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THE PRESIDENT: Hello everyone.
Welcome to the Board of Commissioners conditional hearing on today, which is January 31st, 2024.

First off, $I$ want to apologize. I wasn't here on Monday. I was off on some travel for work, but $I$ did watch the YouTube video.

So if anybody needs to refer to it, it is up as of today. I couldn't find it last night. It popped up today, a good two and a half hours long.

And the other thing $I$ want to do before we get started is just remind people that there will be general public participation after all of the testimony.

So I know there was a bit of confusion about that and some pleas on Facebook and whatnot for people to attend so they could publicly participate, and that will happen, but first we need to get the official testimony and cross over with.

Okay? So I'm going to hand it over to you.

MR. RICE: As most of you probably recall over here, we had some additional parties that attended the last hearing on Monday night and requested party status.

So what I'd like to do is just go through, $I$ know this sounds like I'm taking attendance, but I'm going to go through here so I get some idea who is here and who is not here.

Once you've been granted party status, if you're not here, you're not here. But if you never show up, that's really an issue for you more than it is for anybody else up here.

Mr. Broseman has the ability to object to anybody that he thinks doesn't fall within the requirements for party status or standing basically.

So I'm going to just start at the beginning of my list from August and go through and see who is here.

There is one person on here $I$ think we need to address. I've been told he is going to be here tonight.

So let me start with Jennifer Pechet. Is she here?

MS. PECHET: Present.
MR. RICE: Okay. And there's no objection to you.

Gregg Hess? Gregg, could you come up to the podium please, because Mr. Broseman, I believe, objected to your standing.

I'm going to ask, let me ask you, what is your address, sir?

MR. HESS: 66 Crestline Road, Wayne, Pennsylvania.

MR. RICE: Okay. And how far is your address from this particular property, do you know?

MR. HESS: Yes, . 6 miles. I wrote that as a letter to the attorney who queried me about that on Tuesday and didn't get a response.

I sent it to the township as well, did not get a response. And then $I$ called the attorney's office today and did not get a response.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, this is where
it gets decided. It has to be decided not by e-mail or phone call.

I know I suggested --
MR. HESS: Really? You don't think someone should respond and just say --

MR. RICE: No, no, no. I'm just saying that this is where it happens. The final answer has to happen on the record with our court reporter here.

MR. HESS: Okay.
MR. RICE: So, Mr. Hess, Mr. Broseman, do you have an objection to Mr. Hess's standing?

MR. BROSEMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Hess, I do. That is over a half a mile away.

Crestline is separated from the immediate area by the railroad tracks, which is kind of a physical divider.

So I don't believe that Mr. Hess, as opposed to especially the Radnor Township residents that are adjacent to this property and some of the others that are much closer, with all due respect, $I$ don't
believe he has a substantial and direct and immediate interest in this matter.

So $I$ don't object to him making public comments, but I do respectfully request, object to party status.

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Hess, what township do you live in?

MR. HESS: Tredyffrin.
MR. RICE: Tredyffrin. Okay.
MR. HESS: Yeah. I would mention that, for clarification, and I appreciate the respectful comment and likewise myself.

I cross Strafford Avenue all the time, because we come out on Crestline, which is probably no more than a hundred feet above Strafford, and also $I$ walk down all the time to the farmers market.

So I'm crossing those streets that are impacted by the Hamilton estate development, you know, all the time.

MR. RICE: All right. I understand. But we're talking about 2,000 feet, right, more or less, half a mile?

MR. HESS: Yes.

MR. RICE: Over 2,000 feet. And everybody that drives by there, whether they live in Lower Merion or Radnor or Tredyffrin, is going to have a similar effect as you just described, so you really don't qualify, because you're a distance from the site.

But, as Mr. Broseman said, you're certainly welcome to keep coming to these. I mean, there will be public comment when all the sworn testimony is in. But we have to be consistent with the standing.
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. RICE: Okay. So --
MR. HESS: Okay. And I disagree, of course, with your conclusion that I'm not affected as a party, but $I$ respect your decision.

MR. RICE: But you certainly have the right to make public comment.

So with Mr. Broseman's objection, that's sustained in terms of your party
status. Thank you, sir.
MR. HESS: Okay.
MR. RICE: Mary Ann Mahoney?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Brian Curley?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Robby Wierman, are you here?

MS. WIERMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. Ms. Wierman, could you come up, please, because Mr. Broseman has objected to your standing also, and your address is 101 Lantoga Road; correct?

MS. WIERMAN: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. Do you know how close you are to the property?

MS. WIERMAN: I'm trying to look it up right now in steps as $I$ walk, but it's taking me as if $I$ 'm driving, so, no, $I$ don't know exactly how far. A four-minute
walk maybe.
MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, do you know what the distance is?

MR. BROSEMAN: I don't offhand. I note that it's a much further distance than the other people that were right in the proximate area.

It is on the other side of Route 30 , which again is a natural boundary. I think there's a lot of people much closer to the property.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: But I would object. I believe it's too far out from the property.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, we haven't, you know, we will map it out. At least for tonight, you're still in.

MR. BROSEMAN: We could reserve, like we did last time maybe, till we check the map?

MR. RICE: Yes. We'll hold your standing in abeyance. Keep coming back. But for now, you're still in the case.

MS. WIERMAN: Okay.

MR. RICE: And we'll map that out before we meet again.

Okay. Amber Levy?
MS. LEVY: Here.
MR. RICE: Thank you. Louisa Hanshew?

$$
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(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. It's 219 Sugartown Road. Mr. Broseman, you've objected to this person, $I$ believe; is that correct?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Is that based on distance? Do you know how many feet from the property?

MR. BROSEMAN: That's quite far away, if I'm not mistaken.

It might be the La Maison apartments or down in that area, again across Route 30.

It's pretty far away. It's nowhere near as proximate as the others that have been admitted.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, again, she is
not here, and we'll hold her, any decision in abeyance, and we'll have to map that one out also.

Mr. Schuda is here, I see. Thank you.
Mr. Szary is here.
Steven Rocci, $R-O-C-C-I$, are you here?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: 201 Bloomingdale Avenue.
MR. HOUDER: Mr. Rice, I actually heard from him. He actually moved out to Chester County.

MR. RICE: He moved?
MR. HOUDER: He moved out of this area.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, we have an e-mail address for him, and we will try to track him down and see whether he's -- if he's moved, he's obviously out of the picture.

Peter Clark?

```
                                    - - -
                                    (No response.)
```

MR. RICE: I think you've objected to Peter Clark. He has yet to show up.

Mr. Clark is no longer a party. You have to show up here, at least once.

Sharon and David Willis? So I think we're on a list that is still up in the air and the ones that have been mapped at this point.

So let me just -- and we have mapped the Willises.

Steve and Megan Scheri, Cindy Hansen, Catherine Lafarge, Mr. Sareen, Ted Hymel, Margaret Ruschmann, David Satterfield, Cas Holloway, Kaitlin Silver, Mark Gaeto, John Clemente, and we've mapped those out.

I've provided that map to both counsel here, and it appears to me that they all qualify.

Even though the majority of them live in Tredyffrin, many of them live in Tredyffrin, they're closer than some of the other folks that actually live in Radnor Township.

It's a distance issue when it comes to standing in zoning cases.

So the names $I$ just read, Mr. Broseman, any objection to any of those? You've looked at the map?

MR. BROSEMAN: That's right, and many of them, as you'll recall, $I$ did not object to.

Many of them were adjoining or directly across the street and others we did hold in reserve, and thank you for doing the map.

We do feel that the adjoining people, especially in Radnor and across the street, are the most impacted.

But after looking at your map and hearing from a lot of the people, we don't want to preclude or try to preclude their participation as parties, so I'm not going to object to any of those names that you read that we held in reserve.

MR. RICE: Thank you.
Mr. Marlier, are you okay with that, I assume?

MR. MARLIER: I am, Mr. Rice.
MR. RICE: Okay. So those folks whose names $I$ just read are in as parties, and there's two more.

Becky Nuttall and Katie Harper, are either of you here?
(No response.)

$$
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MR. RICE: Okay. So these are residents of 427 , 423 West Beechtree, and both properties are over 1,900 feet away.

Mr. Broseman, do you have an objection?

MR. BROSEMAN: I did. Respectfully, as did $I$ before, $I$ think they're just too far away.

They're on the other side of the railroad tracks, so $I$ respectfully object.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right.
Following the same rules that we're applying to everyone, and again, this is just standing, being a party to actively participate.

Both of those properties are outside the area that the courts have determined you need to be within in order to have standing.

So for both of those properties, the objection is sustained.

And again, there's an opportunity to participate, public comment, at the end of all of the hearings in this matter.

MR. MARIIER: Mr. Rice, that was Becky Nuttall, and who is the second name?

MR. RICE: Katie Harper.
MR. MARLIER: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Sir, if you have a question, you have to come up, please.

MR. HESS: Gregory Hess again. My question is, my understanding of the court's decision was that it wasn't based solely on your distance; is that correct?

MR. RICE: Well, it's primarily going to be on your distance.

MR. HESS: I don't believe that the language $I$ read said primarily based on distance.

MR. RICE: What language are you referring to?

MR. HESS: The court's finding which created the rule, the one that you're referring to saying it's based on distance.

That's not my understanding after reading the language, so I'm asking if that's the case.

MR. RICE: Well, there's a presumption in the court cases, and I can tell you they're not clear, but $I$ can also tell you that anyone that is a half mile or more away, consistently the courts have said that that's not enough, unless there's some particular special interest over and above what the general public would have.

And when I'm talking about the general public, what you said is that you drive by there or walk by these properties, but there are thousands of people that live in Radnor that do that. So --

MR. HESS: So we are affected if we are walking by and there is a significant amount of traffic and we're at risk
crossing crosswalks, et cetera.
I would say that that's a definition of affected. Would you agree?

MR. RICE: No, that's not the standard. The standard is you have to have something over and above that that's unique in order to, if you don't live close by, okay, something over and above what the general public is exposed to.

That's the standard, not that it affects you because you drive by there. It's got to be something over and above that.

MR. HESS: So how do you define "affect"?

MR. RICE: I'm really not going to debate this with you right now.

MR. HESS: Yeah, I can see that.
MR. RICE: Because we have testimony that we want to get into with this hearing.

MR. HESS: Sure.
MR. RICE: And I understand that you're concerned about that decision, but I'm trying to be consistent, because if
you're at 2,000 feet and you're permitted in, then what about 2,200 or 2,500 or 3,000?

Where do we -- I'm just following what the courts have said.

This is pretty much a black-and-white issue once you get beyond, I'll say, a thousand feet, in that area, unless you have something over and above that impacts you over and above what everybody else in the community is impacted by traffic, et cetera. It's got to be something over and above that.

MR. HESS: Okay. I understand, I guess. For the record, I'd like to say that $I$ believe $I$ am affected and that my understanding, I'm not an attorney.

But in reading the court ruling that is applied by other attorneys, that distance is not the sole definer of who is an affected versus a non-affected party.

MR. RICE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. HESS: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Okay. Does the board have
any questions?
THE PRESIDENT: If any of the people that came in after we started are party or considering party status, you might want to identify yourself to Mr. Rice in that he did do a roll call.

MR. RICE: Okay. So just tell us who you are.

MR. HYMEL: All right. I'm Ted Hymel. I was just a little late.

MR. RICE: Thank you.
MR. HYMEL: Happy to be here.
MS. LUTZ: Cheryl Lutz, L-U-T-Z, 13
Forrest Lane.
MR. RICE: Spell your last name again.
MS. LUTZ: Lutz, L-U-T-Z.
MR. RICE: Hold on a minute. You're not on any list that $I$ have.

So is this the first time that you've been here?

MS. LUTZ: It is, yes.
MR. RICE: It is.
MS. LUTZ: I have three children, and I'm quite busy, and $I$ work.

THE PRESIDENT: But you wish to be a party?

MS. LUTZ: Absolutely.
MR. RICE: What is your address?
MS. LUTZ: 13 Forrest Lane.
MR. RICE: Say it again, please.
MS. LUTZ: 13 Forrest Lane.
MR. RICE: Forrest Lane. Okay. All right.

Mr. Broseman, any objection to Ms.
Lutz?
MR. BROSEMAN: Going by the address she gave, $I$ think that's in between some of the other people $I$ didn't object to, so I don't object.

MR. RICE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BROSEMAN: She is in Tredyffrin, $I$ would like to note for the record, $I$ believe.

MR. RICE: Yes, I believe she said that. So --

MR. SAREEN: So $I$ came in late, but $I$ thought you said my name at the end. Anujeet Sareen?

MR. RICE: Sareen, yes, you're good. Thank you. Okay.

Mr. Marlier, any questions about any of the parties now? I think we have, I'll circulate a master list with contact info after tonight.

MR. MARIIER: Thank you, Mr. Rice. I have no questions.

MR. RICE: Thank you.
Mr. Broseman, are you ready to proceed?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: All right. Call your first witness.

MR. BROSEMAN: Rob Lambert.
And just a matter of housekeeping, could we have the screens on? Mr. Lambert is going to put up the exhibits on the screen.

And I have some hardcopies of exhibits, if people wish them, but we'll use the screen, and if anybody wants a copy either now or at the end, I'll be happy to hand them out.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, if you have hardcopies for the board, that would be -MR. BROSEMAN : Okay.

MR. LARKIN: Seeing A-5, I assume you guys are going to mark and introduce it. I think we only have through A-4 on the website right now.

Could you get copies of any additional exhibits over to Peggy, and we'll get them uploaded for everybody else at the end of the meeting?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. I don't know if they'll be up by the end of the meeting, but tomorrow.

MR. LARKIN: Sometime after the meeting.

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
I'm going to go ahead and hand out copies.

$$
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APPLICANT'S EVIDENCE

-     -         - 

ROBERT M. LAMBERT, JR.,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and
testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Rob Lambert.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Rob, we have put up Exhibit A-5. Is this a summary of your educational and professional background?
A. Yes. It's my CV. - - -
(Applicant's Exhibit A-5 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And can you describe your educational and professional background?
A. Yes. I have a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the University of Notre Dame and a Master of Science in Civil Engineering from Villanova University.

I worked in Radnor Township for about 27 years almost, believe it or not.

In preparation for this, I actually looked at how many projects I've done in Radnor, and we've been involved in over 400 projects in Radnor Township.
Q. And do you have any special experience with regard to stormwater management?
A. Yes. My Master's in Civil Engineering specializes in stormwater management, and we've done extensive work with stormwater.
Q. Are you a licensed professional engineer in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?
A. I am.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'd like to offer Rob Lambert as an expert in civil engineering and land development.

MR. MARLIER: Mr. Rice, I just have a few questions.

MR. RICE: Go ahead.

$$
-\quad-
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## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. Mr. Lambert, you said were you a licensed professional engineer. What is your
certification number?
A. Give me ne second. It's PE060743.
Q. Thank you, sir. Is that license in good standing?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Do you represent any municipalities?
A. I do not.
Q. So you solely represent developers in these kinds of projects?
A. Applicants, yes.
Q. And how many single-family housing projects?
A. Innumerable.
Q. You've done 400 in Radnor, you say, you've been a part of?
A. Yes.
Q. Roughly how many of them were single-family projects?
A. I would say probably, I kind of think of the inverse, probably 90 percent of them are related to single-family projects in Radnor.
Q. So about ten percent multifamily?
A. Institutional, commercial,
multifamily.
Q. About how many -- $I$ want to stay with Radnor here. About how many of those projects were seven acres or more?
A. Given the size of parcels in Radnor Township, $I$ could limit it probably to, you know, let's call it ten.

I don't know a specific number, but there's a limited number that are over seven acres.
Q. So roughly ten?
A. Roughly ten.
Q. And roughly, out of the 400 projects, how many were construction of over 30 homes?
A. I don't believe any.
Q. As you know, because of, I'll call it Hamilton-1, the first conditional use, obviously stormwater was an issue during that, those hearings.

Have you done any projects out of those 400 with more significant stormwater issues?
A. Yes. We've done larger projects with larger amounts of impervious coverage and stormwater management controls.
Q. Can you state some of those projects?
A. Cabrini University, we've done extensive projects with dormitories, parking structure, driveways, a gym addition.

MR. MARLIER: Mr. Rice, I don't have any further questions.

MR. RICE: Okay. So we're just qualifying Mr. Lambert as an expert witness, and he certainly meets the standard in this state as an expert witness based on his background and experience, and so he'll be accepted as an expert in, I think you said, civil engineering and land development, Mr. Broseman?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. Proceed on.
MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Rob, for the record, were the civil engineering plans that accompanied the conditional use application prepared under your
supervision?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. And were the civil engineering plans for conditional use plan one, as we're calling it, also prepared under your supervision?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. I'd like to move on to some general topics regarding the location of the property, surrounding land uses, zoning, and things of that nature.

Could we move on to Exhibit $A-6$, and I'll hand out copies.

$$
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BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Can you describe what this Exhibit A-6 is and then describe the location of the property and the surrounding area?
A. Yeah. A-6 is an aerial image with some overlays and notes on it prepared by Glacken, Thomas, Panzak.

At the bottom right-hand corner you
can see the north arrow. The north is actually, true north is up in the upper left-hand corner.

For purposes of description though, I'm going to call north the top of the page, just for ease of description.

So in the center of the page is an overlay on the aerial image of the proposed development.

So you can see the green area with the brown buildings, that is an overlay of the proposed plan on the aerial image.

Right above that is an additional overlay of the St. Honore development, which is currently under construction, of 14 single-family homes that was recently approved, hence why it's not on the aerial image.

So going from the lower left to the upper right, you can see Lancaster Avenue, and going from about the middle of the page off to the middle of the left is Old Eagle School Road, just for orientation.

From the bottom left-hand corner to the middle of the top of the page is the SEPTA railroad, the Amtrak railroad.

Going roughly in the middle of the page, right under the letter "A," is Eagle Road, and that goes straight down.

So I'm going to use the proposed development as kind of an anchor in my description.

If you look just below that between the proposed development and Lancaster Avenue is the Eagle Village Shopping Center.

So there's a shopping center adjacent to it, just at the bottom to the south of the image, the proposed image.

Working around in a clockwise direction from that point, you have the properties of Forrest Lane going off on a, toward the lower left, residential properties, and then you see the word "Grant Lane."

Grant Lane, that's actually the township line. The middle of Grant Lane is actually the township line for Radnor and Tredyffrin, as everyone talks about, where we are proximate to the township line.

So there are single-family residences that abut the left side of the property along

Grant Lane.
Then you have Staffford Avenue going across the top of the proposed development going left to right.

And as I've described, you have the St. Honore development, which is a single-family development in $R-4$ which was just recently developed.

And then going over to the corner, you can see some single-family residences on the north side of Strafford Avenue.

That's kind of a recent, relatively recent anyway, a development of single-family homes around a larger existing home.

In the upper right corner, kind of catty-corner from the site, you can see the Strafford office complex.

There's a very similar office complex across Strafford Avenue just to the east. So just to the east of the site is a large office complex to the east.

I would note just to the east or right of the office complexes is a density modification development that was built known as Villa

Strafford.
I believe the name of the road or the drive that they have now is also Villa Strafford, so that is just off to the right. There's a density modification development there.
Q. Is that townhomes in that development?
A. Yes, they are townhomes in Villa Strafford.
Q. I'd like to go to our next exhibit, please, A-7.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-7 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. As with the last exhibit, can you explain what this exhibit is and then describe what it shows, please?
A. Yes. This is Exhibit A-7, again prepared by Glacken, Thomas, Panzak. This is a hybrid zoning plan.

I say "hybrid" because there's a dark line with two dashes going from the top to the bottom of the page about a third from the left,
and that is approximately the township line.
So to the left of that is Tredyffrin Township. To the right of that is Radnor Township. Both zoning maps were kind of seamed together at that point.

This plan is in the same orientation as $A-6$, so Lancaster Avenue kind of goes from the bottom left across to the kind of upper right.

The railroad again is off, comes off the top of the page there, the middle of the top of the page under "A" and then goes down to the bottom, bottom left.

The property is identified in the center, roughly the center of the plan, Hamilton Trust Site.

Again, going directly to the north you can see where the St. Honore development is identified. There's an outline of where that development is.

So I'll start off in kind of the same orientation of the zoning. So going toward the bottom of the page from the site is Eagle Village.

That is a C-2 zoning district that abuts the property all the way along the, predominantly along the bottom property line or southern property sign.

The green, including the Hamilton site, is zoned R-4 in Radnor Township. So you can see the $R-4$ includes the property.

And then all the properties along Grant Lane are also $R-4$, along with the properties to the north of Strafford Road.

So Strafford Road goes straight again across the top of the Hamilton Trust site. Those properties are all R-4. Again, that's the green color on this plan.
Q. Staffford Avenue, you mean?
A. Strafford Avenue. I'm sorry. And then going again catty-corner to the site is the Strafford office complex. That is the CO zoning district.

And then crossing Strafford Avenue to the bottom is the Strafford office complex and the farmers market and the Strafford Shopping Center are all in the $P D$ zoning district.

I'll note the Villa Strafford site,
while still in Radnor, was an $R-4$ zoning district.

Going across to Tredyffrin, it was, I believe, $R-1$-- no, I'm sorry. I believe it was the R-2 district.

I'm not sure of the colors there, they're a little bit off, but a residential zoning district on the other side of the township line.
Q. And now $I$ want to turn to the existing conditions of the property. We have an existing conditions plan at Exhibit A-8?
A. That is correct. - - -
(Applicant's Exhibit A-8 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And is this, as $I$ hand this out, was this one of the sheets of the original conditional use plan that was submitted with the township?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. For the record, this was sheet two of

14 of the original conditional use plans?
A. That is correct. It was A-8.
Q. And we're calling it A-8 here for convenience, but referring to this plan, would you describe the existing conditions on the property?
A. Yes. So this is the same orientation as the previous exhibit with north in the upper left-hand corner. The existing conditions on the site contain several structures or many structures.

There were six dwelling units on the property, various outbuildings, greenhouses, driveways, swimming pool, pool house, all related to the property, if you look at the corner of Strafford, again Strafford's at the top of the page going left to right and Eagle Road, going top to bottom, on the right-hand side.

Then we have in the bottom left-hand corner is 18 Forrest Lane, which is a single-family residence that fronts Forrest Lane that is proposed as part of this development.

The existing property from an
elevation standpoint is relatively flat.

There is a, kind of a high point through the, about a third from Eagle Road, there's a high point that runs across the property and drains to Eagle Road, and the main property drains really to the bottom left-hand corner and out to Forrest Lane as the existing contours show on the property.
Q. And are there any stormwater management facilities on the property currently?
A. There are no stormwater management facilities, aside from some small containment facilities.
Q. And are there sidewalks on the frontage of the property on either Strafford Avenue or Eagle Road?
A. There are no sidewalks on either frontage.
Q. And what is the status of this property regarding connection to public water and public sewer?
A. The property has both connections to public water and public sewer.
Q. Does the property contain any watercourses, streams, floodplains, or steep
slope areas?
A. It does not. There's a small area of slopes that are within the right-of-way of Eagle Road, when they cut Eagle Road. Aside from that small area, there are no steep slopes.
Q. And that area you just mentioned, would you characterize that as a manmade or a natural area?
A. It was a manmade area. It's pretty clear when they cut in Eagle Road that the bank along the edge of the road was created.
Q. And did I hear you correctly, I may have missed it, is that in the right-of-way for the road?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. BROSEMAN: I want to go over the submission of the application and reviews and responses and things of that nature.

We mentioned that there was an
original conditional use application, and I should note, we started out at Exhibit A-2 .

I had reserved Exhibit A-1. I have a full set of that that I'd like to mark for
the record.
I think it's on the website, $I$ had heard already, but $I$ can hand that to you, Mr. Rice, if you want it at this time or at another time. It's a big, thick --

MR. RICE: This is the full set of plans?

MR. BROSEMAN: Full set of plans and the related documents that were filed in May of --

MR. RICE: So it's the application?
MR. BROSEMAN: The application, yes.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: I just wanted that to be A-1.

MR. RICE: Well, let's make it A-1. I have some of that already. Let's identify what we're marking also.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-1 was marked for identification.)

-     -         - 

MR. BROSEMAN: Okay. I was going to call this collectively A-1. The top of it
is a cover letter that $I$ prepared dated May 24, 2023.

It was addressed to Mr. White, the township manager. I believe I had been advised that that's who I should file the application with.

And it says that we were filing a conditional use application, and it lists out all of the items that we were filing, so this package includes all of those items.

Would you like me to read all the items, or it's just in the letter?

MR. RICE: Well, why don't we do this? Let's just mark it collectively as A-1 as the conditional use application.

MR. BROSEMAN: That's right.
MR. RICE: With all the supporting documents and plans that are required as part of the application.

MR. BROSEMAN: That's right. And I would like to note one thing. I think we stated it in the application.

But the cover of the application says
it's a zoning hearing board application submittal.

We contacted the township administrative staff and asked if there was a conditional use application form.

They advised us there was not, we should use zoning hearing board application form.

But this is obviously a conditional use application to the board of commissioners.

Noah, do you have a copy of this?
MR. MARIIER: Not that copy. I have a copy, not that copy.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, do you have a third copy that we could make available for the public also?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. And we can also make arrangements, if it isn't on the website, to have it on the website.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, I think it would be good to have a paper copy here for the residents, anyone that wants to come in and take a look.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to hand you another one of that.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. So after the submission of that package on May 24, 2023, Mr. Lambert, did you receive any reviews of those plans from the township consultants?
A. Yes. We received three reviews.
Q. And do you recall when that was?
A. Yes. August 1st, 2023, we received a letter from Gannett Fleming, the township engineer.

Then August 1st we have a letter from Gilmore \& Associates. That is the township traffic engineer.

And on the same date we have a letter from -- I'm sorry. On July 29 th we have a letter from Rockwell Associates, the township arborist.
Q. And I have marked each of these letters. A-9 A, and I'll hand up copies, A-9 A is the Gannett Fleming letter; is that correct?
A. That is correct. And B is the Gilmore letter, and A-9 $C$ is the Rockwell letter.
(Applicant's Exhibits A-9 A through
A-9 C were marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And technically, A-9 B, the Gilmore letter, as you called it, was in the form of a memorandum; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And I'll go ahead and hand out some copies of those.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, before you continue on, these three exhibits were all previously marked the first night we met, August 10th, 2023, by me as board exhibits.

MR. BROSEMAN: Okay. I didn't remember that.

MR. RICE: They're in the transcript from that night.

So B-1 is the Gannett Fleming review later dated 8-1-23; B-2 is the Gilmore \& Associates letter dated 8-1-23; and B-3 is the Rockwell Associates letter dated 7-29-23.

And marked $B-4$ was your, Mr. Broseman,
your continuance request at that time of 8-9-23.

So it's just not an issue. I just want to make sure we have it. They're all way back in the record the first night.

MR. BROSEMAN: I appreciate that clarification.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Mr. Lambert, after receiving those reviews and memorandums, did your office submit revised plans in response to those reviews, along with response letters to the township civil engineering and traffic consultant?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And do you remember when that was?
A. September 18th, 2023.
Q. And I'm going to direct your attention to A-10.

(Applicant's Exhibit A-10 was marked for identification.)

-     -         - 

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Is this a copy of the revised
engineering plans that were submitted?
A. Yes, it is. And just for the record, A-10, it was, it says sheet one of 14 is the cover sheet, and we resubmitted sheets one through nine of that set.
Q. Did these plans address many of the comments that were made in the review letters that we had submitted?
A. Yes. They addressed some of the comments. We also included two response letters that were $A-11 A$ and $A-11 B$.

A-11 A was the Site Engineering Concepts response letter dated September 18 th , 2023, in response to the Gannett Fleming review letter.

A-11 B was again a Site Engineering Concepts letter dated September 18th, 2023, addressing the Gilmore letter.
(Applicant's Exhibits A-11 A and A-11
B were marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And for the record, is this a copy of

A-11 $A$ and A-11 B?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And here is $A-11$ B?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. I'll go ahead and hand those out. And could you describe in general how these letters --

MS. AGNEW: Hold on one minute.

MR. RICE: Go ahead, Mr. Broseman.
MR. BROSEMAN: Go ahead?
MR. RICE: Yes.
BY MR. BROSEMAN:
Q. Mr. Lambert, could you describe in general, $I$ won't have you go through them point by point, but in general how do these letters address the comments that have been received from the township's civil engineering and traffic consultants?
A. So we received the letters as a review letter from August 1st, as you can see from this resubmission in September 18th.

We responded to the zoning and land development the way they organized the letters.

We organized it with kind of sections of comments where it's kind of zoning comments, land development questions, and then more kind of detailed plan-oriented details.

We answered the zoning and subdivision and land development comments with either further questions trying to inquire, probe some of the questions they were asking, and then some of the more plan-related items we actually said we'll comply for many of those items, just because we were waiting, hoping to have additional dialogue before we cleaned up the, kind of the smaller housekeeping items.
Q. And did some of the responses and some of the comments relate to how certain ordinance provisions would be interpreted?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And you set forth information in reference to other code provisions that perhaps weren't mentioned by them?
A. Yes. As we'll talk about tonight, there's kind of complexity in the code and many
different sections that apply, some superseding others, and that's what we tried to clarify in that letter.
Q. And since submitting the responses and the revised plans on September 18, 2023, did you ever receive a response to the revised plans and the responses or clarifications to the township engineering consultant's comments?
A. We have not received any written responses to our September 18th letters.

At the, $I$ believe it's the January 3rd planning commission meeting, we did receive some verbal comments back from township staff and consultants.
Q. And that was January 3rd, 2024?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And you mentioned you didn't receive comments to the response letters.

I assume you also didn't receive comments from the revised plans?
A. We did not, no.
Q. But at January 3rd, 2024, there was issues discussed by the planning commission, and feedback was given on some of the issues at that
time?
A. Yes.
Q. Based on the feedback that you received at the January 3, 2024, planning commission, have further revisions been made to the conditional use plans?
A. Yes. The updated -- the plans included additional response letters. We also updated the stormwater management calculations.
Q. And I'm going to hand up Exhibit A-12, and we also have Exhibit A-13.
(Applicant's Exhibits A-12 and A-13 were marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Is A-12 a set of the revised
conditional use plans?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And A-13 would be the revised stormwater report, kind of based on the revised plans in Exhibit A-12?
A. That is correct.
Q. And A-13 is the revised stormwater
management report; is that right?
A. That is correct, yes.

MR. BROSEMAN: Now, it's quite
lengthy. We only have three copies of this with us at this time. We can provide additional copies at a future date if that's okay.

So, like we did before, shall $I, M r$. Rice, give two to you, one for your record, one for the public, and I'll give one to Mr. Marlier? Would that be okay?

MR. RICE: Yes, that's fine.
BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And when you prepared these, are there also supplemental response letters that accompany these plans?
A. Yes, there are.
Q. And --

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, let's just stop for a minute here. I don't know if you want to identify these any further.

Just going back to A-13, this is, just so we have this for the court reporter, this is the post construction stormwater
management analysis for Hamilton Estate dated May 15th, 2023, revised January 31st, 2024 .

MR. BROSEMAN: That's right. Mr. Lambert put that cover up on the screen. MR. RICE: Pardon me?

MR. BROSEMAN: Mr. Lambert put that cover up on the screen.

MR. RICE: Oh, oh. Okay. I'm shuffling the paper here. Okay.

I just want to identify the revision dates of everything you're submitting so it's clear what's being passed around, because we have some other parties here that aren't getting copies right now, but we need to get copies to the other parties when it's time for them to ask questions.

MR. BROSEMAN: Absolutely. We'll get them whatever they need.

And for the record, $A-12$ is dated May 18, 2023. This is revision number two dated January 29, 2024.

THE WITNESS: And just for clarity, it's a set of sheet one of 17 , and sheets
one through 12 are included in this submission or exhibit.

MR. BROSEMAN: And those are the engineering plans?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. RICE: So you're only revising one through 12?

THE WITNESS: Correct. An additional witness will be providing the other exhibit.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. MARLIER: I'm sorry. Just to be clear, that's A-12 we're discussing?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. MARLIER: So A-12, it says sheet one of 17 , but there are 12 pages submitted here?

THE WITNESS: Correct. On the cover sheet, you can see there's a drawing schedule, and one through 12 are identified, with the remainder being crossed out.

MR. MARLIER: Okay.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And the remainder are sheets in the plan set that are prepared by another firm; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And $I$ was mentioning that we have the supplemental response letters that were to accompany these plans, and we've marked those, as we did with the first responses, using $A$ and $B$, so can you identify $A-14 \quad A$ and $A-14 B$ ?
A. Yes. A-14 A is a supplemental response letter dated January 31st, 2024, for the Gannett Fleming review letter.
Q. And B, A-14 B?
A. Is a January 31st letter from Site Engineering Concepts. It's a supplemental letter addressing the Gilmore memorandum review.
(Applicant's Exhibits A-14 A and A-14
B were marked for identification.)

MR. RICE: So these two, A-14 A and
A-14 B, are additional responses to the original 8-1-23 Gannett Fleming review
letter and the 8-1-23 Gilmore memorandum?
THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct, and they supplemented the September response letters.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Okay, Rob. Turning to the proposed development, you've gone over the location of the property, the surrounding area, the existing conditions.

We've gone through the submissions that were made and the responses and revisions based on feedback, and now I'd like you to focus on Exhibit A-12 and describe the proposed plan.
A. So Exhibit A-12 consists of 12 sheets that is part of the exhibit. The first sheet, the cover sheet, and I'll go through the first couple plans quickly, because we talked about them.

The second sheet would be the existing conditions plan. The third sheet was a demolition plan.

And then we get to the fourth sheet, which I think everybody is waiting for. It's the proposed layout plan, a record plan.

This plan again, the orientation, Eagle Road is on the right-hand side going from the top to the bottom.

Strafford Avenue is going left to right at the tope of the page.

Grant Lane is just, I'm showing it's off to the left-hand side going top to bottom. The shopping center is just to the bottom of the page.

So generally what's shown as the brown color on this plan are the proposed townhome units. The gray area are driveways. The tan are walkways.

There's two different shades of green on this. There's a darker green that's open space and the lighter green is just really other green areas or landscaped areas.

One bigger, more significant change on this plan, if you note that the, and $I$ believe Mr. Houder talked about it the other evening, was 18 Forrest Lane is now proposed to be part of the development fully, that we would remove the existing dwelling there and incorporate that into this property, and that was in response to some
communications with the residents.
So starting at Staffford Avenue and Eagle Road, there's actually a sidewalk that's proposed along the entire frontage. I'll work my way out and back in again.

There's sidewalk that doesn't exist today that's proposed along the entire frontage of Strafford and Eagle Road.

We have two driveway entrances on Strafford Avenue roughly in a horseshoe shape, and then there are groupings of the townhouses going around the horseshoe driveway.
Q. And what's the width of that driveway?
A. Twenty-eight feet. There are extensive stormwater management facilities proposed.

You can see on this plan there are dashed lines, and I'll kind of start off to the right-hand side closest to Eagle Road.

So it is between unit number one, which is in the bottom right-hand corner, and unit 38 , there is a dashed rectangle which is a proposed stormwater management system.

Crossing the driveway, again there's a
dashed line that's underneath the front parking spaces that are shown with a striped area adjacent to the driveway. That is a stormwater management facility.

Going to the other end of the row of units 25 through 28, the closest unit, 25, is another subsurface stormwater facility, and then behind units 13 through 15 is a triangular stormwater facility.

And then out on 18 Forrest is an additional stormwater facility that we have included on that parcel.
Q. And this plan has how many townhomes?
A. Thirty-eight townhomes.
Q. And you mentioned the color green, the color green on the screen, the shade, I can tell the difference. I think on the paper copies they're clearer.

But can you describe the darker green I would call in the center of the site? Is that what you're counting as the required common open space?
A. That is correct. So the darker green area in the center of the site, there's a note in
the middle that says 26 percent open space, 84,807 square feet, and so that was the open space, the required open space.

There is also in the zoning table, and we'll get to that in more detail, identification of the required open space of 25 percent. The 26 percent is proposed.

And then in that zoning summary table it also identifies that there's 7.9 percent of stormwater underneath that basin.
Q. And another professional prepared it, but there will be a significant amount -prepared the plan, $I$ mean to say. There will be significant amounts of landscaping provided?
A. Yes, there will be an extensive amount of landscaping.
Q. And you may have mentioned it, I may have missed it, but was a connection, pedestrian connection added between the property to the Eagle Village Shopping Center to the south?
A. Yes. In between units four and five, there's a proposed walkway which will connect the sidewalk along the driveway, an internal driveway of the site to the Eagle Village Shopping Center.
Q. Now, this proposed development will be a planned community under the Pennsylvania Uniform Planned Community Act; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And there's a note to that effect on the plans?
A. Yes, in the upper right-hand corner, there's general notes, and it's note number one.
Q. And did the conditional use submission, or Exhibit $A-1$, did that include an initial draft of the Declaration of Planned Community for the proposed planned community that would ultimately be recorded in the Delaware County Recorder of Deeds Office?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. We're going to be focusing on the zoning ordinance standards for a conditional use for a density modification development in the $R-4$ residence district next.

Before we get into those specifics, can you confirm the other types of reviews and approvals that would be required for this project after it goes through the conditional use stage?
A. After the conditional use stage, we
will need, as far as the township, a preliminary and a final land development review phases and approvals.

As part of those, we'll go to the shade tree commission. We will have consultant reviews. We will have additional details provided and additional reviews of those plans.

We will have outside agency approvals with an NPDES permit, the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System, that's required when you disturb over an acre.

It is a permit that's issued through the Delaware County Conservation District, which will review and approve the plans for the stormwater management and the erosion and sediment control.

There will be the Department of Environmental Protection for the planning module review, so for the sanitary sewer. That will be reviewed and approved as part of the process.
Q. And in addition to all of that, then the township has various permit reviews and permits that must be issued?
A. Yes. Once we're through the process,
get through the final plan approval, then we can submit our gradings.

Obviously, there's going to be building permits associated with this also, but a grading permit will be required to be reviewed and approved.
Q. And as you mentioned, stormwater management, erosion and sedimentation control, so reviews by both the township and the Delaware County Conservation District.

Does that cover the stormwater issues that would arise during the construction and then after the construction is completed?
A. Yes, both during and post development stormwater controls.
Q. I want to turn now to the specific zoning ordinance provisions that are applicable to this conditional use application, and you indicated, and as we know, this property is in the R-4 Residence District.

Can you confirm that density modification development is permitted in the $R-4$ district by conditional use?
A. Yes. Section 280-29 B states: The
following uses, only when authorized as a conditional use by the board of commissioners, and I'll paraphrase some of these.

Subparagraph one is: Density modification development, in accordance with the requirements of Article XIX, density modification development.
Q. And is Article XIX of the zoning ordinance found at Code Sections 280-90 to 280-100?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. We're going to run through most of those provisions, and we're going to generally go in order, but we're going to try to follow order numerically, but we're going to try to also, the way the code is written, there's sort of a logical order, so we're not always going to go in numerical order.

But turning to Article XIX, Code Section 280-92, which, among other things, confirms which zoning districts permit density modification developments, can you describe those provisions and how the plans comply with them?
A. Yes. So 280-92 A(4) says: In the R-4 districts, the minimum tract size must be at least five acres, and I'm going to pause on some of these, just to reference the plan.

So in Exhibit A-12, sheet four, on the left-hand side there's a zoning summary. In that zoning summary, the top line is the tract area size. The requirement is five acres. We have 7.487 acres.

And then it says: The density shall be a maximum of five and a half units per acre.

About halfway down that table, the maximum density is identified as five and a half units per acre, which would allow 41 units.

In the proposed, we have 5.08 dwelling units per acre, with 38 units proposed.

There shall be no buildings within 40 feet of an existing right-of-way line. So again, using Exhibit A-12 --
Q. Let me interrupt you. The ordinance says existing street right-of-way line; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Sorry to interrupt.
A. That's okay. Sheet four, so both in the plan view, you can see the 40 -foot dimension from the existing street right-of-way line, there's a dashed line identifying that 40-foot limit and the dimension from the existing street right-of-way.

And again, in the table, there is the minimum setback, and it says from existing street right-of-way. The requirement's 40 feet. We have a minimum of 51 feet.

And then the last part of the section says: And 25 feet from any adjacent property line.

So again, the plan view shows a dashed line with a 25-foot dimension from the property line, and this is also included in the table under the setbacks, which is 25 feet required and 30 foot proposed.
Q. So that 25 feet is for the property lines that don't adjoin Staffford Avenue or Eagle Road?
A. That is correct.
Q. Turning to Code Section 280-93, the use regulations for density modification
development, please describe these provisions and how the plans comply with them.
A. So under 280-93 A, it says:

Townhouses shall be authorized only when constructed, owned, and operated under single ownership or under the Pennsylvania Unit Property Act.

As we mentioned, it is a planned community. We've included the documents as part of $A-1$.

Section 280-93 B, it says, again this will be kind of broken up again: Not more than eight townhouses shall be attached in a single group.

And so looking at $A-12$, sheet four, we have one section of buildings which is six units, it is the largest, so it's under that eight-unit limit.

And then continuing it says: And each group of townhouses shall be separated from each other group by at least 20 feet.

And so again, using $A-12$, sheet four, you can see that we actually have a minimum of 30 feet separating each group of buildings.

It says, continuing the code section, it says: No more than two contiguous townhouses in any group may be constructed in line, and each townhouse shall have at least one plan element on any floor which projects or recedes within the wall plane of the facade a minimum dimension of two feet.

So all of our units actually stagger two feet, so we have a stagger to each unit, as one unit is either ahead or behind the other unit by two feet.
Q. And you can see that on Exhibit A-12, sheet four?
A. That is correct. And then 280-93 C says: For purposes of this article, townhouse is defined as a single-family dwelling consisting of two or more floors, attached to one or more similar structures as part of a unified development.

As we talked about, it's a planned community. And then in the upper right-hand corner of Exhibit $A-12$ are general notes.
Q. You're referring to sheet four?
A. Sheet four, yes. I'm sorry. A-12,
sheet four, in the upper right-hand corner, it was note three, it says:

Each townhouse shall have at least two floors in compliance with applicable height limits and shall be occupied as a single-family dwelling. So we would comply with 280-93 C.
Q. Code Section 280-94 addresses area and height regulations, particularly building area coverage, impervious surface, and height.

Please describe those provisions and how the plans comply with them.
A. So 280-94 A says: The building area coverage and height regulations of the zoning district in which the property is located shall apply, except that the total area covered by building and impervious surfaces, excluding streets, shall not exceed the percentage of building coverage and impervious surfaces established for the zoning district plus an additional five percent.

If we go back to the R-4 standards, it's at 280-30 B under the $R-4$, that building area, the requirement of not more than 30 percent of the area of each lot may be occupied by
buildings.
So if we add the five percent back, we're permitted 35 percent building area.

And then under 280-30 F, the maximum impervious surfaces is 40 percent. Again, we can add the five percent to that. That's 45 percent.

So going back to A-12, sheet four, the zoning summary table on the left-hand side, we have the maximum building coverage of 35 percent permitted, and 23 and a half percent is proposed.

And then the maximum impervious coverage is 45 percent is permitted and 42 .9 percent is proposed.
Q. And did you address height?
A. Height was, the underlying zoning was permitted 35 feet. Again, in the zoning summary table on the left-hand side, you see a maximum building height of 35 feet, and we're proposing heights that are less than 35 feet.
Q. And would these structures exceed three stories?
A. No.
Q. This is one of the examples of, I'm going to go out of numerical order with the code
sections and go to 280-91, common open space.
Can you please describe those provisions and explain how the plans comply with them?
A. Yes. So 280-91 A is: Not less than 25 percent of the tract area shall be designated in the subdivision or land development plan as common open space.

So going back to A-12, sheet four, I previously mentioned the darker green color is open space. It's identified as 26 percent open space.

And on that same zoning summary table on the left-hand side, we have the common open space of 25 percent required, and 26 percent is proposed.

The ordinance section then continues. It says: Common open space may not include required buffer yards, floodplain, or wetlands.

So the buffered yards, we haven't gotten to that portion of the code, but buffer yard is along the residentially-zoned property.

And so along the left-hand side on Grant Lane, and there is, one property remains at
the bottom of the page that's on Forrest Lane.
As you can see from $A-12$, sheet four, the common open space is not adjacent to any of those buffer areas, so that buffer areas are not included.

The ordinance then continues and says: No more than ten percent of the required common open space may be used to meet the plan's stormwater management requirements, and all required common open space shall be contiguous unless the board of commissioners approves otherwise.

So when $I$ described the plan previously, identifying two stormwater management facilities that were under the common open space, the area of those is deducted out.

You can see again in the zoning table that we have 7.9 percent of stormwater within the common open space. And then, as you can see on the plan, the common open space is all contiguous.
Q. Now, Mr. Houder mentioned this earlier, but this was the section that was changed shortly after the adjudication and
conditional use plan one.
Is it your recollection that section previously read in total: Not less than 15 percent of the tract area shall be designated in the subdivision or land development plan as common open space?
A. That is correct.
Q. So the changes included increasing the open space requirement from 15 to 25 percent; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And it also regulated how much stormwater management, specifically regulated how much stormwater management could be within the required open space where it didn't before; is that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And the provision was added: All required common open space shall be contiguous unless the board of commissioners approves otherwise.

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. I think Mr. Houder testified regarding
some examples of how the size of the common open space that's being designated in the central part of the site here on sheet four of Exhibit A-12 compares to some other familiar locations in Radnor Township for other open areas.

Do you have any further example of this?
A. Yes. I think kind of coincidentally there's a park on Lancaster Avenue, a township park, Veterans Park, that's almost very, very similar size, $I$ believe it was 1.9 acres, and the overall dimensions of the open space are very similar to what is proposed here.
Q. 280-91 B is another provision. Could you go over that provision?
A. Yes. That provision says: Common open space shall be land which is appropriate and in suitable condition for recreation, park site, school grounds, woodland conservation, or other similar recreation or open space purpose.

So this ground is, the existing conditions are relatively flat. This will remain a relatively flat area that will be open. There's some existing trees in that area.

And so it's very suitable for, you know, a park-like setting and passive open space types of recreation in that open space.
Q. And you mentioned previously it's not constrained by features such as steep slopes, floodplains, those types of things?
A. That is correct.
Q. And 280-91 $C$ is another requirement. Can you go over that one?
A. The common open space shall be contiguous to the development and not be separated from the tract by existing roads.

As you can see on A-12, sheet four, the common open space is part of the tract, and it's not separated by existing roads.
Q. Continuing on, 280-91 D is still another requirement. Can you go over that requirement?
A. Yes. Consideration shall be given to the arrangement and location of common open space to take advantage of physical characteristics of the site and to place common open space within easy access and view of dwelling units, at the same time preserving and enhancing natural
features.
Areas set aside for common open space shall contain no structure other than a structure related to outdoor recreational use.

Again, using A-12, sheet four, you can see that the common space is really central to the site within easy access of all the proposed units.

We are proposing no structures within the common open space, and we, the location of the common open space preserves some mature trees.
Q. And is it in easy view of the dwelling units, generally speaking?
A. Yes. Generally speaking, all of the units are afforded views in the open space.
Q. Continuing on, 280-91 E, can you describe that requirement?
A. Yes. Common open space shall be made subject to such agreement with the township and such deed restrictions duly recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in Delaware County as may be required by the board of commissioners for the purpose of preserving
common open space for such use.
And so that was part of the planned community documents which will be recorded as part of this development, and it will ensure the preservation of that common open space.
Q. And then there's a subsection $F$. Could you go over those requirements?
A. Yes. Common open space, within the meaning of this article, shall consist of a parcel or parcels of land or an area of water, or a combination of land and water, within a development site, designed and intended for the use or enjoyment of the residents of the development or the public, not including streets, off-street parking areas, and areas set aside for public facilities.

As described, this is for the residents of the development and the access to the area of land. We don't have any water.

And it's meant for the enjoyment of the residents and does not include any streets, it does not include any off-street parking areas, and it only includes, if you can call them, public facilities, the ten percent, less than ten
percent of the stormwater facilities as permitted by subsection A.
Q. And those facilities are underground, underneath the open space, in any event?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And would they interfere with the use of the land above for recreation or open space purpose?
A. They do not, no.
Q. Interestingly, this section indicates that it could be a parcel or parcels of land to be the common open space; isn't that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct, but we are going to have the whole, part of the same parcel.
Q. 280-91 G is another requirement here. Can you go over those requirements and how the plans comply?
A. Yes. There shall be a buffer of 25 feet along all property lines which abut residentially-zoned districts which shall not contain any roads, structures, parking areas, et cetera, and shall be planted in accordance with a plan which shall be approved by the board of commissioners at the time of final approval.

This buffer strip shall not be counted toward the common open space.

So, as I described when we were talking about subsection $A$, there is a, using A-12, sheet four, on the left-hand side along the Grant Lane neighbors, there's a 25-foot buffer that goes along that residentially-zoned property that continues out to Forrest Lane, with a 25-foot buffer going out to Forrest, perpendicular to Forrest Lane, parallel to the adjacent neighbor.

And then coming back from Forrest Lane there's a 25-foot buffer that then goes around the single residentially-zoned property to the right of the 18 Forrest Lane property, there's a 25-foot buffer.

The buffer then stops there 25 feet past that property line as the shopping center is not zoned residential and is not required to have a buffer.

The landscape plan with the buffer will be provided by the landscape architect. Q. 280-99, and again I've gone out of numeric order, but staying with the topic of
common open space, 280-99 contains requirements regarding ownership and maintenance of the required common open space.

Please describe these provisions that are applicable at this time to the application and how this project complies with those provisions.
A. So 280-99, ownership and maintenance of common open space, A says: Land development plans shall describe the plan for ownership and maintenance of common open space.

Although we're not in land development at this time, we have included the draft HOA documents or planned community documents, which include the ownership and maintenance of the common open space.

B: The plan shall provide for, one, dedication, which we're not proposing to dedicate the common open space; or two, private ownership and maintenance.

So again, we're providing in the documents that are A-1 that it would have private ownership and maintenance of the open space.

And then subparagraph C says: The
board of commissioners may require dedication, easements, and/or deed restrictions covering all or portions of the common open space and may require the applicant to provide for and establish an organization for the maintenance of the common open space, organized under or similar to that required by the Unit Property Act of July 3, 1968, PL 196, and agree that such organization or the group of unit owners holding undivided interest in the common open space shall not dispose of the common open space by sale or otherwise, except to a similar organization or group conceived and established to own and maintain common open space.

In determining whether the organization described in the plan is adequate, the board of commissioners shall consider the type and structure of the organization from the standpoint of its capacity to raise revenue, meet obligations, and properly maintain facilities.

So again, the planned community will provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance, and ownership of the common open space.
Q. And again, that would be owned as part
of the planned community and maintained by the homeowners association?
A. Yes, that's correct. And then subsections $D, E, F$, and $G$ are really not applicable at this time. It really is for future maintenance activities.
Q. And those provisions, as you indicated, are not applicable at this time, but is it fair to say they give the board of commissioners certain authority, if for some reason the common open space wasn't being maintained satisfactorily, which we certainly do not expect, but those provisions give the board authority to take steps to address an issue like that?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. Going to a new code Section 280-95, which is entitled site considerations, these address various items in kind of a general fashion.

Would you please describe these provisions and how the plans comply with them?
A. Yes. So 280-95 A says: Every effort must be made in connection with each subdivision
and development plan to avoid excessive earth moving, undue tree clearance, and destruction of natural features.

The following are priority
requirements: One, lakes, streams, and wooded slopes shall be preserved.

As we described, we do not have any lakes, streams, or wooded slopes.

Two: The development plan must specify the means for protecting trees and other natural features during construction.

So sheet, or Exhibit $A-12$, sheet six, includes the erosion and sedimentation control plan.

This plan includes tree protection, fencing, and then erosion and sediment control features during construction.

Three: The location of trees and other natural features must be given first consideration in planning common open space, location of dwellings, walks, paved areas, and finished grade levels.

There's actually -- the common open space provides for the tree canopy, a healthy
portion of the tree canopy along Strafford Avenue preservation, and then there is a grouping of trees that project into that open space, and those are all being preserved.

As I mentioned before, the grades are relatively flat on the site. Obviously, there will be grading in association with the development, but it will be kept to a minimum.

Four: Landscaping shall be regarded as essential to every development plan.

Not only must natural features, trees, and slopes of the site be preserved, but careful attention must be given to landscaping of parking areas and providing for street trees.

Mr. Panzak will be testifying to the extensive landscaping plan and landscaping that's being provided.

Number five: Seeding, sodding, and other planting shall be applied to stabilize topsoil on steep slopes and to enhance the appearance of open space.

As we talked about, there are really no steep slopes on the site.

And then Exhibit A-12, sheet four,
shows kind of the green area.
And then sheets six and nine, six is the erosion and sediment control plan, nine is the erosion and sediment control notes, which will address seeding and sodding requirements of any disturbed areas.

Six: Streetlighting shall not shine directly into habitable dwelling windows located inside or outside the development.

That will also be, Mr. Panzak will be testifying to the lighting.
Q. This code section talks about, and you covered it, trees and natural features.

There are really no natural features other than trees on this site; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. The provision in the preamble doesn't give any specific standard or any way to judge this, but there's a reference to avoid excessive earth moving, undue tree clearance. Again it mentions destruction of natural features.

Could you comment on whether you believe, in your professional opinion, this would be considered excessive earth moving?
A. I don't believe it's excessive. As I've commented, the site is relatively flat.

There will be some grading to accommodate the improvements, but there won't being excessive earth moving efforts.
Q. And there would be other types of development though where there could be more excessive earth moving if you didn't have such a flat topography, for example; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And with regard to tree clearance, the township has regulations regarding that, and it allows for tree clearance is permitted with certain tree replacement; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And Mr. Panzak will be discussing that; is that right?
A. He will, yes.
Q. And you mentioned that during the land development process, projects like this would be required to go to the Radnor Shade Tree Commission.

Is that where these matters are also reviewed during the land development process
regarding tree clearance and tree replacement?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. 280-96, code Section 280-96 deals with utilities. Can you describe these provisions and how the plans comply with them?
A. Yes. So this 280-96 says: Every development under this article shall be served by sanitary sewers and public water supply.

So the existing property is served by both public water and public sewer, and the proposed plan, Exhibit A-12, sheet five, shows the proposed water and sewer lines servicing this property.

So it's really going to service, just like all the surrounding properties are serviced by public water and sewer, this proposed development will be serviced by public water and sewer.
Q. Code Section 280-97 is called yard, I believe, and it addresses so-called yard requirements.

Can you describe the applicable provisions of this section and how the plans comply with them?
A. Yes. So 280-97, I'm going to skip to subparagraph $D$, because it's more specific to this development.

It says: If a tract is developed and operated under the Unit Property Act of Pennsylvania or under any similar form of development and operation, the minimum side yard distances between dwellings or groups of townhouses, in lieu of the foregoing yard requirements, shall be 30 feet, and I'm paraphrasing, 30 feet in the $R-4$ district.

So in the sections above, where it says in lieu of the foregoing yard requirements, I'll just point out that under 280-97 B, it goes through all of the yard requirements, the front, side, and rear yard requirements.
Q. But this section $D$ is saying when you're under a similar form of development to the Unit Property Act, which is a planned community, this section is saying in lieu of those requirements, follow this separation distance between groups of townhomes.

Is that your understanding of this provision?
A. Yes. I would point out that when we were going over provision 280-93 B under use regulations, there was a specific requirement that each group of townhouses be separated by 20 feet, where this section is a little bit in conflict.

So that section says that the groups, that side yard distances between dwellings or groups of townhouses were 30 feet in the $R-4$ district, so we have complied with the 30 -foot requirement as the separation distance between the units.
Q. And you mentioned this before, but those separation distances are shown on sheet four of Exhibit A-12?
A. That is correct.
Q. There was an issue discussed at the planning commission about the rear yard requirement, so I'm going to ask you to go to 280-97 B, the ones that you said were essentially superseded for the building groups under $D$.

Can you just run through these requirements of 97 B ?
A. Yes. So $97 \mathrm{~B}(1)$ was the front yard,
and it says:
No dwelling shall be located less than 35 feet from the edge of the outside of the curb, and again I'll paraphrase some of these. I would note that this was not a description as -- let me find it -- 280-92(4).
Q. $\quad A(4) ?$
A. $92 \mathrm{~A}(4)$, correct, which required a 40-foot separation from the existing street right-of-way line.

So again, we've used the 40 foot from the existing street right-of-way versus 35 feet from the curb line.

Under 280-97 $B(2)$ under the side yard, this says: Each side yard shall be 15 feet in the R-4 district. We used the 25 -foot perimeter setback requirement, which exceeds 15 feet.

280-97 $\mathrm{B}(3)$ refers to a rear yard, and it says the rear yard shall be 30 feet in all districts.

Again, the way $I$ read this, it was superseded by 280-97 D under the requirements, but nonetheless, we did receive a review letter and comments at the $P C$ meeting, the planning
commission meeting, that a rear yard is required for the lot, not for the individual units, but for the lot, the rear yard, and you could pick which rear yard it was.

We can pick what we were going to designate as the rear yard. We chose to designate the Grant Lane side of the property as a rear yard in this instance. And then --
Q. So is that now shown on $A-12$, sheet four, as a 30 foot rear yard requirement on that property line?

That was something that was added to this A-12 based on the feedback received at the planning commission meeting?
A. Yes, that is correct. So that, the line adjacent to Grant Lane has three different designations to it.

When you look at $A-12$, sheet four, it has the 25 -foot perimeter setback as required, it has a 25-foot buffer requirement, and it has a 30-foot rear yard requirement identified on the plan.
Q. And I think it's pretty clear on the plans, but for the record, this proposed plan has
no accessory structures or buildings proposed?
A. That is correct.
Q. 280-98 is another part of the density modification provisions. Its heading is housing.

Please describe those provisions and how the plans satisfy those provisions that are applicable.
A. 280-98 is housing, subparagraph A: All housing shall be designed with regard to topography and natural features of the site.

The effects of prevailing winds, seasonal temperature, and hours of sunlight on the physical layout and form of the proposed land use and buildings shall be taken into account.

As we've discussed, the topography, there's limited topography on the site. There's limited natural features. We do have some trees that we talked about, the preservation.

This region does not have very strong prevailing winds. And then seasonal temperatures and hours of sunlight, the modern-day building codes really take into account seasonal temperatures with heating and air-conditioning as well.
B, 280-98 B --
Q. Before you leave that, just for the record, it would be obvious to most people, but these townhome units will have heating and air-conditioning?
A. Yes, they will.
Q. And with regard to the sunlight, is the fact that the site is open with large green areas, separation between the units and adjoining tract lines, does that prevent sunlight from having an effect, casting large shadows, things like that?
A. Correct. And the height of the buildings proposed, there won't be long shadow lines from a really tall building.
Q. In fact, the 35 feet that's permitted for density modification, that's pretty much the height of any single-family dwelling that's permitted, even in a more strict zoning district in Radnor; is that right?
A. That is right. I believe that's the permitted height in most districts.
Q. Even for a single-family detached dwelling; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you mentioned our area isn't known for strong prevailing winds.

I know, of course, climate change is a topic, but as compared to other areas, does our area see large seasonal temperature differences as compared to other areas?
A. You mean with hot days and cold days? The building codes address insulation to address the fluctuation in temperatures.
Q. And there's a section 280-98 B. Could you go over that provision?
A. Variation in setbacks shall be provided, when practicable, for housing fronting on the street.

So we talked about the variation, kind of the front/back two-foot variance between units. So going along, I'll start along Eagle Road.
Q. Are you on --
A. A-12, sheet four, starting at the bottom right along Eagle Road you have unit one, unit one, so you have green space, you have unit one, you have a larger area of green space, and
then you have the block of units 33 through 38.
Those will also have variations along the facade facing Eagle Road.

And then when you turn on Eagle Road onto Staffford Avenue, you would make a left, and you have unit 33 , which would face Strafford, and then you have the proposed driveway, and then unit 32 has a slight variation to the setback from unit 33.

Then you have a large common open space in the center, and then unit 21 has a different setback than unit 20 , which is on the other side of the common driveway.
Q. And there's a general provision, this is duplicated, $I$ believe, with slightly different wording in other provisions, at 280-98 C.

Could you go over that provision?
A. Yes. This provision says: Adequate vehicular and pedestrian access and parking areas shall be provided without creating nuisances or distracting from privacy.

I think one thing we didn't talk about when we talked about the plan, each one of the units is proposed to have a two-car garage within
the unit with spaces 19 feet wide by 20 feet long, which would comply with the township parking size standard, and then there's common parking in two locations.

So one, using A-12, sheet four, one area that's adjacent to the common driveway, there are five parking spaces in the lower right that exist outside of the common open space, and then in the lower left there are five parking spaces again in the lower left of the common open space.

For pedestrian access, we talked about the proposed sidewalk that doesn't exist today along Strafford Avenue and Eagle Road.

We also have a sidewalk along the internal driveway and a pedestrian connection over to the Eagle Village Shopping Center.
Q. This provision doesn't provide any guidance on what it means for these to create a nuisance or detract from privacy, but in your professional opinion, will the vehicular and pedestrian access and internal parking areas run afoul of those general provisions?
A. No, they will not.
Q. Since you mentioned parking, it's not specifically in the density modification requirements, but the zoning ordinance, as many zoning ordinances do, does require certain minimum parking requirements for different types of uses.

Can you go over the code sections that provide the code-required parking that is needed for a density modification development like this?
A. Yes. So section 280-103 B(1) is
dwellings: There shall be two spaces per dwelling unit.

And if you look at the bottom of Exhibit A-12, sheet four, there's a parking summary table roughly in the center of the page.

It identifies the code section of two spaces per unit. With 38 units proposed, that would require 76 parking spaces.

In addition to that, there's a
subdivision and land development code section 255-29 A(20) -- I'll pull up the language.

It says: Where semi-attached,
attached, or multiple dwellings are proposed and where private garages or driveways are proposed
to be used to meet the off-street parking requirements, one parking space per four dwelling units of overflow off-street parking shall be provided.

Such parking may be located either in a public parking facility or on individual lots.

And so the, going back to the table, so we have one space per four units, 38 units would require nine and a half parking spaces, rounding that up to ten is what is proposed.

So going back to the plan view of A-12, sheet four, we have two parking spaces in each garage space for each dwelling unit, meeting the code requirement.

In addition, the driveway aprons have a space that is actually compliant with the township code for two parking spaces. We did not count the drive, you know, the unit driveway spaces.

> And then for the ten overflow
off-street spaces as required by the code, we identified the five spaces on the bottom left of the common open space area and to the bottom right of those off-street parking spaces, and
those are on the main lot of the development.
Q. You mentioned the driveways. There was a modification there based on comments received in the review letters and in the planning commission meeting, but can you point out, you mentioned that they accommodated two cars, but do the plans contain the dimensions to show that?
A. Yes. There are typical dimensions proposed on the plan in various locations. For instance, in front of unit six, it shows a width of 19 feet for the driveway, and for unit seven, it shows a depth of 20 feet from the back face of the sidewalk to the unit.

The review comment, there was a concern that the space previously was shorter, that a car could overhang the sidewalk, so to address that comment, we've increased the length of the driveway apron.
Q. And one of the review comments in the Gilmore letter, $I$ believe, also asked to make the driveways, beyond the sidewalk comment, accommodate the two cars, even though that wasn't a code requirement, and that was done as well?
A. Yes. Before they were 18 feet wide, and now we show the driveway as 19 feet wide.
Q. And what's the math on that? What's one space required to be in the Radnor code?
A. The Radnor code requires a nine-foot-six-inch wide space by 20 feet long, and so having two adjacent would require a 19-foot width.
Q. Code section 280-100 --

MR. RICE: One quick question. I believe the Radnor parking space size is nine and a half feet by 20?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. So, all right. And the width that I'm looking at on A-12 is 19 feet wide.

THE WITNESS: That's two spaces parallel. Nine and a half by nine and a half is 19.

MR. RICE: You'll be able to open a door?

THE WITNESS: Your code requirement is nine and a half for the clear --

MR. RICE: I'm just asking a practical
question.
THE WITNESS: A practical question, yes, yes.

MR. RICE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: The nine and a half is a wide parking space as far as local codes go.

Local codes, some of them have some smaller numbers. So nine and a half is a wide parking space.

And that is from 280-4, which is a definition under parking space:

An outdoor space or garage space used for parking motor vehicles, which shall measure not less than nine feet six inches by 20 feet.

MR. RICE: So almost all the parking in driveways are 19 by 20?

THE WITNESS: Correct. The driveway access into the garage space is 19 by 20.

We're not counting those as required parking spaces. It's an extra area.

MR. RICE: You're counting the garages as a parking area?

THE WITNESS: We're counting the garages as a parking area.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: Good to move on?
MR. RICE: Sure.
BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. There's a code section 280-100. It lists items that are to be submitted to the township in connection with a conditional use application for density modification development.

Please describe these provisions and how the plans and the conditional use application materials that have been submitted satisfy these provisions, the applicable ones of this section.
A. So 280-100, the section starts at $A$, but I'm going to jump to B, because that's where it creates a list.

It says the following: In addition, the following information shall be submitted to the township.

One, the nature of the landowners' interest in the land to be developed. That was included in $A-1$ showing the trust ownership of the property.

Two, the density of land use be allocated to the site to be developed. Exhibit A-12, sheet four, the zoning summary shows both the area and the density of the development.

B(3) says: Location and size of common open space and the form of the organization proposed to own and maintain the common open space.

So I think we covered this in testimony. We've identified on $A-12$, sheet four, the location and size of the common open space, and $A-1$ included the form of organization proposed to own and maintain.

B(4) says: The use and the approximate height, bulk, and location of dwellings and other structures.

Again, $I$ go back to $A-12$, sheet four, proposes the configuration of the dwellings, and the zoning table and notes include the bulk area, the height and the bulk area requirements in the ordinance.

B(5) says: The feasibility of proposals for the disposition of sanitary waste and stormwater and provision of public water
supply.
So as part of Exhibit $A-1$, we have included an Aqua will-serve letter, which is from Aqua Pennsylvania saying they will provide water to serve the facility.

Part of $A-1$ was a planning module application that we have filled out for the sanitary sewer, and then we had Exhibit A-13.

A-1 included a stormwater report. We have revised that stormwater report based on a different configuration, so A-13 includes the revised stormwater report.
Q. In addition to the reports that were submitted, did the plans include conceptual plans for sanitary sewer and public water?
A. Yes, they do. Exhibit A-12, sheet five, shows proposed water mains and sewer mains that service all of the units.
Q. And these are public?
A. Yes, they would be public water and public sewer. A-12, sheet five, also shows the stormwater management facilities.
Q. In your professional opinion, will it be feasible to service the property with both
sanitary sewer service and public water service?
A. Yes, just like all of the surrounding properties are serviced with public water and sewer.
Q. As you noted, this property is already served in that manner; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Can you explain how public sanitary sewer service for new developments is typically handled in Radnor Township?
A. Yes. We would file currently for a project of this size, you would file a planning module that is typically submitted, along with our preliminary plan.

It gets processed throughout the land development process, not to use "process" twice. But during the land development, the planning module continues for review and approval.

Many projects have been issued conditional final approval based on receiving a planning module, depending on when it comes in. That is the typical process.
Q. Now, you mentioned it's typical you've seen for preliminary land development plans to
include a sewer planning module, but, in fact, the subdivision and land development ordinance at 255-21 $B$ doesn't seem to require a planning module until the time of final land development.

Is that your understanding of those code provisions?
A. Yes. It's common practice though to file it sooner, because they take a long time to process. Typically we file them sooner in the process, just to begin the approval.
Q. And the subdivision and land development ordinance $255-21$ B, again referencing a final land development plan, does that confirm at subsection (3) (a) that that's a final land development plan requirement, a public sanitary sewer facility plan?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And that same section 255-21 $B(d)$, that indicates a final plan would have a horizontal plan for sanitary sewers?
A. Yes.
Q. And 255-21 $B(e)$, there's a requirement for a final land development plan to have sanitary sewer profiles?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And you mentioned this, but just in case I missed it.

Even though it's not technically
required until the final land development plan stage, and it's typically done at preliminary land development, did the conditional use application that we submitted as Exhibit A-1 include a sewer planning module package that was prepared by Hilbec Engineering?

## A. Yes.

Q. And that would address the sanitary sewer proposal in greater detail?
A. Yes, it would.
Q. And that would be, as $I$ said, repeated during land development?
A. That is correct.
Q. So this section, as you indicated, talks about stormwater management. That's a big topic, as we know, so we're going to cover that in greater detail, so I'd like to move on to the next section, 280-100 B. We're going down the list. We've worked through (1) through (5).

You addressed stormwater management in
that testimony, but we're going to provide more. Can you go to subsection six?
A. Yes. Subsection six says: The substance of covenants, grants of easements, or other restrictions proposed to be imposed upon the use of the land, buildings, and structures, including proposed easements or grants for public utilities. Again, those were included in Exhibit A-1.

Seven says: A provision for parking of vehicles and the location and width of proposed streets and public ways.

We're not proposing any streets or public ways, and we have internal parking that we just went over for the parking requirements.

Eight: A statement which will show the ecological and economic impact of the development on the township and especially as to the surrounding areas.

We'll have another witness talk about the fiscal impact study, and $A-1$ included comments on the ecological.

In addition, we had the plan set in A-12, which shows the grading and erosion
sediment controls, the stormwater improvements to the property.
Q. And we will also have landscape plans that cover, you might say, ecological issues in dealing with tree replacement and other proposed landscaping?
A. Yes, that is correct. And then number nine --
Q. Before you leave that, if I missed it, I'm sorry. But in the package we submitted as Exhibit $A-1$, there was also a development impact statement that covered various topics that may have also addressed these as well; is that right?
A. Yes, it was in great detail.
Q. Okay. Sorry to interrupt. You were going on to number nine.
A. Number nine: The results of traffic studies taken on the surrounding and nearby roads. There will be a witness that has prepared a traffic study and will testify to that.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, we're going to take about a ten-minute break before you move on to the next topic.

MR. BROSEMAN: A break sounds good.

MR. RICE: And then we'll discuss how long we're going to go tonight.

MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Okay. Ten minutes and we'll be back.
(Recess taken.)

THE PRESIDENT: So I think, given the time of the evening and everyone is starting to look pretty blurred out there, we're probably going to need to call it quits.

It's going to take us some time here to figure out some more dates. So once John comes up with the room's schedule, we'll see what we can find.

Sorry, Rob, to cut you off in the middle of your testimony, but you had at least an hour more to go.

THE WITNESS: I'm happy to continue. I hope $I$ didn't put everybody to sleep.

THE PRESIDENT: It will also give people some time, everything will get up on
the website.
You can actually look at these and see them, rather than seeing just a blur up on the screen. That way you'll come in better informed for the next time.

We will have some hardcopies available if people don't feel comfortable enough with the technology to look at this.

Peggy, where will you keep them?
MS. HAGAN: The hardcopies that George gave us, they can come to my office.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. So second floor of the township building.

MR. RICE: So let me throw out some dates that $I$ know that this room is open.

We're going to have this off the record so we can decide, and then we'll go back on.

$$
\begin{gathered}
--- \\
\text { (Discussion off the record.) }
\end{gathered}
$$

MR. RICE: We're going to go back on the record. So the hearing tonight will be continued to February 15th at 6:30.

We have also tentatively scheduled February 27 th at $6: 30$ and March 7th at 6:30.

We will announce those dates, the board will announce those dates on the 15th in case anything changes between now and then.

But for tonight we're continued to February 15th at 6:30. Any questions from anybody? Come on up front, please.

MS. LEVY: Is the documentation for the 15th meeting all released now in this new batch of documents?

MR. RICE: Yes.
MS. LEVY: As far as land development and all of those? Everything is current?

MR. RICE: It will be available at the township building.

MS. LEVY: Certainly. All right. Thank you.

MS. AGNEW: Moira, I think what she's asking is what we're going to use.

MS. LEVY: The documents that we're going to be discussing on February 15th --

MR. RICE: No.
MS. LEVY: -- has not been. Will that be available before the 15th?

MR. RICE: No, it's not available to anybody. It's not available up here or out there.

MS. MULRONEY: It has to be entered into evidence.

MS. LEVY: Got it. Okay. Thank you.
MR. RICE: The documents get marked and entered at each hearing.

So the way these are going, you'll have an opportunity to look at what we've entered tonight, because that witness is still on the witness stand.

So you'll be able to look at those, and if you have questions about that, you'll have the opportunity to ask them.

Anything else?

$$
\begin{gathered}
--- \\
(\text { No response.) } \\
---
\end{gathered}
$$

THE PRESIDENT: No? We're going to call the meeting adjourned.

Robert Lambert, Jr. - Direct
(Proceedings concluded at 9:13 p.m.)

-     -         - 
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