they were part of a previous party?

MR. RICE: It would be, but it still becomes a question of how close do they live to the site.

I mean, the courts say if you live within a certain distance of a property, it's almost -- it's assumed that you're impacted differently than somebody that lives on the other side of the township.

So I think $I$ want to clarify it before there's any final decision on that. Mr. Broseman can look at it.

Mr. Marlier, if you want to look at that. The address is 335 Strafford Avenue that we're dealing with.

Steve and Megan Scheri? Are you here? MR. SCHERI: Here.

MR. RICE: Okay. There's no
objection.
And Cindy Hansen, there was a reservation by Mr. Broseman. And, Ms. Hansen, you live at 6 Hedgerow?

MS. HANSEN: Correct.
MR. RICE: Could you come up, please?
Mr. Broseman may have questions for you about where you live.

MR. BROSEMAN: Hi. Good evening. Are you in Tredyffrin Township also?

MS. HANSEN: I am. I'm right on the border.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm sorry. What was the address again?

MS. HANSEN: Six Hedgerow Lane. I'm approximately . 08 miles, less than 500 feet.

MR. BROSEMAN: Mr. Rice, would you mind if, like we did with the other, that $I$ check the map and you would as well?

MR. RICE: Okay.

MR. BROSEMAN: I just don't have that on my map. I'm having a hard time seeing it.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right. You're in so far. We're going to come back on Wednesday and map out the address.

I have one other person that sent me an e-mail, $I$ think, over the weekend, $M r$. and Mrs. -- forgive me -- Chawla?

MR. CHAWLA: Yes.
MR. RICE: And you live at 21 Grant?
MR. CHAWLA: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Broseman, Mr. Chawla has requested party status. Any objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier, do you object?

MR. MARLIER: No objection. Can you spell it?

MR. RICE: $\mathbf{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{W}-\mathrm{L}-\mathbf{A}$.
MR. MARLIER: Is there a first name?
MR. CHAWLA: Gagan, G-A-G-A-N, 21 Grant Lane.

MR. RICE: Okay. Now, is there anybody else that $I$ missed?

Yes? Please come on up to the microphone.

MS. LAFARGE: Catherine Lafarge, L-A-F-A-R-G-E. I live on 9 Forrest Lane, so $I$ am in Tredyffrin.

But $I$ have also lived there for 42 years, so $I$ have a pretty good idea of what's happening.

MR. RICE: And you're on Forrest Lane?
MS . LAFARGE: Yes.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, any objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: I'd like to map that one out, too, if that's okay. I could let you know on Wednesday.

MR. RICE: Okay. So we have three Tredyffrin residents who appear to live close by, but we're going to confirm that between now and Wednesday night.

So, sir?
MR. SAREEN: Anujeet Sareen, the last name is $S-A-R-E-E-N$, the first name is

A-N-U-J-E-E-T. I'm at 205 Strafford in Wayne.

MR. RICE: Okay. I need you to say that again, the last name.

MR. SAREEN: Sareen, $S-A-R-E-E-N$.
MR. RICE: Okay. And you're requesting to become a party?

MR. SAREEN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: Thank you, sir.
Yes, sir?
MR. HYMEL: Ted Hymel, H-Y-M-E-L, 11 Forrest Lane. We are in Tredyffrin. We're within a few hundred yards probably of the site.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: As with Ms. Lafarge, I assume she lives at nine. Mr. Hymel's at 11. I'll check that out and let you know on Wednesday, if that's okay.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right. So come back Wednesday.

MR. MARLIER: Mr. Rice, if I may,
whoever is being added to party status, if we could collect e-mails, I'm sure Mr. Broseman and $I$, the attorneys for the township and the applicant respectively, will be sending out an e-mail at some point, and $I$ wouldn't want to miss any party.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. MARIIER: Thank you.
MS. RUSCHMANN: Hi. I tried to send an e-mail but it got kicked back.

I am Margaret Ruschmann,
$\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$, and I am also a
Tredyffrin resident at 14 Grant Lane, and I am just kitty-corner, less than 500 feet from the corner of the property, but I'm on Grant Lane.

MR. RICE: You're in Tredyffrin also?
MS. RUSCHMANN: Tredyffrin.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, any
objection? Do you want to deal with all the Tredyffrin residents --

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to check on my map, if that's okay. I don't have that.

You're at 14 Grant Lane?
MS. RUSCHMANN: 14 Grant Lane.
MR. BROSEMAN: Okay.
MS. RUSCHMANN: I was party to the other one. I live right in that little area. Okay?

MR. SATTERFIELD: My name is Dave Satterfield, S-A-T-T-E-R-F-I-E-I-D. I'm at 207 Strafford.

MR. RICE: Mr. Satterfield, is that in Tredyffrin also?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Radnor.
MR. RICE: Radnor?
MR. SATTERFIELD: Directly across from the development.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, any objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: I have no objection.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MS. NUTTALL: I'm Becky Nuttall, N-U-T-T-A-I-L. I live at 427 West Beechtree.

It's on the corner of Eagle Road and West Beechtree which is, I don't know, how
big is a block?
It might be a block and a half. I'm right at the corner. So right down the road is where it is from me.

MR. RICE: Your address again, please?
MS. NUTTALL: 427 West Beechtree Lane, on the corner Beechtree and Eagle.

MR. BROSEMAN: I would object to that last one, although I'll confirm on the map, but it looks quite far.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: It looks like it's on the other side of the railroad tracks, more than a block, by what $I$ can see.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. HOLLOWAY: Good evening. Cas Holloway. I'm the general partner for $C$. F. Holloway, III - St. Honore, LLC, general partner for St. Honore Holding Company, LLC.

We own the properties at 215, 219, 223, and 227 Strafford Avenue, directly across the street from the property.

From what I heard Mr. Rice say this
evening, if we have any questions during the proceedings, we have to be a party. Is that --

MR. RICE: No, no. You can ask questions any time.

If you want to question the witnesses, you have to become a party.

MR. HOLLOWAY: And I'm not sure. I might have no questions. I just wanted to clarify that if we need to be a party, if we do have questions during the proceeding.

MR. RICE: About the procedures and questions about the application and the plan, you need to become a party.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Okay. So I would like to become a party, if the owner has no objection.

MR. BROSEMAN: There's no objection.
MR. RICE: No objection?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. HOLLOWAY: Thank you.
MS. SILVER: Kaitlin, K-A-I-T-L-I-N, last name Silver, $S-I-L-V-E-R$, and I'm a homeowner at 201 Strafford Ave in Radnor,
right across from the property.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. GAETO: Hello, everyone. I'm Mark Gaeto.

I'm at 4 Hedgerow Lane in Strafford 19087, from Tredyffrin, but I'm about a couple hundred yards from the property, G-A-E-T-O. I'd like to be able to ask questions as well.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, a Tredyffrin resident. I assume you have the same objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. MARIIER: Can we state the address again, please?

MR. GAETO: Four Hedgerow Lane.
MR. MARIIER: Thank you.
MR. GAETO: So that's a no?
MR. RICE: You're in so far. There's going to be a final decision on Wednesday on that.

MR. CLEMENTE: John Clemente, C-L-E-M-E-N-T-E. I'm at 12 Forrest Lane,
right down the block.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: Is that Tredyffrin Township, Mr. Clemente?

MR. CLEMENTE: I'm afraid it is, yes.
MR. BROSEMAN: Is it in Tredyffrin?
MR. CLEMENTE: Yes, it is. It's in Tredyffrin, right on the border. I think I'm the last house on the border.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: Just for consistency, I'll object, but $I$ was going to check the map on all of these, as $I$ had mentioned.

MR. RICE: We have about half a dozen mainly Tredyffrin residents.

MR. CLEMENTE: I'm on the border, the last house.

MR. RICE: Sir, what is your last name again?

MR. CLEMENTE: Clemente.
MR. RICE: Thank you.
MR. CLEMENTE: Thank you.
MR. RICE: So for purposes of tonight, we'll treat everybody as if they're a party
as we go through witnesses.
As $I$ said, you don't have to ask questions, and if someone has asked your question already, there's no reason to ask it again.

We now have 25 resident parties in addition to the township and the applicant, so I'm trying to be as efficient as possible. I'm going to be the referee to some extent as we go through this.

Everybody that came tonight and signed up, $I$ would like you to visit Peggy Hagan, who is sitting over here.

Give them your full name, your address, and your e-mail address, because that's the way we've been communicating with hearings and any other types of notices.

So before you leave tonight, please do that. There will probably be a break at some point, but we're going to need that.

Okay. Mr. Broseman, Mr. Marlier, any questions at this point?

MR. BROSEMAN: None from me.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, you're ready to call your first witness?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. Well, let's have that person sworn in. You're going to have your witness where, Mr. Broseman? Right next to you?

MR. BROSEMAN: Is that okay?
MR. RICE: That's fine.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. RICE: Are there any questions from the board on where we're going? We're going to start with witnesses now. Okay?

MS. MULRONEY: I do have one question about your timeline, Mr. Broseman, for mapping these parties.

So is that something that you could do on a break tonight, or are you going to come back on Wednesday?

What are your plans for checking on those parties? Right now we're treating them as parties until we hear otherwise, so
when do we expect that?
MR. RICE: I think for tonight, they're in as parties, subject to looking at the map and seeing how close they are to the actual site.

If somebody is a half a mile away, you'll be able to ask questions tonight, but that will not qualify you to become a party.

The addresses, $I$ think most addresses I recognize from the last time, and even though they're in Tredyffrin, that by itself doesn't disqualify somebody.

So $I$ don't know that $I$ can map it out tonight, but you're in conditionally on not being in, subject to the mapping of where you actually live.

Okay?

APPLICANT'S EVIDENCE

CHARLES HOUDER,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Charles Houder, Charlie, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$.

MR. BROSEMAN: Can everyone hear?

-     -         - 

(Discussion off the record.)

-     -         - 


## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Charlie, could you state your business address for the record?
A. It's 40 Morris Avenue in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.
Q. And are you also a resident of Radnor Township?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And could you briefly describe for the board your background?
A. I am a real estate investor and developer. I've been that for about 25 years. We invest in all sorts of real estate but have a particular specialty, $I$ guess, in taking on substantial projects in many cases which have had
difficult approval processes because of their complexity or, in some cases, they were, for want of a better word, kind of messed up.

So we got involved, and we were able to engage in a process and get it figured out and resolved and ultimately developed.

We're based in Bryn Mawr. I'm
stalling now so that George can get to his next question, but based in Bryn Mawr, and most of our activity is in the region, as it were.
Q. Charlie, I've handed out a document. Did you prepare this? It's marked A-2.
A. Yes, I did.
(Applicant's Exhibit $A-2$ was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. This just summarizes some of your background?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And do you have any community connections that you wanted to highlight?
A. I live in Radnor. I have children
that go to Radnor schools. I've been coaching in Radnor youth basketball for many years.

And when I'm not doing those things, I have a significant and ongoing involvement with Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.
Q. What is your role regarding --
A. Oh, and also the Wayne Music Festival. I forgot about that. I'm co-organizer of the Wayne Music Festival, mostly a money raiser.

Mr. Kearns, as you may know, is on the forefront of the planning.
Q. And, Charlie, what is your role regarding the property that is the subject of this conditional use application?
A. Yeah. By way of background, and this may be as good a time as any to mention to the board and to the people that are here, but a rather extraordinary thing occurred to me this week.

This project has been, and this is germane to Mr. Broseman's question about how we got involved. So this project has been a topic since about 2018.

Tonight is the first time since then
that everyone, township, applicant, and neighbors, have been in the same room in person, which is incredible.

We were going through a series of informal meetings at the end of '19 and into '20, and then March $13 t h$, the world shut down and everything went virtual.

So we went through the last process online, which was, you know, in my professional estimation is terrible, because you don't get a chance to talk to people.

You don't get a chance to -- everyone is, you know, a cube on a screen and they're raising their hand and they're asking questions, and you don't know if they like the answer or were satisfied with the answer.

But as incredible as that is, this is the first time that we've all been here talking substantively, okay. We've had other procedural meetings.

But in any case, Mrs. Hamilton, as you all know, well, there's a trust that owns this property. Mrs. Hamilton was a part of the trust, and she lived on this property. She died in
2017.

And so of all the assets that she had, this is the one that the trust that owns it was charged with taking it through a process.

As you know, it's a somewhat unusual property. It's got her house on, it's got some other buildings on, and it's got a bunch of other buildings spread all over.

It's very unique, and it's very unique to her. I think it was hard for the family and the trust to think about somebody else stepping into this housing and using it the way she used it.

So they determined, as in their fiduciary capacity, that this should be taken through a process to find its highest and best use.

And so having a relationship with the family and knowing, they asked us would we be interested, and we said yes. So that's a longwinded way of answering your question.
Q. So you personally and your company, you're not a developer in this matter. You're working directly for the trust that owns the
property?
A. Yeah. We're just, we were essentially hired by the trust, and ultimately, if there are homes built here, those will be presumably built by a builder, a home builder.
Q. And many people may know this, but generally for those who might not be familiar, you mentioned Mrs. Hamilton, but could you tell us a little bit about her and her connection to this property?
A. Yes. Well, she lived here since the '50s, raised her kids here, lived here for decades. She, I'm no authority on Mrs. Hamilton, but $I$ think she's relatively well-known in the community.

She had significant means, and she was known to be very philanthropic. She supported a whole laundry list of causes in the suburbs and around Philadelphia, from Jefferson Hospital to University of the Arts to everything in between.

So when she passed, she had, I guess, put the property into a trust form of ownership prior to her passing, and when she passed and no longer lived here, then it was, fell to the
trustees to do something with the land and essentially find its highest and best use, which is what brings us here today.
Q. Did she have a connection with the next-door Eagle Village Shops?
A. Yes. She -- yeah. I'm speaking somewhat loosely, because I'm not speaking in terms of the legal forms of ownership, but she was, had an ownership interest in the Eagle Village Shopping Center, which is adjacent to her house, and was also involved in some of the businesses there, Valley Forge Flowers and others, which she helped to build out and make them look the way they do today.
Q. And over the years since the 1950s, was there development near and around Mrs. Hamilton's property?
A. Yeah, definitely. I mean, yeah. I think that starting from when she moved there, it probably looked extraordinarily different than it does today, and most of, $I$ think, the surrounding neighborhoods have filled in significantly certainly since the time she started living there, as well as the commercial corridor of

Lancaster Avenue.
Q. And there was a subdivision across the street. I think some of the people who became parties, I think a parent tract address was 205 Strafford Avenue that was subdivided in more recent years; is that correct?
A. Yep, yeah. There's a decent amount of new construction along Strafford and in the neighborhood.
Q. And there was a redevelopment of a former Villa Strafford restaurant property about a block away on Strafford Avenue?
A. Yes.
Q. To your knowledge, did Mrs. Hamilton object to those developments?
A. I don't believe she did.
Q. What is your understanding of the purpose of the trust regarding the property that's the subject of this application?
A. So I'm not a trustee, but as we've been advised, it's a trust with a charitable purpose. So the trust has assets.

And in accordance with the dictates of the trust, it donates a portion of those assets
and the income to charitable causes.
The causes that it has elected to pursue are educational causes in the greater Philadelphia area, in the five-county region, as well as, of course, the University of the Arts.

So in addition to any other assets that it has, when this property ultimately gets sold, those proceeds will go into the coffers and they will continue to amplify those efforts.
Q. And how did you go about advising the trust regarding this property?
A. Yeah. Well, that's important. I mean, one of the things that $I$ was hoping to do per my statement earlier about us all being sort of in the same room together, and also noting that some of the board members weren't here the last time that this was submitted, is just sort of talk about, $I$ guess, a little bit of the history here, which is, when we were asked to look at the property, you know, unlike other developments in the area where sometimes developers look at a future property and say, I really think it should be this, so how do I figure out how to fit that into the rules, here
it was, what is the highest and best use of the property?

We advised getting a group of professionals who were very familiar with Radnor, and so we identified Mr. Broseman principally, as well as Bern Panzak and Rob Lambert, engineers, landscape architects, land use attorney, and said, look at the code and draw what comes out of your analysis of the code with no necessarily instruction other than that.

And so they did that, and what resulted was them recognizing that the conditional use is an option in the $R-4$ zone.

You can go single family. You can go conditional use. If you go conditional use, you have to meet certain rules.

They drew the plan to meet those rules, and that was the plan that came through the last time, and it was denied, and it was denied based on the fact that -- two reasons.

It was, one, that there were
stormwater facilities under what was considered open space. We thought that was okay, because it was true open space.

It wasn't a swale or a stormwater retention basin that we were trying to count as open space. It was a lawn that was going to have an underground system.

And then the other objection was that because we had open space spread around the property, it wasn't quality open space. So those are both things that we didn't necessarily agree with.

We actually thought that it was okay to put the stormwater facilities under the open space as long as it was still usable open space on top. So in response to that denial, we went back and said, okay, fix it.

Now, in the meantime, the township changed its rules and said that you have to have 25 percent open space instead of 15 percent open space.

And so the guys went back and they redrew the plan, and it resulted in the plan that you see today, which is 38 units, not 41.

It has all the stormwater management separate from the open space, other than the small amount that is allowed to overlap, that the
new rule says that you're allowed to have a certain amount of overlap, and the 25 percent threshold, which is the new open space threshold, is met.

So we submitted that plan, and that's the plan that's before you. But if I may, and I'll ask for, $I$ guess, $I$ don't know if $I$ can talk about this, but --
Q. Charlie, before do you that, you mentioned the ordinance changes.

Was there something added also that said that the open space, the required common open space has to be contiguous unless otherwise approved by the board of commissioners?
A. Yes, yeah. So that was the other change. So essentially we interpreted that to mean that to count anything as open space, it had to be meshed together, so you couldn't have open space here and open space there. You had to have it all concentrated.

So all that resulted in the plan that is now submitted and before you. But the other thing, and this is why $I$ think it's so important of everybody being here together.

So while we were getting ready to submit that revised, what we hoped would be a responsive plan, we continued to have dialogue with the neighbors.

And our focus, well, was on the folks on Grant Lane and the folks on Forrest and making sure that those water conditions, the adjacent properties, were as great as they could be.

So we called for two broadcast, you know, sent out e-mails to as big of a list as we could come up with last summer, and one was on a Tuesday night, and then we had one on a Saturday in the morning just to try to create some different possibilities for people.

So the interesting thing that happened was that the folks that came out were the Grant Lane residents and Mr. Schuda, who's behind me, on Forrest.

So the purpose of the meeting was to go through the plan that's before you and explain the 38 units and why it changed from the last one.

And I went through the whole dog-and-pony show of explaining the new plan and
all of the changes, and the neighbors politely listened.

And then one of the neighbors, who shall remain nameless, but he's in the audience, sort of raised his hand and said, can $I$ have your pen for a second?

And he walked up to the 38 -unit plan that's before you today and he said, what if you changed this, this, and this, and he basically moved some buffering around and cleaned out some of the units, created a bigger buffer so that we could do more stormwater on the Forrest Lane side.

He said, what --
MR. MARLIER: I'm just going to object to hearsay at this point.

MR. RICE: Can $I$ just ask a question because, $I$ mean, this is a recitation of what has gone on, starting with the prior application. It's not factual testimony on this specific application.

I mean, $I$ understand it's background, and there is hearsay. We've heard about a trust, but that's not been marked or
admitted in this record.
So, you know, $I$ know what you want to do with this, but let's get to testimony on this particular application. I think that that's important.

He's not an expert witness; correct, Mr. Broseman? You're not offering him up as an expert?

MR. BROSEMAN: That's right. I do believe we're entitled to present our case and should be given some latitude in how we do that.

Mr. Marlier did make relevant, in my view, the old decision when we were here in December.

He raised an issue regarding whether that decision is affected by the doctrine of res judicata, and $I$ think we are entitled to talk about the old plan, the old decision, because we're going to be talking about how this plan is different from that and why that is.

It is an issue that was brought into this, so we would like to cover those
things.
And the board, in all of my years of experience here, has always been eager to hear about community outreach, and that's what Mr. Houder is talking about now, so --

MR. RICE: Understood.
MR. BROSEMAN: I don't think we have a lot of time to go on this.

THE WITNESS: And, Mr. Rice, if I may, in a couple of sentences, $I$ can bring this in for a landing.

MR. RICE: Well, let's deal with the objection, first of all.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. RICE: The objection --
MR. MARLIER: And I was giving wide latitude to a number of things, but when he starts talking about what other people said at a meeting, that's obviously hearsay.

MR. RICE: Right. And he has to object to that. But this is a zoning hearing, so we all know that the rules of evidence don't apply in zoning cases in Pennsylvania.

So there is wide latitude, but I think we need to talk about this specific application at some point. That's all.

THE WITNESS: And just with a couple of sentences, and then we can move on.

My point in bringing all of that up is that it was really great, because the neighbors who were most focused on, especially that condition, came up with points, all of which we agreed to.

I mean, that's what $I$ said, $I$ would agree on all of those, but we can't without leave from the township, because we have to follow the rules. We can't break up the open space, and we can't move things around in this way.

So my only point in going into that was, that all happened outside the view of this group by design. It was an informal meeting right out in the hallway.

But I think it's important, even in a zoning context, to know that there's been significant dialogue and real input that $I$ think, if explored, frankly, makes the plan
better.
So I just wanted to make the board aware of that. It's just, it was a very organic and healthy process that I thought was, you know, we're glad that it happened. BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Now, Charlie, $I$ have as Exhibit A-3 the prior decision of the board.

Applicant's Exhibit $A-3$ was marked for identification.)

MR. BROSEMAN: Do you need a copy of that, Mr. Rice? I would just like to put that in the record.

MR. RICE: How many copies do you have?

MR. BROSEMAN: I have several.
MR. RICE: I would -- yes. If you're going to refer to it, I mean, I would like to obviously have a copy of it.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm not going to refer to it right now, but $I$ have copies. I would just like to make it $A-3$.

[^0]MR. RICE: Let's bring one up, and we'll make it Exhibit A-3. I have to keep them in some order.

And just in terms of the other parties, whatever extra copies Mr. Broseman has I'm going to ask him to leave over here for anybody that wants to take a look at the table, because you all have a right to look at the exhibits also. Okay?

MR. BROSEMAN: And I would say, if we do get the e-mail list and people want to get copies, we can figure out a way to make that happen if they don't get them tonight.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, do you have any more copies you can bring up here?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
(Discussion off the record.)

-     -         - 

MR. BROSEMAN: I was going to say, I was aware there were old things on the website, and the last time arrangements were made to put the things on, so we could work with the township to do that.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Charlie, could we put up Exhibit A-4? Before you put it up, to give Mr. Marlier an opportunity, this is what we're calling the neighbor plan.

MS. MULRONEY: Mr. Broseman, can you use the mic so everybody can hear?

MR. BROSEMAN: To give fair warning before we flash it up there, it's what we're calling the neighbor plan, which is basically what arose out of the meeting that Mr. Houder mentioned, and we're not going to go over it in great detail, but we wanted to provide it.

We also wanted some of the neighbors on Grant Lane that were involved in this to know that we hadn't forgotten about that. So is that okay, if $I$ move to $A-4$ ?

MR. RICE: Sure. So this is the, we're calling this A-4, the neighbor plan. This is not the same conditional use plan that's in front of the board?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MR. RICE: Right? Okay.

Q. It is at the bottom.
A. Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. So good
point.
For everyone looking for
clarification, we show it as an alternate down below, but all of the changes we were in agreement with.

And most notably, you know, what it does on the Grant Lane side, which is that side, it creates an 85-foot buffer which allows us to do enhanced, even more enhanced stormwater management facilities underground in that location.
Q. Now, Mr. Lambert is going to go over the -- we're just going to take a break while --

MR. RILEY: I have a question. I can see on the screen, the one that's up there now, it's from September of 2023, and the one that's on file that $I$ looked at prior is from May of 2023.

The one that you just handed out in the lower right corner is from September, which is the one you're calling A-4.

So just so we have it like in order, I think it would help to say the dates on them.

MR. RICE: Let me clarify, because plans get changed over time. So the application for this conditional use was filed in May 2023. That's the plan that's in front of the board.

During the course of the conditional use hearing, the applicant can come forward with other plans that may be better than what was filed or they think is better or you think is better than was filed in 2023, and that's what we're looking at now; correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, and it's mostly a result, and again, $I$ think in every land development I've ever been involved in, plans get better when you take input, and this, to me, was, really the hallmarks of it are, all came from that meeting in July of last summer with the Grant Lane and Mr. Schuda neighbors.

MR. RICE: So in the board's consideration, I mean, ultimately the board has to make a decision, that decision you can consider this new plan or any aspects
of this new plan that you think are better or worse than what was originally filed.

Sometimes this becomes a moving target with applicants that submit things in response to, but that's what we're dealing with.

This is in the record now. The original application, as you know, what you looked at and what $I$ think everybody has is probably what's posted on the township's website from May of 2023.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. RICE: This is a modification, an idea, something that the board can consider in coming to some resolution or decision.

MS. MULRONEY: Will you be going into specificity around what the changes are between what was submitted and what we're looking at?

THE WITNESS: I can. It's --
MS. MULRONEY: It might be helpful to understand what changed.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. So without this being, so this is what we drew in
response to what we heard.
So what we heard was these folks, Grant Lane neighbors, all in Radnor, and Mr. Schuda --

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. For the record, you're referring to the Grant Lane residents to the north of the property immediately adjoining?
A. That's correct, share a border. And with the way that the land falls, they feel impacts from water.

And so right now this property has no stormwater management and is an empty property. So the idea is, how do we get as much stormwater management as possible in this corridor.

So what we did was took the buffer from here, which is, and I'm approximating, but the buffer that is in the submitted plan following the dictates of the code would have the buffer right around here.
Q. You're saying "here." For the record, can you be more --
A. I'm sorry. On this side. Is it 30 feet, Rob?
Q. Twenty-five feet.
A. Twenty-five feet. So this takes it out to 85 feet. Also, instead of having five, one, two, three, four, five on this, we'll call northern Grant Lane border, it takes away this middle unit and makes it less dense here.

The other thing it does is it gets to that amplified buffer by making this common green smaller.

On the submitted plan, because of the contiguousness requirement, all of the open space is in this center green.

Open space is great. Center greens are great. But the one on the submitted plan is so enormous that it sort of like loses its function. It's almost too much of a good thing.

It's almost 1.8 acres of square open space, which, just to frame that, that's roughly the size of the Radnor Middle School playing field. What this plan did is to distribute it.

And what, $I$ guess, maybe to
paraphrase, quality open space might be in the eye of the beholder, and this center green, $I$ think, still works great as a center green.

These buffers are still great on the Staffford Avenue side. But this buffer becomes a mega buffer on the Grant Lane north side.

The other specific thing, obviously it adds this entrance onto Eagle, which again we can't do without leave of the township. But the other thing it does, and this is a significant point.

The current filed plan does not include this parcel here, which is 22 Forrest Lane -- I'm sorry, 18 Forrest Lane, my apologies -- 18 Forrest Lane.

This is a house right now that a woman lived in that worked for Mrs. Hamilton. The current plan doesn't include that lot.

One of the stipulations that we made as part of the desire to speak to these neighbors is basically take this house away and make this forever an open lot.

It will be a landscaped lawn. It will be landscaped and taken care of by the HOA. It will have stormwater, additional stormwater management underneath it.

And it just, in the totality of, you
know, honestly good faith and good ideas put forward by these neighbors, it is putting this into the mix as something that would just create, and again, I'll try to describe this.

Going west, so the land falls this way, sort of the direction Ms. Kircher lives, so towards the west.

And so all of this amplified catchment area all underground feels like good steps in the right direction for stormwater. So anyway, those were the essential features.

Frankly, that lot has great value, but in the grand scheme of these changes, I'm hard pressed to say why they're not all good ideas. So that -- those were the ideas that we incorporated.

MR. BROSEMAN: Let me just see if I have anything else for Mr. Houder at this time.

THE WITNESS: One other thought that's related to these changes and the filed plan versus this plan.

The first one we started way back when. Most of it, all of the formal part
of the process was online.
And now here we are, is that this property, $I$ was having a conversation earlier today with someone from the Radnor Conservancy.

And the point $I$ wanted to make is that this property will be developed. It will be developed.

If it has to be developed as single-family homes, small lot, singlefamily homes, it will get developed as small lot, single-family homes.

I believe that a plan like this using the conditional use section of the code provides much greater opportunities for better planning, which is to say that the direction here is to, whether it's this plan or the filed plan, the stormwater management system meets a very high standard.

It's a hundred year stormwater management system in both plans. And that, and all of this open space, this plan still meets the 25 percent open space.

It's, I guess it's debatably
noncontiguous, which again we would need the leave of the township, but I still think when we look at this plan, it looks like there's a lot of open space.

Anyway, all of those opportunities for open space, an amped-up stormwater management system, all of the buffering, and all of the professional landscaping and preservation that will come in that buffering all can happen with this plan.

If it becomes small lot, single-family homes, yes, you're going to have landscaping and you're going to have stormwater management of a kind, but that's going to be up to 25 homeowners to decide, you know, how they're going to handle that with respect to landscaping.

And with respect to stormwater management, $I$ would argue that most significantly these buffer areas give the opportunity for the greatest relief.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And, Mr. Houder, do you remain willing
to work with the adjacent neighbors and the township to address concerns and come up with a good plan?
A. Of course.

MR. BROSEMAN: That's all I have for Mr. Houder at this time.

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

MR. MARIIER: I do.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. You mentioned the trust, sir. Can you go through all the individuals that make up the trust?
A. I don't know, $I$ can't say -- I'm not sure if this is on? Sorry. I can't say --

MR. BROSEMAN: Charlie, use this.
THE WITNESS: I can't say definitively
that $I$ have an exhaustive list of the
trustees, but just to characterize it, it's the children of Mrs. Hamilton and the estate and trust attorney.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. And you don't know how many children Mrs. Hamilton has that are in the trust?
A. She has three children, had three children.
Q. Are you able to give their names for the record, so the board knows who's in the trust, who the applicant actually is?
A. Well, it's the trust.
Q. Understood. And who are the three children that make up the trust?
A. I don't know that, if I'm under oath, I don't know that $I$ can say that with a thousand percent certainty.
Q. Understood. So you're not sure what their names are?
A. I know what her three children's names are. I just don't know -- I can't say under oath that they are all trustees.
Q. So you're not sure if the three children -- you know their names, but you're not sure that all three children make up the trust?
A. Correct.

MR. RICE: So we're probably talking
about beneficiaries to the trust?
THE WITNESS: No. The trustees, I think, is what --

MR. RICE: Well, okay.
MR. MARLIER: That was my next question, Mr. Rice.

MR. RICE: You have trustees, you have a trust, and you have beneficiaries of the trust. But go ahead, Mr. Marlier.

MR. MARIIER: That was my next question.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. So the trustees, you had mentioned that it was the children, that it was the estate and trust attorney, but you're not sure if the children do make up the trust?
A. I believe that they do, but $I$ wouldn't want to say that under oath, because I'm not a hundred percent certain that all three are trustees.
Q. Understood. And who are the beneficiaries of the trust?
A. I don't know, other than charities that are designated by the trustees. The ones
that have been reported to me are University of the Arts, and without specific names, some educational institutions that are in the five-county area.
Q. You mentioned that if the homes would be built, that they would be built by a home builder. Who would that developer be?
A. To be determined.
Q. You mentioned during your testimony the homes that are being built on 205 Strafford Road across from this proposed development. How many homes are being built?

MR. BROSEMAN: I would object. 205
Strafford is an existing residence. The gentleman who lives there is here. You might be speaking of the other development.

MR. MARLIER: I might be.
THE WITNESS: St. Honore? The St.
Honore development?
BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. How many homes are there?
A. I think it's 12?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fourteen.
THE WITNESS: Fourteen.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. Fourteen homes? Is that what you believe?
A. I'm going to take advisement from the public that it's 14, not 12, yeah. I'll go with that.
Q. And I apologize. I'm not from Radnor, I'm not from Delaware County, so help me out.

You mentioned during your testimony something about Villa properties?
A. Oh, yes. So down Staffford Avenue to the east is a development that is known as Villa Strafford, because $I$ think that was the name of the restaurant that was there, and I think that's the name of the driveway that is used for the residents.
Q. And how many homes are at the Villa Strafford?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's 11. I reside there.

THE WITNESS: Oh, there you go. I'll take it on a friend it's 11.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. You're hearing from a resident, for
the record, stating that he lives near that?
A. Yeah. I'm assuming he is correct, yes.
Q. That sounds correct to you?
A. That seems correct, yeah.
Q. And roughly how many acres would the Villa Strafford be, do you know?
A. I don't know off the top of my head, but --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do. 2.51.
MR. MARIIER: Hold on. We can't hear from, yelling out from the crowd is --

THE WITNESS: The answer is, the answer is I don't know. It may be around 2.51. But -- sorry.

MR. BROSEMAN: Charlie, please don't guess if you don't know an answer.

THE WITNESS: I really don't know.
BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. I guess we could do it this way. Is it larger or smaller than the proposed development?
A. It's smaller in acreage, $I$ know that for a fact, and it's higher in density.
Q. And what about the development that we were referring to, St. Honore?
A. Yes, St. Honore.
Q. St. Honore, thank you. Is that smaller or larger in acreage?
A. You know what? I don't know what the acreage is, 'cause $I$ know there's been a little bit of assemblage there, so $I$ don't know what the acreage is.

It was an assemblage of some other parcels, so $I$ don't know what the acreage is.
Q. Mr. Houder, you referenced the opinions from the last, from Hamilton-1, we'll call it, the last conditional use hearing regarding this property, and you mentioned the, some of the legal positions as you thought.

I see on your resume that you did receive a Juris Doctor; correct?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Syracuse?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you a practicing attorney, sir?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been a practicing
attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you last practice law?
A. Um, 2001?
Q. At that time, did you do municipal
law, sir?
A. Real estate transactions.
Q. I see on $A-4$ where it typically would go over, state whether this is a revision or not, and it would have a number and date, there is no, nothing there that this is a revision of any plan.

So this is an entirely new proposed plan relative to the proposed plan in question with the May application that's before this board?
A. Yeah. I'm not sure what you mean by "proposed." It's just a proffered illustration of some ideas of different things you could do.
Q. And you mentioned a number of changes that, between this $A-4$ and the application in question or the plans with the application in question. Are you an engineer, sir?
A. No.
Q. Specific to this plan, did you reduce the number of townhomes?
A. No.
Q. Did you reduce the size of the townhomes?
A. Yeah. I believe that four were reduced in footprint size.
Q. I assume, and $I$ hope, I'm guessing everyone hopes, that we'll have some testimony from an expert regarding this proffered plan, because you did reference the open space and changes you made to that.

Will you be having a witness testify to some of the changes that were made?
A. Yes, and those things that $I$ referred to, calculations and so forth, yes. We have Mr. Lambert, who will be able to address that and/or answer questions.
Q. Great. Thank you. And you mentioned the 18 Forrest Lane. That's the probably -correct me if $I$ 'm wrong -- towards the bottom left of the development? I think it would be northwest?
A. Yes. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Hopefully we'll hear this from an engineer, but is that where the stormwater easement would be as well?
A. There will be -- well, yes, there will be stormwater facilities running, in this proffered plan, there will be stormwater facilities running into that space, and it would make use of that space as part of the overall system.

As to whether there will be easements or not, it would all be one property at that point. We would presumably attach that lot to the overall, so the HOA would sort of own it and control it all.
Q. And on the original plan, I'm not looking at the original plan. I don't think any of us are.

So just to be clear, the stormwater, as well as the sewer, were coming off onto a different property.

Is that to the right of 18 Forrest as you're looking at this plan, to the right of it originally? Is that gone now?

MR. BROSEMAN: Could I suggest, Mr.

Marlier, we do have our engineer who could answer these questions.

THE WITNESS: I'm happy to give you -BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. If you know the answer.
A. I would defer to Mr. Lambert, too, only because his answers on these topics are going to be more satisfactory because they're going to be more precise.
Q. But just to be clear, the 18 Forrest Lane is part of the Hamilton estate? It's all part of that?
A. It is common ownership, yes, but as I said, in the submitted plan, 18 Forrest is not part of the land mass that was submitted.

It's shown here again as part of a set of ideas that came out of neighbor meetings.
Q. Is it part of the Hamilton estate?
A. When you say the "estate," are you referring to the land or the legal, the legal estate?
Q. The legal parties that draw up the --
A. Yes. I believe it's common ownership, yes, like the same entity on the deed, if you
will.
Q. You mentioned that there was numerous differences between this plan and the plan that was submitted in May.

You went through some of those differences. Just to be clear, Mr. Lambert is going to go through all the differences?
A. He can address the differences in any level that would be requested.

MR. MARIIER: I believe that's all the questions $I$ have, $M r$. Rice, for now.

MR. RICE: Thank you. Okay. So I'm going to go through the parties that are here, and if you heard what Mr. Marlier did, he just asked Mr. Houder about what he testified to, not some other topic.

So that's what you're limited to, what he said, and ask him questions about what he just said. So that's your crossexamination that you're entitled to as parties.

EXAMINATION

MR. RICE: So let me start with Mary Ann Mahoney. Any questions of Mr. Houder? Please, you're going to have to come up to the microphone.

MS. MAHONEY: I live at 5 Grant Lane, the first house. I have huge problems with water. I'm hoping that this will help the property that $I$ have right now.

Will this be additional stormwater? Will it help my house, Mr. Houder?

THE WITNESS: Mr. Lambert can go into the math on the stormwater system, but I think I can say, I will say that compared to what's there now, it's an objective fact that what will be here from the stormwater management system will be a great improvement.

MS. MAHONEY: But from what $I$ can see on the map, there's a perimeter at the top. It doesn't look like there's going to be any stormwater that will be affected there.

So I'm still going to have water coming down Strafford Avenue.

MR. RICE: Is that correct, Mr.

Houder? There's no stormwater at the top?
THE WITNESS: I'm going to let Mr . Lambert go through.

When we look at these kinds of images, they don't always show everything that's happening in the layers underneath, if you will.

So Mr. Lambert will go through an extensive run-through of how the stormwater systems work across the whole property.

So if the water falls in the upper right corner, what happens to it if it's, or anywhere else, because what you don't see also on this plan is how the land flows.

And so I'll defer to him, because he can go through it in whatever amount of detail. But again, and $I$ don't say this lightly, because $I$ know it's important.

The system here, you know, when $I$ say it's above and beyond, it's a very robust underground stormwater management system that will certainly help the conditions in this area.

MS. MAHONEY: Um-hum. Okay. Again, my questions are, do they come halfway through to my house?

Like it looks to me right now like it would help my house halfway through, or would it --

MR. RICE: Can you answer that, Mr. Houder?

THE WITNESS: Mr. Lambert will be the one that can talk to you about that in detail, exactly how these systems function.

MS. MAHONEY: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Thank you. Mr. Curley?
And everybody bear in mind that the engineer will testify about stormwater. He's the expert. He may be next.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Houder, can you confirm that you said that the 18 Forrest Lane was just added to the neighbor plan? Is that what you said to us?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. CURLEY: Okay. Because all along, my understanding has been that the original plan was having the stormwater run through

18 Forrest Lane to connect to the sewers that are at the intersection of Forrest Lane and Fairfield Lane.

How, if you just added it, were they going to get rid of the stormwater prior to that?

THE WITNESS: Well, the trust has always owned it, so it had the ability to run facilities through there.

Maybe the difference is, it was always being used for facilities, and I'm looking at Rob, because he can probably speak more precisely. The difference is is that in this plan, nothing will be built on it.

So instead of having an easement along the side of it and you still have a house built, it would be flattened, turned into a lawn, and nothing would be built there.

MR. CURLEY: But 18 Forrest Lane has always been in the picture; am I correct?

Because to say it was new, to me, is disingenuous, because I believe you're going to have to run stormwater through
there.
It's always been part of the plan. It's just now it's been changed. For you to say it's new, to me, is disingenuous.

THE WITNESS: Well, I wish you wouldn't take it that way. It wasn't meant to be that.

It was, it was -- the difference is a house with easements running alongside of it versus an open lot.

That's the difference. So I just probably wasn't clear in distinguishing that.

MR. CURLEY: Okay. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thanks.
MR. RICE: Ms. Levy from the Radnor Conservancy? Any questions?

MS. LEVY: Yes. Is this the only page for the neighbor plan that exists at this moment?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. LEVY: Okay. So will there be a updated tree removal plan coming along with this new neighbor plan?

THE WITNESS: Yes. This was done just for -- which one of the exhibits is the submitted plan? A-12?

MR. BROSEMAN: We haven't gotten to that yet.

THE WITNESS: What $I$ was going to say is just for purposes of being able to see it rather than describe it.

But the fully landscaped plan with Bern, Bern Panzak, our landscape architect, his overall plan for tree conservation and replacement would be put onto this plan if it were to go forward.

MS. LEVY: Got it. And do we know that there is an increase in conservation for trees with this increased 60-foot buffer that is happening along this side? And also, I'm going to go ahead and note concerns about leveling and creating a grass lawn on this one property as well as far as an improvement, hoping that maybe more preservation can be done there, but $I$ know that there's a house standing there.

But is there increased conservation
that happens along that space?
THE WITNESS: Bern would be able to perhaps speak to some of that. To be fair, I don't know that he -- because again, this is just an illustration of some ideas.

I don't know that he has done an exhaustive plan of what would happen if this was now the plan.

But he did note, and he can speak to it, that just with an 85-foot buffer now instead of 25 on the Grant Lane side, you just have more opportunity.

And also, $I$ just wanted to address your point about 18 Forrest.

When $I$ say that it will be kept a lawn, that doesn't mean just a rectangle patch of grass.

MS . LEVY: Okay.
THE WITNESS: If it, $I$ want to be mindful of its function.

But to landscape that and make it look like it's sort of a landscaped, finished area is certainly something we would be willing to do.

MS. LEVY: And my last question is when the updated work is done, is that going to work off of the current tree assessment, or is that going to work off of a tree assessment from four years ago or whenever that tree assessment was done, just so we can make sure that we are working with current and real numbers.

THE WITNESS: It's all up to date.
MS. LEVY: Okay. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: And I will offer that we would love the idea of working with the Radnor Conservancy on the details of street trees and, you know, appropriate plantings.

Bern Panzak is great, and he certainly won an award in Montgomery County for preservation.

But anyway, we would welcome that opportunity to work on the details of this plan with the conservancy.

MR. RICE: Mr. Schuda, any questions?
MR. SCHUDA: Yes. Joe Schuda, 14 Forrest. You had mentioned during your
testimony that this plan, the neighbor plan, as you call it, was directly a result of a meeting with neighbors in the community, specifically, the Forrest Lane and the Grant Lane neighbors.

Was there any urging from anyone to facilitate those meetings, Mr. Houder, do your recollect?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm trying to recollect. I mean, I think this board, present and past board, have sort of a standing request, $I$ feel, to engage with neighbors as much as possible.

Mr. Larkin mentioned in the past, as a passive, passive observer, just to facilitate some kind of room or access.

So I think, actually, I see that as a standing thing. So -- but it was urging or just sort of a natural part of the process.

MR. SCHUDA: Thank you. Also, in terms of the plans and the evolution of the plan that was dated in May, would it be in your interest, not interest, $I$ should say,
but would it be advantageous to amend that May plan, or would that require a new submission to incorporate the neighbor plan?

THE WITNESS: It could require a new submission, and again, I can't speak for the township obviously.

It could require, it could give a new submission, although $I$ think just out of a sense of practicality, we wouldn't want to submit this plan, knowing that it runs afoul of township requirements because of some of the things that it features.

But if the township said they were in favor of it, we would submit it, or we would amend the current submitted plan to reflect these features.

So, procedurally, I don't know exactly how that would shake out, but if I think of the original 41-unit plan, then the currently submitted 38 -unit plan, and then this plan, it's sort of like I think the 41-unit plan was good and it got better and this is better still.

MR. SCHUDA: So basically if the neighbors that are most affected, being Grant Lane and the proximity to the parcel, Forrest Lane, that, $I$ don't want to say report, but the fact that that would be something that was generated out of the conversations that you held with those individuals, would your opinion be that the township would be serving in its community interest by supporting that?

THE WITNESS: That's -- I'm biased, obviously, and this board will make its own determination as to what it thinks is the right thing.

But as a general matter, $I$ just think when you sit down and talk with people and they say, can you change this or change that and it still, makes it better, it seems like a good thing, yeah.

MR. SCHUDA: Thank you. It's a good plan. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Mr. Szary here, Gregory?
MR. SZARY: Yes. Good evening, Gregory Szary, S-Z-A-R-Y, 6 Forrest Lane.

Mr. Houder, thank you very much for your opening statements. I'd like to clarify a couple of things.

One, you said all the neighbors contributed to what you're calling the neighborhood plan.

I'm assuming you're only talking about the six people on Forrest and the Schuda residence that abut your piece of property and not the 25 or so people that are potentially a party to this; correct?

THE WITNESS: Excuse me, correct. Those are the people that showed up to the meeting.

MR. SZARY: All right. So you had indicated that you invited people.

I called several people after that statement, and none of us had received -and we all live adjacent to Mr. Schuda.

So I'm curious why certain people were invited and certain weren't.

THE WITNESS: Well, I invite -- I don't have a master list of, $I$ mean, obviously, I didn't invite the whole world.

So $I$ invited the residents that, you know, can be identified on this map who were Radnor residents.

MR. SZARY: I assume you have a list of the people who were a party to the previous submissions?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: Okay. But they weren't included in that?

THE WITNESS: If they were not objected to and they were Radnor residents, I'm pretty certain they were.

MR. SZARY: So you limited it to Radnor residents, and thank you for that.

I'd like, you used the phrase "highest and best use" in the planning of that piece of property. That's subjective.

I'd like to find out what your definition of "highest and best use" is.

THE WITNESS: My definition, which has been the mandate of the owner, has been, look at the code, come up with a plan that maximizes the value of the property based on what the code offers, and pursue those
approvals.
MR. SZARY: And that was with the intent of building or developing residential properties for sale?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: As opposed to any other higher and better use for that property, like donating it to the township as open space or something along that line?

THE WITNESS: Well, yeah. I don't think they'd perceive that to be, you know, in their mandate.

MR. SZARY: So it is subjective, "higher and best use."

THE WITNESS: Um, yes, you might be able to -- yes, $I$ guess it is.

MR. SZARY: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Sharon Willis?
MS. WILLIS: No questions.
MR. RICE: Steven and Megan Scheri?
MR. SCHERI: Yes. Steve Scheri, S-C-H-E-R-I, 9 Grant Lane.

Just for clarification, Mr. Houder,
what is presented to the board for official consideration right now is a plan that is just to the 25 percent change in the code for open space that is contiguous?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. SCHERI: And in your estimation of redesigning your plan, you feel fairly confident that that plan meets all of the code requirements set forth?

THE WITNESS: We do.
MR. SCHERI: Okay. So then that plan, which we're not looking at, we're looking at $a$, that's a different plan.

So all of these improvements, so the plan that's actually before the board in itself has less stormwater, less open space around the affected neighborhood, and lot 18; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, with a couple clarifications. It has, and again, Mr. Lambert can speak to this.

It certainly has less buffer on the Grant Lane side, the submitted plan does.

It has less stormwater -- the
submitted plan has less stormwater facilities in that area of the enhanced buffer.

And to Mr. Curley's comments, while facilities were going through 18 Forrest, this plan suggests that 18 Forrest become open space, landscaped open space.

MR. SCHERI: Since we have not seen the actual proposed plan, would it be fair to characterize that whatever you call it, the southwestern corner where it meets the turn there with less buffer before when we come around the corner, and $I$ don't know if that's southwest. To me, it's southwest.

THE WITNESS: Where the triangle is?
MR. SCHERI: Yes. That's what we're going to talk about.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SCHERI: That, under the proposed plan, that is pushed back closer to that triangle?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. SCHERI: Okay. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. RICE: Ms. Hansen, any questions?
MS. HANSEN: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Chawla, any questions?
MR. CHAWLA: NO.
MR. RICE: Ms. Lafarge?
MR. LAFARGE: No.
MR. RICE: Mr. Sareen?
MR. SAREEN: No questions.
MR. RICE: I'm having a hard time reading my print. Mr. Hymel, 11 Forrest Lane.

MR. HYMEL: So, Ted Hymel, 11 Forrest Lane. Just a couple questions. So you referenced the neighbor meeting.

Is there a reason why you did not invite any of the, $I$ mean, $I$ understand the boundaries, but is there, you know that there's concerns from Tredyffrin residents.

Why did you exclude those from this neighbor meeting?

THE WITNESS: Well, we're developing in Radnor Township in accordance with Radnor Township rules, and so, you know, we made the decision to appeal to Radnor
residents.
MR. HYMEL: And that was when roughly that you met? July?

THE WITNESS: Those meetings were both in July of last year.

MR. HYMEL: So during your testimony, you referenced something from years ago, so clearly you were aware from a lot of TE residents that there's a lot of concern.

But I'm just curious, are there any other future neighbor meetings, because it seems like there's a lot of ideas that you're incorporating.

Are you having any other neighbor meetings with only Radnor Township members, or can we be invited to those?

THE WITNESS: No meetings are planned.
And, yeah, $I$ mean, $I$ wouldn't -- I certainly wouldn't object if you came.

MR. HYMEL: Yes.
THE WITNESS: But again, our focus has really been on the Grant Lane folks specifically and part of Forrest with respect to Radnor.

MR. HYMEL: Okay. I keep going to that meeting.

Were some of those neighbors like, I don't know who was there, but were they engineers or land attorneys or do you know?

THE WITNESS: $I$ don't, $I$ don't know.
MR. HYMEL: I'm just curious why neighbors are giving you ideas which, to me, they sound good, but how are they coming up with better ideas than the experts are generating?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. HYMEL: Isn't it that you've been doing it for 25,30 years?

I've heard Mr. Lambert. He's very credible. I remember him from four or five years ago.

So how are neighbors coming up with ideas that you are saying to us are better if they're not even engineers or land attorneys or developers?

THE WITNESS: That's a great point, because it may not have been clear, because I know that with some of the neighbors,
it's like, well, if this is better, submit it.

And the reason -- so we could have come up with, or I'll defer to Rob, 'cause he's the engineer. It's not that Rob couldn't have thought of it.

It's that we, under the township rules, we can't submit this without the township saying okay, because the minute we submit it, it runs afoul of requirements that only the township can give us relief from.

MR. HYMEL: Could I just ask a general question kind of thing, the obvious?

Are we just assuming, $I$ mean, again, it sounds like it's better.

Are we assuming that you guys have run this by the board and they're like, well, if the neighbors are okay with it.

Or like, why are we here talking about something? I mean, $I$ know I'm thinking it.

THE WITNESS: That doesn't exist or it's an idea?

MR. HYMEL: Yeah.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. So I'll give you my opinion. I think that for the reasons that $I$ said earlier, this has been a protracted process where a lot of it happened during a very difficult time where people couldn't get together and it got sort of stretched out and protracted.

So again, this is only me talking. We, we could have sort of said to the township, hey, can we come talk about this even though, you know, it's not filed.

But if $I$ was the township, I think what $I$ would say is, let's talk about it in the open and like in this forum exactly as we are, and then if there's ideas that come out of this and the township wanted to then give direction and say, hey, look, we heard what people have to say, this seems like it's got things in it that are of merit, they can then give us that direction.

But to give us that direction in a conference room somewhere and then everyone is like, well, what happened? You know, we went from this plan to this plan, how did
this all happen?
If we're doing it in this context, it's much more transparent.

And that's why I appreciate the leave that everyone is allowed to sort of go through sort of the how we got here, because, you know, and again, $I$ apologize for you feeling excluded.

MR. HYMEL: You deal with this every day. It's just very confusing to people who see this once every five years.

MR. RICE: Let me try to clarify. This is a conditional use hearing, so they have an application for a specific plan.

THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.
MR. RICE: Okay. Here we go. So during a conditional use process, the original plan is the original plan, but the board doesn't have to accept the original plan.

The board could in a decision take some elements out of this plan, because now we've seen it, it's in the record of this hearing, and pick and choose that, you
know, a condition may be that this particular property that has a house on it will be part of the plan.

So it's not a fixed plan when it comes in. I mean, if they put on testimony that supports some condition or not, then the board, in its ultimate decision, doesn't have to take one plan or the other plan.

It can be a general concept subject to 25 conditions. So at this point, we'll move on.

MR. HYMEL: I understand. I understand. Last question for me. So we're on the TE side. We're on Forrest Lane.

And when $I$ say stuff rolls downhill, clearly there's a lot of residents down there that are dealing with just the scope or the slant, slope, I guess you could call it, of where stormwater is an issue.

But can Mr. Lambert describe, even though we're adjacent to the property, can he go through like what happens downstream,
so to speak?
And to give you some context, several years ago we learned that it's not just not having the right intentions or the right technology or whatever.

It's, there's a lot of issues with township jurisdiction going down to Old Eagle, which is, $I$ believe, part of PennDOT. It's been several years, so --

MR. RICE: Okay. We're going to have him testify.

MR. HYMEL: Can he clarify that?
MR. RICE: Just, just questions. And when he comes up on the witness stand, you can ask him those questions.

MR. HYMEL: Fair enough. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Okay. Ms. Ruschmann?
MS . RUSCHMANN. Hi. Thank You. I was one of the small group that -- and I do appreciate this effort.

I just want to ask you, because we discussed putting that road out onto Eagle, I just want to reiterate with everyone, if you live in our little community, having
the ability to get an extra road out to deflect some of the traffic could be very beneficial and, in particular, because just down the road is the train station, and there's a tough left turn and there's no light.

And so $I$ just think that's a very important point. And otherwise, thank you. I think this is much better than the original plan.

THE WITNESS: Thanks.
MR. RICE: Mr. Satterfield?
MR. SATTERFIELD: No questions.
MR. RICE: Ms. Nuttall? Questions?
MS. NUTTALL: Thank you for letting me ask my questions.

With regard to what she was talking about, so $I$ think the reason that $I$ feel particularly affected by this, this isn't an island.

So there's a lot going on around this, including new stuff with Villa Strafford and the stuff above this, and you're kind of limited to -- I assume that's Eagle

Village down there?
THE WITNESS: Yes, um-hum.
MS. NUTTALL: So the thing that concerns me is the traffic, and $I$ think this is lots of small residential areas, and it's already harder going up and down Eagle Road.

MR. RICE: Madam? Questions.
MS. NUTTALL: The question is --
MR. RICE: On his testimony only. He didn't testify about traffic; right?

MS. NUTTALL: Right, but that's the question I'm bringing up. It's a new additional thing coming out to the side of Eagle Road.

MR. RICE: Ask him if he's willing to do that.

MS. NUTTALL: Did you guys look at traffic?

THE WITNESS: We did, and we have a traffic study and traffic engineer who will testify.

MS. NUTTALL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And just to answer maybe
what you didn't ask, which is that that entrance onto Eagle Road, again we would need the leave of the township to say it's okay, but we would be more than willing to do that.

MS. NUTTALL: Okay. Thanks.
MR. RICE: Thank you. Mr. Holloway?
Any questions?
MR. HOLLOWAY: No questions. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Ms. Silver?
MS. SILVER: No questions.
MR. RICE: And Mr. Gaeto? Any questions? Is he here?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think he left.

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Broseman --
MR. MARLIER: I do have a few more questions.

MR. RICE: Go ahead, but Mr. Broseman will have a chance to redirect the
witnesses.
Go ahead, Mr. Marlier.
MR. MARLIER: It's a little unorthodox at this stage. Thank you for letting me ask a few more questions.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. You mentioned, sir, that what's there now, this plan will be an improvement regarding the stormwater.

Is that what your testimony was?
A. Yes.
Q. But just to be clear, you are removing mature trees from the property for the development; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us how many mature trees you would remove under this plan that's on A-4?
A. No.
Q. Thank you.
A. And $I$ don't mean to be snarky, but Bern Panzak, so as $I$ said before, this iteration
we put forward is just a capturing of ideas.
I think intuitively I can look at that enhanced buffer area and just know that there's going to be more preservation opportunities, because now we have more space.

But what the overall plan calculations are with respect to preservation, $I$ don't know.

Bern may be able to speak intelligently to it, but he may not have done the full-blown tree calculations and landscape plan for this plan, only because it's not official. We're not officially submitting it yet.
Q. You don't mean to be snarky, and $I$ don't mean to be cute, but I've got to ask the question because you brought it up.
A. Yes.
Q. You're saying there's going to be more preservation on, we'll call it, the left side, the Grant side under A-4; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But you would agree with me there's going to be less, because in the middle and potentially on the right side, or let's just call it the rest of the property, because you're
moving the townhomes to the right; correct?
A. Yes, but overall the same amount of open space. So if you were to be able to superimpose onto this property where the existing trees are, you may pick up benefits, because certain trees may be in the enhanced buffer, and so that's a pick-up, as opposed to the submitted plan, which has the sort of giant center green, you know, whether they're -- again, Bern will be the one to speak to it, but my sense is that there are better quality trees that are probably more worth saving along the perimeter than the interior of the property, just by the way the property currently is laid out. The interior of the property is kind of open.
Q. And you brought up that large, open green space on the plan that's before the board, the May plan, the May application?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you mentioned this, but just to be clear, this open space on A-4 is not nearly as contiguous as the plan that's before the board; correct?
A. No, it is definitely not as
contiguous.
Q. It's spread out more throughout the property, the open space?
A. Correct. Again, to finish the thought, because the impetus for that was to put open space in the places where it meant the most to the people that were adjacent to that open space, and putting it all in the center green, there are some Strafford Avenue neighbors that are, that benefit from that.

But again, with the buffering that's already on Strafford, it seems like diminishing returns versus spreading it out in the way that this plan shows.
Q. And you would agree with me though that the people that would benefit the most would be on the Grant Avenue side; correct?
A. The enhanced buffering on the Grant Lane side?
Q. Correct, Grant Lane.
A. Grant Lane. Yes, yes. Certainly there is -- well, yes and no. There's more than one answer to that.

Yes, certainly, as a practical matter,
more buffering up against Grant Lane is good for the Grant Lane folks, but I think also the chance to just magnify the stormwater facilities on that whole side of the property in that corner and at 18 Forrest are overall helpful because of the way that water flows and the lay of the land.

So the more that we can concentrate in that corner where that triangle is in the northwestern corner, $I$ think it's better, based on my understanding, is the way that the stormwater works.
Q. Continuing with the stormwater and that concept, and I'd like to kind of piggyback off of Mr. Hymel's testimony.

He is in Tredyffrin. That's a different township; correct?
A. His question, yes. Yes, he's in Tredyffrin, yes.
Q. But Tredyffrin is within, how far from the property that's shown on A-4?
A. Well, the property line is right along the other side of Grant Lane.
Q. Eighth of a mile?
A. I'm sure in some cases it's far less.
Q. And the water does run, and again, I'm not from the area. Help me. The water runs toward the Grant Lane side; is that correct?
A. Yeah. And again, I'll defer to Mr. Lambert, because he's the expert. But the -MR. BROSEMAN: Just defer to Mr. Lambert.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I'll defer to Mr. Lambert.

MR. BROSEMAN: Don't, don't, Mr.
Houder --
MR. MARLIER: You're actually jumping in to answer the question.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm objecting, I've been trying to be, as you said, a wide latitude, as you have been, which I appreciate, but I'm trying to make the point that we have a stormwater expert. We have a landscape expert.

I don't think it's fair to keep asking Mr. Houder, and I would ask Mr. Houder not to speculate.

MR. RICE: Mr. Houder needs to say I don't know, and he's trying to answer the
question.
THE WITNESS: I'm trying to have a dialogue as opposed to --

MR. BROSEMAN: And I don't mean to be argumentative. I just don't want to --

MR. MARLIER: I would just make the point that the witness has testified to stormwater, and pretty significantly, in the last hour and a half.

MR. RICE: But he's not the expert and --

THE WITNESS: Yeah. And Mr. Lambert can speak to all of this. And again, frankly, $I$ don't want to not answer your question, because that seems rude.

But I do think Mr. Lambert will just be able to give you way more detail on the function of stormwater, not just in that corner but across the whole site.

MR. MARLIER: Thank you.
BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. And you did mention that, again you
said it's a great improvement regarding stormwater because there's no stormwater facility
there now; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But again, I've already asked about removing mature trees. There is going to be significant earth disturbance with this development; correct?
A. Temporarily during construction, but then it will all be restored and landscaped, and there will be trees preserved and trees replaced 'cause, you know, the township has extensive landscaping requirements, and we'll comply with all of them.
Q. You mentioned, speaking of complying with the township code, you mentioned that A-4 is not, $I$ think you said it runs afoul of the township code; correct?
A. I wouldn't use that word.
Q. I think you did use that word.
A. I believe it's in the spirit of the township code, but that's my opinion.
Q. So is it your, $I$ just want to understand it, and Mr. Rice kind of touched on this a little bit. I want to understand what the goal is here.

There's an application before the board, and it's a conditional use hearing.

So are you hoping that the board approves the conditional use, the use with conditions that reflect the plan on $A-4$ ?
A. If you're asking me what my hope is? I'm going to answer that in full.

And my hope is that after a very long, protracted process of plan one versus plan two and these ideas, that with every passing day that stormwater management systems are not here, the people that live near here are affected by it, this will make it better.

And my hope is that the board will look at this whole process and say, you have a plan. You changed the plan. Now as a result of meeting with key constituents, the plan has these changes.

We think they're good and better, and we would approve it based on the stipulation that you make these changes and then take us into land development where we would work with neighbors, the conservancy to continue to perfect this plan and, you know, just since you brought it up, my
hope also is that we get to plan development because, as I've promised the neighbors on Grant Lane, as well as the neighbors on Strafford Avenue, they would have a seat at the table to sit with our landscape architect and help configure what is across the street from them in terms of the way it looks and the way it's landscaped.
Q. So you'll be talking to neighbors moving forward, but for the purpose of this presentation, this hearing, you're hoping to have conditional uses tacked on relative to A-4 and incorporate A-4?
A. If procedurally the township could, through the conditional use process, approve the submitted plan with the stipulation that it have changes made that make it look like this, that would be, that would be my humble request or hope.
Q. You mentioned the new buffering that's created on A-4.

Is any of the what's considered open space, and keep in mind, $I$ just got this plan an hour and a half ago.

Is any of that considered open space in that new buffer?
A. No.

MR. MARLIER: I have no further questions of this witness.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, any redirect of this witness?

MR. BROSEMAN: Nothing at this time.
MR. RICE: Okay. We're going to take about a ten-minute break, and when we come back, the board is going to have some questions for Mr. Houder, so he's still on the witness stand. Okay?
(Recess taken.)

-     -         - 

MS. MULRONEY: Good evening. Everyone come in and take a seat and we will get started. Good evening. Hi.

Break's over. Please take your seat. We'll get wrapped up for the evening. And again, $I$ will ask our solicitor to take us through.

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Houder is still
on the witness stand, and we're going to have any board questions for Mr. Houder, and then $I$ think we're going to call it a night. We'll be back here on Wednesday.

I've been told that Mr. Lambert, the expert in stormwater management, the civil engineer, will be testifying, so have your questions ready for him, questions, and we'll deal with that on Wednesday night.

So with that, Mr. Houder, I guess why don't we start, and we'll work our way this way, with commissioner questions.

Any questions?
MS. AGNEW: No questions.
MR. RILEY: No questions.
MS. MULRONEY: No questions, not for me.

$$
\begin{gathered}
--- \\
\text { EXAMINATION } \\
-\quad-\quad
\end{gathered}
$$

MR. LARKIN: So this is entirely procedural, and perhaps hopefully unnecessary.

But if $I$ were to ask you all the same
questions that you were asked by all the presently being treated as parties but may ultimately not be party residents, would your answers be the same?

THE WITNESS: Say that last part again.

MR. LARKIN: If I were to ask you the same questions now that were asked of you by all of the residents who are presently being treated as parties but may, subject to your counsel's objections, eventually be disqualified and may no longer be parties, if $I$ were to ask you all the same questions that they asked you today, would your answers be the same?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. LARKIN: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Any other board questions?
MR. COATES: I have a couple of questions.

MR. RICE: Go ahead.
MR. COATES: I promise mine will be easy, because I'm not going to ask you about stormwater, and I'm not an attorney,
so it will go fast.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. COATES: A couple questions to clarify here. I'm seeing these plans all for the first time.

The green space in the middle of $A-4$, and $I$ saw on the original exhibit, $I$ think it was 28 percent or roughly 9,000 square feet, two acres, right, a little less?

THE WITNESS: Roughly, a little less, yes.

MR. COATES: I'm in marketing. We only need to be close.

But the middle here now with this new plan, the one that you're hoping we will substitute or create conditions around, what would you say that roughly is now, knowing it doesn't meet the 25 percent?

THE WITNESS: Well, overall we still meet the 25 percent.

MR. COATES: Sure. This makes sense. We're not considering that stormwater area.

THE WITNESS: I may walk over and consult -- do we have that? Obviously, I
don't know if that's a number on that middle section of the green, the square footage.

Do you have another question? So the total open space is over 25 percent, but I think Mr. Coates' question was the center green area.

MR. COATES: That's okay. I can find out later.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. We can get that calculation, yeah.

MR. COATES: So in this plan or the other plans, are any of that open space publicly accessible, or is that only usable by the residents of the property?

THE WITNESS: Yes, so this answer always sounds like overly --

MR. COATES: If you know.
THE WITNESS: So the answer is that there would be an HOA that owns this property, and they will be in charge of the landscaping, and actually in this configuration, as well as the submitted configuration, you know, snow, trash, all
private.
So technically, as private property, it's private property. As a practical matter, $I$ think, you know, it's not going to be gated.

So I think the ability to sort of come and go, there will be fencing, but it will be landscape fencing. You know, I think it will be part of the neighborhood.

There has been some conversation around access points. I don't know the particulars, but there are some -- but there used to be a way to get from Forrest like into the back of the shopping center.

That could probably be re-established for more pedestrian fluidity, and there's also a plan to create some connectivity between this and the center, Valley Forge Flowers, restaurants, things like that.

So technically private, but I think practically the public will have access to parts of this, just being part of the neighborhood.

MR. COATES: That's great. The reason

I asked this is because you brought up the trust, right, the spirit of the trust is philanthropic.

So thinking about that is this property in and of itself, making a publicly-accessible area could be a really good use of the space given how much open space you have.

So that's not a question, so I know Mr. Rice will get mad at me if $I$ don't ask questions, so I'll leave that as is.

I guess my last question, and this is for you or for someone else.

But how did you choose townhomes over single-family homes, and how did you get to the 38 number?

THE WITNESS: So Mr. Lambert can answer that specifically with respect to the site calculations, but what $I$ can say is that from a code approach, the R-4 zone says you can do single-family homes and they have the following lot requirements, or you can do, you can, through a conditional use process, you can do this
kind of clustering of townhomes.
And so in looking at it, one, the following conditional use gets you to more homes, which is, makes the property more valuable, but also this approach gives you all of the opportunities, so if you did this under the R-4 single family, you'd come up with 24,25 single-family home lots.

They're small. They're crammed in, my words. It's not a very good plan.

MR. COATES: Small, crammed in. I feel like $I$ understand that pretty well.

THE WITNESS: You're coming up with sort of, you know, it's just, it's not a great plan.

And I think, more importantly, then each homeowner is doing their own landscaping.

The buffers, you know, they can put the proverbial swing set or shed right up against the property line, and they all have their own stormwater management.

So ongoing maintenance, meeting
minimum requirements versus more robust requirements, all of those things kind of get -- the opportunity to do all of that enhanced system, HOA managing the landscaping and the maintenance of the stormwater system, all happen in this plan versus the alternative under $R-4$.

MR. COATES: Sure. I know I said that's my last question, but $I$ have one more.

I'm looking at this plan. This tan line, that's sidewalks; correct?

THE WITNESS: The ones along the road?

MR. COATES: Correct.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. COATES: And those are not there today. There's no sidewalks on the street. You'd be adding the sidewalks?

THE WITNESS: These streets aren't there today. I mean, there's nothing.

MR. COATES: I mean the sidewalks on Eagle Road and Strafford.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. I was
looking interior. That's correct, they're not there today.

MR. COATES: So you'd be adding that pedestrian access?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MR. COATES: All right. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Just one question. So highest and best use, that was your testimony, I mean, that was your charge working for the trust.

You would agree with the trust, I guess, and then the idea is for you to do a plan that's the highest and best use.

This versus the singles, this is a much more lucrative plan.

I assume you've run the numbers to show that in terms of benefit to the trust and to the beneficiaries than 20 singles, was it?

THE WITNESS: Twenty-four, 25.
MR. RICE: Twenty-four, 25 versus 40-ish townhomes. I mean, this is --

MR. BROSEMAN: Thirty-eight.

THE WITNESS: Thirty-eight.
MR. RICE: It's 41, 38. So, but that was your testimony, that the highest and best use, and I always think the highest and best use is, $I$ always think the highest and best use is the most lucrative for whoever the beneficiary is.

Would you agree?
THE WITNESS: That's usually the way landowners operate, yeah.

MR. RICE: Okay. So, I mean, I know the difference between that type of a development versus this type of a development, but it's about getting as much density as possible and making it the highest and best use.

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's doing what any property owner would do when you divorce the fact that, you know, Mrs.

Hamilton and whatever perceptions of her and wherewithal, things like that.

Any property owner would look at the property and say, what's the most $I$ can do here, if they were seeking to develop it,
and $I$ think that's all they're doing here.
MR. RICE: Okay. No more board questions, so let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. RICE: Let's go back on the record, because we're coming back. We're going to continue this for tonight. We're coming back on Wednesday.

On Wednesday we will have to pick another date, so bring your calendars with you on Wednesday.

Mr. Broseman has told me that the engineer, Mr. Lambert, will be here, that's probably the only witness we will have on Wednesday night, and then we'll pick some more hearing dates that night.

MR. BROSEMAN: Is that also 6:30 p.m.?
MR. RICE: It's also 6:30. Just generally, any questions about any of this from any of the parties before we adjourn? Yes, sir?

MR. CURLEY: I'm Brian Curly, 136
Fairfield. If for some reason, and $I$ do have one, $I$ cannot attend, can $I$ submit testimony either online or information to you directly that could be presented at the meeting?

MR. RICE: No. What you can do, for anyone that is not here, you'll lose the opportunity to cross-examine the witness.

But when you are here, you can certainly present any kind of testimony that you want to present if you want to rebut that witness.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you.
MS. MULRONEY: I just have a question for you, Mr. Broseman. So it looks like we'll have the engineer on Wednesday.

Do you have a witness list of how many witnesses you will ultimately be calling?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. At this time, which could be subject to change, because there's a lot of other parties, I'm anticipating we'll have the engineer, Mr.

Lambert.
We have Mr. Panzak, who was mentioned, the landscape architect.

We have a traffic engineer, and we have a land planner to discuss the fiscal impact study that was submitted with the application.

There is some potential of others, but right now, they're not on my list. That's what $I$ have right now.

MS. MULRONEY: Thank you very much. Maybe be prepared to bring two witnesses next time.

There may be an opportunity for the board to stay a little longer, and $I$ don't want you to be caught without another witness, because tonight we had just one. Bring your team.

MR. BROSEMAN: Okay. Do you have an idea of how late you might go?

I don't need to know now. I just -if you knew.

MS. MULRONEY: It's probably nine, and based on tonight, there are a lot of
questions and a lot of parties, so we're likely only going to get through one.

But if we can, you know, everybody wants to do this on the least amount of nights as possible because it's hard to schedule all of these folks coming out to ask questions.

If we can tighten up, we're going to try. If we can't, $I$ want everybody to have the space that they need.

MR. BROSEMAN: Sure. I'll have other witnesses here.

MS. MULRONEY: Thank You.
MR. RICE: Yes?
MS. LEVY: Amber Levy, Radnor Conservancy. I was just going to ask if when the new information is added to the township website, if it could include dates or something in addition to its file name than A-4 or Exhibit A-4.

I think that that would really help with clarity as people are trying to follow along, whether they have public comments or, you know, want to participate in the
hearing.
If that could happen as things are added to the township website, that would really help us move along as well.
(Inaudible comment.)

-     -         - 

MS. MULRONEY: We can't hear you.
MR. RICE: This is being recorded.
MS. COBB: Hi. My name is Barbara Cobb, and I'm not a party at all.

But when $I$ go onto the website, $I$ see the 41 units. Is this, the May plan, on the website?

MR. RICE: The May 2023 conditional use, that's on the website.

MS. HAGAN: It's all included in the agenda packet.

MR. RICE: But is it on the website?
MS. HAGAN : Yes.
MR. RICE: Yes.
MS. MULRONEY: But I did hear the question, and it's the one we have up on the screen tonight has not been --

MS. COBB: I couldn't find it anywhere.

MR. LARKIN: So I just want to make sure $I$ understand.

Peggy, I think on our Radnor.com website, there is a stand-alone page for the Hamilton lot, which I'm pretty confident is the plan from 2021.

I don't think there's a stand-alone plan for the 2023 plan or A-4, which was introduced today for the first time.

MS. HAGAN: Yes. We do have to get a page up for this hearing, so we will do that tomorrow and get everything loaded in.

MR. LARKIN: But it sounds like from what you said there is available right now on our website the application which has everything except for $A-4$, which was introduced today.

So if residents or objectors or parties wanted to look on the website, they can look in the agenda section for tonight and find the submitted plan; is that
correct?
MS. HAGAN: Correct. It is all
included in the package.
MR. LARKIN: So it is on the website. It's just not on the stand-alone.

MS. HAGAN : Yes.
MR. LARKIN: Thank you.
MS. COBB: If $I$ can't find it, who would I call?

MS. MULRONEY: For additional clarity, there will be more, obviously, documents probably by tomorrow, but if you wanted to look tonight, you would go to our agenda page.

All meeting agendas are on one page. You can find it pretty easily from the front page of the website, you look for agendas and minutes.

And on tonight's date, there is a whole packet of everything that was submitted. So it is a little hidden tonight. It is going to be better tomorrow.

MS. COBB: Thank you.

MS. MULRONEY: Of course.
MR. RICE: Okay. So with that, that will conclude tonight, and we'll see everybody on Wednesday.

MS. MULRONEY: Thank you for being here.

$$
\begin{gathered}
--- \\
\text { (Proceedings concluded at 9:07 p.m.) }
\end{gathered}
$$
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