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THE PRESIDENT: Welcome to the 2-15-24 Hamilton Trust conditional use hearing I'm calling it, and you are welcome to join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance)

MR. RICE: Just a little bit of housekeeping from the last time in terms of the parties.

There were three people who had requested at some point party status, and we had agreed to map out their addresses.

All three of the individuals are outside the thousand feet or more away from the property.

So let me just read these into the record so it's clear if you're here. What that means is you're denied party status because of your location.

So Robby Wierman of 101 Lantoga, 1,250 feet; Louisa Hanshew, 219 Sugartown, 1,900 feet away from the site; and Steve Rocci, $R-O-C-C-I$, who $I$ was told last month
had moved out of the township, and I don't think he's ever been here. Maybe he came the first night. So those three are out in terms of party status.

And tonight Mr. Lambert is back on the witness stand on direct examination, and once he's done, Mr. Marlier will crossexamine him, and then once Mr. Marlier is done, we're going to go through the parties that have questions.

Remember the rules, questions about the witness's testimony.

So if he's talking about civil engineering, stormwater management, site conditions, don't ask him about traffic, because there's a traffic engineer here who will testify for other things, other than the substance of his testimony.

That way it will be, there won't be any objections, and we'll keep moving things along. So any questions from any of the parties at this point?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Lambert, you are still under oath.

Mr. Broseman, proceed on.
MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.

-     -         - 

APPLICANT'S EVIDENCE

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

## - - - <br> DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. At the end of the last hearing on January 31, 2024, Mr. Lambert, we had reviewed Code Section 280-100 of the provisions regarding density modification development application requirements.

Let's now turn to Code Sections 280-135 $C$ and $F$ in the general provisions regarding conditional use applications.

Can you summarize these provisions and
describe how the plans comply with those?
A. Yes. So 280-135 C states: A generalized site plan shall be submitted as part of any conditional use application.

It is not intended that such a plan be engineered or contain a fixed architectural layout, such as would be required under Chapter 255, Subdivision of Land.

The plan shall, however, demonstrate compliance with all applicable standards for approval of the conditional use, including those cited in Subsection $F$ below.

So we've far exceeded a generalized site plan. We've provided a full plan set with existing conditions, proposed layout, stormwater management controls, erosion and sediment controls, details, profiles, landscaping, and lighting plan.

So we have really a full plan set, so we far exceeded the generalized site plan requirement.

Under subparagraph $F:$ In addition to demonstrating compliance with all standards applicable to the conditional use being
requested, the generalized site plan shall show the applicant's intentions with regard to the following.

Subparagraph one says: Site access, interior circulation, and parking.

So $I$ would refer to Exhibit $A-12$, and sheet four shows the site access. We have two driveways accessing Strafford Avenue, which you can see on the plan.

Interior circulation, again we have the driveway, which is roughly a horseshoe shape on the property. It shows all the internal circulation and the parking.

We've shown the parking previously with the parking spaces within the garage of each unit, and then we have ten overflow parking spaces, five in the lower right of the horseshoe and five in the lower left of the horseshoe.
Q. In addition to these general zoning requirements regarding site access and interior circulation, is there a specific provision in the Radnor Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for attached-dwelling development like that proposed here?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. And would you review those provisions as they address interior circulation and driveways and address how the plans comply.
A. Yes. So under Section 255-40, the title of the section is Multifamily and Attached-Dwelling Residential Development. It's application details.

Subparagraph C is: Access and circulation. $C(1)$ is: Access to the dwellings and circulation between buildings and other important project facilities for vehicular and pedestrian traffic shall be comfortable and convenient for the occupants.

Again, we've laid out the driveway onsite to provide convenient and comfortable access for all the vehicular access, the two points of ingress and egress on Strafford Avenue, and then we also provide a sidewalk along the internal driveway all the way around the perimeter of the property.

Subparagraph two says: Access and circulation for fire-fighting and other emergency equipment, moving vans, fuel trucks, garbage
collection, deliveries, and snow removal shall be planned for efficient operation and convenience.

So in addition to the plan shown at Exhibit $A-12$, sheet four, in $A-12$, sheet 12 , is the turning template plan, the turning template plan.

So we used the largest fire truck from Radnor Township to show that the fire truck can circulate throughout the proposed development.

We have also shown a truck being able to circulate through the development that would provide the access.

And then subparagraph three says:
Walking distance from the main entrance of a building or single-family dwelling unit to a parking area shall be less than 100 feet.

As I testified to before, each one of the dwelling units has two parking spaces in the garage, and there will be parking within the units themselves.

Under 255-40 E is driveways.
Subparagraph one states: Driveways shall be provided on the site where necessary for convenient access to dwelling units, garage
compounds, parking areas, service entrances of buildings, collection of refuse and all other necessary services. Driveways shall enter public streets at safe locations.

I'm going to go back to four, A-12, sheet four. So you can see on $A-12$, sheet four, the driveway provides convenient access to the dwelling units, because the configuration of the driveway provides all kind of direct access to each of the units.

It provides access for the parking, not only the parking within each unit, but the overflow parking on the site, as $I$ said, in the kind of bottom right and left of the horseshoe driveway.

And we have collection of refuse, so the trash trucks will use internal driveway systems, private collection. They will be collecting trash on the internal driveway.

And driveways shall enter public streets at a safe location. And so on Exhibit A-12, sheet five, we show the clear sight triangle for the driveway where it enters Strafford Avenue.
Q. They are also on sheet four, are they not?
A. Yes, they are also on sheet four.
Q. Are you finished with that section?
A. I'm sorry. Subparagraph two says:

Driveways shall be planned for convenient circulation, suitable for traffic needs and safety.

Again, $I$ think some of the previous comments had similar requirements.

I think again we're showing the convenient access and circulation of the horseshoe-shaped access providing access to all of the units throughout the development.

And number three: All driveways shall be paved and constructed in accordance with township standards.
Q. And do you believe this driveway meets the applicable standards for driveways?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go back to 280-132 F, the generalized site plan provisions. You've done F(1). Let's go to $F(2)$.

Would you summarize 280-132 F(2) and
describe how the plans comply with those requirements?
A. I believe you're referring to 280-135 F (2) .
Q. Yes. Thank you.
A. $\quad$ (2) is: Location, approximate dimension, and arrangement of all areas devoted to ground cover, trees, screening and buffering, other planting, open space, recreation and similar purposes, as applicable.

So I'll use again Exhibit A-12, sheet four. The open space is identified in the center in the dark green color and is labeled open space. It shows in lighter green area other landscaped areas.

Another witness will address all of the landscaping proposed on the site and screening and buffering.

Subparagraph three says: Adequate handling of stormwater, in the form of a preliminary written analysis and conclusions as to anticipated methods, prepared by a registered professional engineer.

The plan set includes full stormwater
design. There is also a separate stormwater report, which is Exhibit A-13 at the last hearing. It would be a full stormwater report.

The plans show full stormwater controls with the appropriate calculations. We've done permeability testing to demonstrate that we will be able to meet infiltration requirements.

In general, using Exhibit A-12, sheet four, on the right-hand side there is an underground stormwater basin in front of units one and two and kind of down to the bottom of unit 38 .

There is an underground stormwater basin underneath and larger than the five overflow parking spaces in the bottom right of the horseshoe. There is another underground stormwater basin to the left of unit 25.

And then there is an underground stormwater basin kind of behind units 13 to 15, and there is an additional stormwater basin on the Forrest Lane parcel, there's an additional stormwater basin.
Q. And you mentioned that the plans
include details you mentioned regarding stormwater. You've identified locations on sheet four of A-12.

Do sheets five, six, seven, eight, and nine also contain information about the proposed stormwater systems?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. Before I have you go into the proposed stormwater management system in greater detail, let's focus for a moment on existing stormwater conditions.

Are you familiar with existing stormwater management conditions on the property?
A. I am.
Q. And can you describe what the situation is on the property as it currently exists regarding stormwater management?
A. So using Exhibit A-12, sheet two, is the existing conditions plan.

You can see the improvements on the plan, including structures, extensive driveway network, accessory buildings, swimming pools, walkways.

All the impervious amounts to almost
just under two acres of impervious, and there are no stormwater rate or volume controls on the site.
Q. And can you describe in general what is proposed for the stormwater management facilities for this project?
A. Yes. There will be, going back to A-12, sheet five, we have a series of underground stormwater basins that will control both the rate and volume of runoff in accordance with the township and NPDES regulations.

We have a collection system collecting with inlets and piping directing water to the underground system, and then the underground system will control the rate and volume of the stormwater runoff.
Q. And in your professional opinion, will these provisions meet the applicable township stormwater management ordinance provisions?
A. Yes. We've prepared stormwater calculations, Exhibit A-13, and on sheet two, labeled as two, we have provided -- I apologize, I have a new computer here -- a summary.

So what $I$ focused on is Point of

Interest A. This is also Point of Interest B.
Point of Interest $A$, for the record, was kind of in the lower left corner of the plan, Forrest.

It's really where we had the most interest in from the community, the drainage area in that direction.

We have provided stormwater calculations in accordance with the township requirements, and those requirements require you to make assumptions that aren't existing conditions necessarily for our existing coverage.

So, for instance, in the
pre-development condition, which you can see on the left-hand side on our model to show how much water is coming off for the one, two, five, ten, 25, 50, and 100-year storm, the township requires the condition of the soil or condition of the site to be considered meadow.

So really what it's doing is it's creating a fictitious condition which reduces the amount of runoff leaving the site that they allow you to match when you do your modeling for the pre-development condition.

In addition, they require that the two-year post-development rate be reduced to the one-year pre-development rate.

So what this table shows is, on the left-hand side you have the pre-development for the allowable release rate, which is shown in the fourth column from the left, and then we have pre-development.

Again, there's many pages behind this report. I only included the summary table supporting this documentation.

The post-development rate after the water runs through the system and looking at the same point of interest, how much water is being discharged to that point, and then the next column is showing the compliance, and then it shows a reduction.

And so I'll focus on the percent reduction. So the reduction for a one-year storm, we would have a 68 percent reduction in the rate of runoff.

The second row for the two-year storm only shows an 11 percent reduction, and it looks a little bit odd with the other percentages
shown.
The reason that was a little bit odd is because the two-year storm must be controlled under the one-year storm, and so you have this over-control as part the ordinance, and this is showing that we're exceeding the ordinance with the rate control.

And then going all the way down to the hundred year storm, you can see we have a 39 percent reduction in the amount of runoff based on that fictitious pre-development condition.
Q. And when you said that you have to treat the site as meadow, in layman's terms, does that mean when you looked at the existing conditions plan, you said there was almost two acres of existing impervious coverage?
A. That is correct.
Q. So the township ordinance, very conservatively speaking, is basically saying, ignore all of that, assume instead that it was a natural meadow, and compare your new project not with the existing large amount of impervious but as if it were a meadow.

Is that what it's doing?
A. That is correct. We don't count the existing impervious coverage.

The typical intent of the ordinance is that $y o u$ want to get back to a more natural condition and cure some of the past ills, right?

So we wouldn't count that impervious that's there for the rate of control, and we'd be able to count it as a meadow.
Q. And with the stormwater management ordinance and storm water management plans, are those typically a subject of land development review and approval?
A. Both land development and then further along is permitting. We would need, obviously, the land development approvals, and then we would need township grading permits, and the NPDES permit also reviews the stormwater controls.
Q. And during the land development process, the township has its own engineering consultants that review the reports and review the plans and make sure the plans comply with the ordinances as well?
A. Yes. They do extensive reviews.
Q. And that happens during land development as well as the township permitting process?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And you mentioned the NPDES permit. You may have said this in earlier testimony, but since we're on the topic, what is an NPDES permit, and what is the review process for that?
A. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System, and it is a permit that's issued through the county conservation district that reviews both your erosion and sediment controls for during construction and your post-development stormwater controls.
Q. And that's required whenever there's more than an acre of disturbance on a project?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And so in addition to all of the township reviews, the NPDES, is that reviewed by professionals, and who would that be?
A. The NPDES is reviewed by the county conservation district.
Q. And as part of the township process and the NPDES process, will a covenant be
required to be recorded to document the stormwater management requirements and that the systems that are required and installed would be properly maintained and functioning?
A. Yes. The plans are recorded showing the systems, and there's an operation and maintenance agreement that's recorded.
Q. And that has to be recorded as part of the NPDES requirements?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Now, $I$ know there is a lot of concern about stormwater management conditions, existing conditions beyond the property.

Can you describe your understanding of some of the nearby existing stormwater conditions?
A. Yes. Early on in our engagement with the community, there was a lot of concern about stormwater runoff.

The site generally drains the water runoff from about a third over from Eagle Road to the bottom left corner, I'll scroll down a little bit, to Forrest Lane, and so many community members on Forrest Lane are fearing substantive
runoff.
So our client, the applicant, asked us to take a look at a little bit larger view of the stormwater than we typically looked at.

So I put on the screen here Exhibit A-15. And this is a --
Q. We're going to hand those up. We hadn't submitted this previously.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-15 was marked for identification.)

THE WITNESS: So Exhibit A-15 consists of three sheets. The first two sheets are kind of a compilation plan that includes some of our survey information overlaid on an aerial photograph with topography, publicly-available topography information to determine the approximate drainage area.

And it has various colors on it, which I will describe, which show different drainage areas.

And the third sheet is a summary sheet using actual conditions, or actually the
township-required conditions to provide real numbers, because the question that we always receive is, well, what is the change going to be when you're done.

So we tried to address that separately from the township requirements so they're not confusing.

So the plan that's up on the screen right now is Exhibit A-15. We'll go to A. And this plan shows the existing conditions.

We have a purple area -- I'm sorry. The orientation of the plan is the same that we've been looking at for all of the other plans.

Eagle Road is on the right-hand side, going top to bottom. Strafford is going across the top of the page, left to right. Forrest Lane is down in the lower left of this plan.

So the area that's labeled A-6, which is the pink area, is kind of the area along Strafford.

Some of the area, it's a little bit
difficult to tell the exact pattern of the water, but it appears that the water from the sort of top along Strafford from the site runs along Strafford and then makes its way out the bottom left.

The blue area, which is area four, is the portion of the site, the development site, which drains towards Forrest Lane.

So that's where I'm saying we're kind of a third from Eagle Road, it drains down to the lower right.

Area A-5, that is the area of Grant Lane. So this is the front of Grant Lane, and Grant Lane drains to the inlet at the end of Grant Lane.

And then the area $A-3$ is the green area which drains kind of to the lower area of Forrest.

So we started doing an analysis to see how much area drains to Forrest, what impact the proposed development site has on that area, and what we can do to help mitigate some of the issues.

On the bottom of $A-15$ A is really the
overall summary showing what we calculated as impervious overall area.

This is about 555,000 square feet of lawn area and impervious area, so we used some of those in our calculations.

So Exhibit A-15 B, again this plan is in the same orientation as the exhibits, the same base plan surrounding the site.

But the site, the area of development actually shows what the proposed plan will look like on the site, and we've changed some of the drainage areas. The main drainage area that we changed was the pink area.

There was a concern, $I$ believe, at the last hearing when we were here before, a neighbor at the corner of Grant Lane and Strafford testified they received a lot of water coming down Strafford.

15 A shows that there is a fair amount of drainage area that gets out to Strafford and runs down Strafford and $I$ believe gets along that property.

What we've done is actually added, to
address some of their concerns, we've actually added an inlet out on Strafford along the site to be able to collect the water, control it, and release it in a controlled manner.

So the blue area is a little bit larger than what was shown on $A-15 A$, and so A-15 $B$ shows a little bit larger area in the proposed conditions.

Yet $I$ want to point out that the rate and volume that's actually discharging out in the lower left is based on the $A-15$ A drainage area, so we've actually over-controlling the water, picking up more water and over-controlling it.

So that's what we have shown on this exhibit. And then again you can see the green area down in the lower left.

The blue area is about 40 percent of the drainage area, getting to the lower green area.

And then A-15 C is a summary table, and $I$ will reiterate for the record that this is not, this is not a table following
the township requirements.
That was Exhibit $A-13$, is the township's stormwater report. But what we've actually done is we've called this actual conditions.

So not assuming a pre-development meadow condition, looking at existing conditions draining to Point of Interest $A$, water, the rates of runoff getting there, it's pre-development versus post-development, and what are the changes that a resident may see.

And so if you look at, for a one-year storm, we now have a 95 percent reduction in the amount of runoff coming from the site down to the Point of Interest $A$.

For a two-year storm, remember the anomaly we talked about for $A-13$, where we're showing an 11 percent reduction. In actual runoff terms, it would actually be a 92 percent reduction.

And then going down to the hundred year storm, I believe the hundred year in A-13, off the top of my head, was

39 percent, and you can see that we actually have a 55 percent reduction in the actual amount of runoff using existing conditions.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Does that cover the stormwater management topics that you wanted to cover?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to 280-135 $F(4)$. We're still under those generalized site plan requirements, the general part of the conditional use.

Please summarize those requirements and then address how the plans comply.
A. So it states: Location, planned uses, approximate overall dimensions, gross floor area, coverage and height of each building or structure.

So I will go back to A-12, sheet four. So using the notes in the upper right-hand corner that identifies that we're proposing a townhouse use, we have, the dimensions are shown on various units.

We have one, for instance, has the width and depth. Various other units show
dimensions both of the units and dimensions in between units.

The gross floor area, we have the building area in the zoning table on the left-hand side showing the amount of building area, the coverage.

Again, we have the building coverage and the impervious coverage in the zoning table on the left-hand side of the plan, and they are in conformance with the ordinance.

And then the same goes for the height of each building or structure. The height will be in conformance with the ordinance under, $I$ think, it's 35 feet.
Q. And as to gross floor area of a typical unit, there's a note about that on the plan?
A. Yes. So general note number three identifies the gross floor area of 3,000 square feet, not including a basement or garage.
Q. I want to follow up on a couple of items that came up at a prior hearing, $I$ believe, on the January 29th, 2024, hearing.

The topic of single-family detached
development under the $R-4$ Residence District came up, in other words, development without seeking a conditional use for density modification.

Has your office prepared a concept showing a subdivision under the $R-4$ district without utilizing the density modification provisions of Article XIX of the zoning ordinance?
A. Yes, we did, Exhibit A-16.
Q. We're going to hand this out as well.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-16 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Now, this is just a concept plan. This isn't a land development plan or anything like that; correct?
A. That is correct. It's just a concept.
Q. And would you describe this plan?
A. Yes. So this is Exhibit A-16. This plan is in the same orientation as the previous plans we discussed.

Eagle Road is on the right-hand side
going top to bottom. Strafford Avenue is at the top going left to right. Forrest Lane is on the bottom to the left.

What this plan shows is, it was a compilation of a single-family development under the base R-4 zoning, which requires a 7,000 square foot minimum lot area.

We have shown a new road that would be a horseshoe shape on the site accessing Strafford Avenue, and we've shown 31 dwellings that would be constructed.

All of the lots exceed 7,000 square feet. Many of the lots are much more than the minimum requirement.

And the houses would range anywhere between a 1,300 square foot or 1,200 square foot footprint and a 3,000 square foot footprint, depending on the parcels or the lot.
Q. And, of course, under R-4, there's no requirement for common open space in the zoning ordinance; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And setbacks and things like that for accessory structures can be closer than under
density modification?
A. Yes. There's no buffer requirement, if that's what you're referring to, along the perimeter. Accessory structures can encroach within setbacks.
Q. Moving on to another question that I had in my notes from last time, I believe it was Commissioner Coates asked about what we call the neighbor plan, Exhibit A-4.

I believe he asked the size of the common open space on that plan, and $I$ think we had said we would come back with that information.

Do you have a plan, a version of Exhibit $A-4$, we're calling it $A-4 A$, where you've added that information?
A. Yes. Exhibit A-4 A.
Q. We'll hand that out as well.

$$
-\quad-\quad-
$$

(Applicant's Exhibit A-4 A was marked for identification.)

$$
-\quad-\quad-
$$

THE WITNESS: I believe the question was what was the distance between, for
instance, units 29 and 22, like the grouping of buildings with 22 and the grouping of buildings with 29 , and the distance between Strafford Avenue and units 24 and 26.

And so we've added a dimension on the plan to show that it will be 177 feet from unit 22 to 29 and I believe 208 feet from the right-of-way line along Strafford Avenue to unit 25.

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And does this have the size of the open space as well?
A. Yes. In the bottom left corner of the plan we have shown the open space. The purpose of the exhibit in the bottom left corner is the same layout that you see in the main plan, but what it does is identifies what was considered as the official open space.

And so we've included two areas of open space, the open space in the middle, which is about 35,000 square feet, and the area on the perimeter was 64,000 square feet.

And then there's a table, it's right
below the image, and it shows that 29 percent of the area is open space, and stormwater management consists of about three percent of that area.
Q. And as with the other plan, $A-12$, in calculating the open space, the common open space, you didn't include required buffer areas?
A. That is correct. You can see again in that lower-left corner on the left-hand side of that image, you can see lines coming out kind of perpendicular to the site.

Those are the Grant Lane properties, and there's a white space between the property line and the green, and that would be the buffer area that's not included as part of our open space calculation.
Q. And you didn't count any of the empty lot on Forrest Lane as part of the open space; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. But as a practical matter, those areas will basically remain as green space; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MR. BROSEMAN: That's all I have for

Mr. Lambert at this time.
MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier?
MR. MARLIER: I'm going to ask at this time, frankly, there's a lot of information in the last hearing, but there's a lot of information packed into the last 45 minutes specifically regarding stormwater runoff, which I think is the most important thing to these folks.

I certainly was hoping that Mr. Lambert would speak a little more to their stormwater calculations, but $I$ would like to take some time to figure out, to review the testimony from Mr. Lambert tonight regarding the stormwater, look over their exhibits, talk to the engineer that this board has hired to review that, and come back at the next hearing with my cross-examination, which certainly is going to take a good chunk of time.

What $I$ would recommend, since it is 7:15 and there's a good amount of time left tonight, I'm sure the neighbors have questions for Mr. Lambert, and maybe we
have them ask questions of him.
MS. MULRONEY: Can you use your mic?
MR. MARLIER: Absolutely.
MS. MULRONEY: You can take it off the stand.

MR. MARLIER: Sure. I thought I was projecting enough.

MS. MULRONEY: You are, but we're also recording.

MR. MARLIER: Absolutely.
MR. BROSEMAN: And I would like to note for an objection that $I$ believe if there is time, Mr. Marlier should proceed as had been planned.

MR. MARLIER: And I would note, Mr. Rice, that a number of exhibits were provided just tonight, a number exhibits that clearly need to be reviewed by an expert and reviewed by the engineer that this board has hired regarding conditional use.

I would also note that $I$ did not receive the last two exhibits. So I think
a little bit of time, we are on for just
three weeks from now, March 7th, I believe, and $I$ certainly will come back fully prepared for a cross-examination, not just of this evening, but the last hearing as well.

MR. BROSEMAN: And I would note, the only new exhibits were the drainage area maps and the concept sketch, and the $A-4$ A just had some requested information added to it.

As was stated last time, Mr. Lambert is not available at the next hearing due to prior commitments, so I think it would be fairer to the applicant that we proceed as planned.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, do you have any other witnesses ready tonight?

MR. BROSEMAN: I had assumed that Mr. Marlier was going to take a long time. He had indicated before that he probably would.

MR. RICE: Is that a no? No? You don't have any other witnesses here?

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm not really prepared
to proceed with others at this time.
MR. RICE: Okay. So --
MR. ABEL: At the last hearing, didn't we ask for the applicants to be prepared so we didn't have to have dead time?

MR. RICE: Well, I mean, what happened last time was, when this was scheduled, Mr. Lambert was not available.

So Mr. Broseman represented that I think the planner or the traffic engineer would be here, and that changed since the last hearing, and I guess Mr. Lambert freed up his schedule, so he's here tonight.

Mr. Broseman should have notified counsel of that. So $I$ really don't want to waste the time that we have.

I mean, $I$ think the board is willing to go till 9:00 o'clock, so we have about an hour and a half.

Let's do this. Let's take about a five-minute break. Let me discuss this with the board and see how the board wants to proceed, and then we'll come back.

But you don't have anyone else ready
to go, Mr. Broseman, tonight; is that right?

MR. BROSEMAN: I could put on some brief testimony, but $I$ really prefer not to. We were not -- we were going to do Mr. Lambert.

MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: The two exhibits, by the way, they're not -- they were additional information.

It's about existing drainage patterns off the property, and Exhibit A-16 is a concept for a development we haven't applied for.

All of the other exhibits have been provided last time and also provided electronically as requested.

MR. RICE: Okay. I mean, going forward, if, let's say, cross-examination, we started less than an hour ago.

So if cross-examination went, let's say, a half hour, we'd be done, and you don't have any other witness available.

So I think we have to try to do this
as efficiently as possible.
But just for now, let's take about a five-minute break, and then the board will come back and we'll discuss how we're going to proceed.

So, Mr. Marlier, you want to defer your cross-examination of this witness until either March or whenever the next hearing is after that?

MR. MARLIER: I would, Mr. Rice.
MR. RICE: Let's go off the record now, and I'll caucus with the board.
(Recess taken.)

MR. RICE: Okay. We're going to start back. Regarding the hearing, what we want to do is, since Mr. Lambert is here and apparently he's not available March 7th, which is the next scheduled night -February 27 th was posted, but that was unavailable.

We talked about three dates. It turned out that one was a conflict. So
it's March 7th would be the next one. And then after tonight, we'll talk about further dates in March.

So just in order to be as efficient as possible, one of the problems with zoning hearings is information doesn't get disclosed ahead of time, so you show up and you have plans and you have evidence and exhibits and things like that.

So just for now, we're going to wait for Mr. Marlier per his request. We're going to defer his cross-examination.

The residents, if they have questions for Mr. Lambert, can ask those tonight, and they can ask questions again when he's done, if you want.

And then the board has some questions for Mr . Lambert, and $I$ have some questions for Mr. Lambert regarding what's been testified to up to this point, and then Mr. Broseman might have some redirect.

But we're going to go till
9:00 o'clock, so we'll make use of the time.

Mr. Broseman may have another witness, but let's see how far we get, and we'll start with the residents, any questions you have about stormwater management.

MR. ABEL: John, can you repeat that? You said the neighbors will have an opportunity tonight, and then you said when he's done. Who is "he"?

MR. RICE: When Mr. Lambert is done with his testimony, because right now we're in cross-examination. Everybody gets that opportunity.

The board gets the opportunity to ask questions. Mr. Broseman will probably have some redirect.

That's the next piece. And then after that, there's another opportunity for recross.

MR. ABEL: That will not be at the March 7th hearing?

MR. RICE: Right, because he won't be here on the March 7th hearing.

So, anyway, that's where we're at, and we're just trying to use the time that we
have. So let's start with --
MS. MULRONEY: I have one more
clarifying question.
So if we are waiting to have Mr.
Marlier cross Mr. Lambert, won't he be back on another night?

MR. RICE: Yes.
MS. MULRONEY: And at that time, would parties be able to continue to cross on that evening as well?

MR. RICE: Yes, yes.
MS. MULRONEY: So those of you who are parties and want to ask questions tonight would also have another opportunity after some more thinking about it and preparation when the other cross-examination is happening; is that right?

MR. RICE: Yes.
MS. MULRONEY: All right. Thanks.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: Mr. Rice, could I just make a comment? We'll see what happens then, but $I$ just wanted to make a comment about the objection $I$ made.

As I indicated, Mr. Lambert is not available on March 7th. We really thought that his cross-examination would go forward tonight.

As I indicated, these were only a couple of new exhibits, sort of tangential things, and as had been indicated, we expected that to take a long time.

But I did want to acknowledge -- and we really didn't want to go out of order.

But had it happened that there was only a short period of cross-examination, we would be prepared to go forward with another witness as had been requested.

So I didn't want to leave the board with the impression that we ignored what was said.

MR. RICE: We might have time for that other witness, let's see how far we get, because that other witness is probably going to come back on March 7th if they're available.

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. We may not be able to finish that, but $I$ didn't want to
leave the board with the impression that we, in the unlikely event that the cross-examination had ended quickly, we were going to just say we weren't prepared.

MR. RICE: Okay. Okay. Understood. Look, these are -- this is not a courtroom, but we try to have some order and give everybody an opportunity.

And there is no discovery, so you don't know ahead of time what somebody is going to testify to.

It's new for a lot of you, and a lot of us up here, this is new. So we'll see how far we get tonight.

We have another date, and when we're done tonight, we'll talk about further dates in March. Okay.

So with that, I'm going to call the resident parties' names, and if you have any questions tonight, feel free.

You'll have to come up to the microphone and ask Mr. Lambert questions.

So Steve Scheri? Scheri? Megan Scheri?

| (No response.) - - - <br> MR. RICE: Ted Hymel? <br> _ - _ <br> (No response.) <br> - - - <br> MR. RICE: Mark Gaeto? <br> - - - <br> (No response.) <br> - - - <br> MR. RICE: Sharon Willis? <br> MS. WILLIS: No questions. <br> MR. RICE: David Willis? <br> MR. WILLIS: No questions. <br> MR. RICE: Chawla? <br> - - - <br> (No response.) <br> - - - <br> MR. RICE: Brian Curley? Mr. Curley. <br> - - - <br> CROSS EXAMINATION <br> MR. CURLEY: Hi, I'm Brian Curley, a |
| :---: |

Radnor resident, 136 Fairfield Lane.
The question $I$ have for you, Mr. Lambert, on your Exhibit A-15 describing the current runoff conditions in the neighborhood?

THE WITNESS: A, B, or C?
MR. CURLEY: I believe A, where you were showing the direction of the runoff. Maybe make it a little bit smaller.

Can you explain to me why you stopped the runoff on Fairfield Lane at the end of the Hamilton property?

Just to point out, the green exit at Hamilton property on Fairfield Lane, there's another building and then a second house on the right side. That's my house. Okay?

I'm going to tell you that runoff comes straight down Fairfield Lane, and I don't understand why it's not included here, because Fairfield Lane is Radnor Township.

It seems like you addressed T/E Township's runoff, but you haven't
addressed Radnor. Can you explain why?
THE WITNESS: Sir, we looked at, as I said, the topography, and it appears to be in break line. And again, as I said, we were focused really on the Forrest Lane area.

If anything, this would overestimate the amount of water getting to Forrest Lane slightly in that area.

It is relatively flat in some of those areas, so it's a little bit hard to tell exactly where the water would go, and that's why we showed it that way.

It's really just based on the lines of our contours.

MR. CURLEY: Well, the reality is, it's not level, as you try and explain it. There is an incline from 18 Forrest Lane down Fairfield Lane.

Additionally, what my concern is is not only the runoff from there. It's that there's another Hamilton property that you did not include here, and obviously you didn't include it because Eagle Village
does not have a stormwater plan. Okay?
However, just so the board understands, that the runoff that's --

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to object.
There's no questions here.
MR. RICE: Mr. Curley, questions for the witness, not a speech.

MR. CURLEY: Okay.
MR. RICE: Ask him, what you just said, ask him if he agrees with you.

MR. CURLEY: Do you agree that the runoff from the Hamilton properties, including Eagle Village, should also be included in your diagram?

THE WITNESS: We have not studied Eagle Village. We studied the subject parcel.

MR. CURLEY: Just so the board knows, Eagle Village is the Hamilton property. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Mr. Lambert, do you know, is that the Hamilton property that is owned by the Hamilton estate?

THE WITNESS: I do not know who owns
it right now. I know at one time it was owned by them. I don't know who owns it currently.

MR. RICE: Okay. John Clemente?
MR. CLEMENTE: No questions.
MR. RICE: Kaitlin Silver?

$$
-\quad-\quad-
$$

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Margaret Ruschmann?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Sareen?
MR. SAREEN: Anujeet Sareen, 205 Strafford.

Mr. Lambert, I just want to confirm, I think $I$ can infer this from your comments, but $I$ want to hear it from you as well.

Given the state of the current stormwater system, in quotation marks, at the "current property," regardless of whether it would be a single-family development or the townhome conditional use
application, would you say that the stormwater would be improved in either Case?

THE WITNESS: Yes. There would -currently there are no controls. No matter how the property is developed, assuming it would go over the minimum threshold, which any real development of substance would go over the threshold, would require stormwater management controls.

MR. SAREEN: The other question, and if this is not the appropriate forum, I'll retract it, but $I$ think it may have bearing in regards to the plans being proposed here.

The neighborhood, the area along Strafford in particular, is a residential, is a single-family residential neighborhood and it has moved more in that direction over time.

The bed and breakfast is gone, and the St. Honore development is building more single-family homes.

So wouldn't this be a development that
would be more contrary to the nature of the current neighborhood?

THE WITNESS: NO, I would disagree. I believe that this site is an appropriate site as a transitional use.

I pulled up Exhibit A-6, which is an aerial photo, showing the surrounding area, including the St. Honore development that you mentioned. It shows the site inset onto an aerial.

And if you look just to the east of this site, just directly across the street from this site on Eagle Road, there's a large office complex, Strafford office complex. To the bottom of the page, there's a large shopping center.

And so this use is a good transitional use from those more intense commercial uses and the single-family residences that you referenced.

And from a, kind of an aesthetic standpoint, this use allows actually the aesthetic along Strafford Avenue that you really have a cadence of two homes that you
see facing Strafford Avenue.
You're going to have a large open space, similar to the green space that's there, and then a cadence of two single-family residences at the end facing Strafford.

So you have kind of two, big open space, and two. So it does act as a very good transitional use between those more intense commercial uses and the single-family residence uses.

MR. SAREEN: But to be clear, these are -- this whole neighborhood is single-family homes, including the existing property the application is to develop.

So I'm confused when you say, help me understand this, that moving away from single-family homes is somehow more consistent with what exists in that area today.

THE WITNESS: It's a transitional use.
MR. SAREEN: It's a change. It's a change different than what's there.

THE WITNESS: If you let me answer the
question.
It's a transition between the higher-intensity commercial uses and the single-family residences, very similar to Villa Strafford.

It's labeled here as Madison Lane, which was again a density modification development that was, has single-family residences on the kind of upper right side, what is identified as Madison Lane, and then the commercial uses on the other three sides.

And this again is transitioning between those higher commercial uses and the residential uses.

MR. SAREEN: So let me ask, Villa Strafford came up before, and I'm just very surprised how that's even remotely parallel.

Just looking at the map that's been presented here, that's a de minimis percentage of that property abuts single-family homes, but it's largely surrounded by commercial use. That's not
true of the area that we're talking about.
MR. RICE: Do you agree with Mr.
Sareen?
THE WITNESS: I was going to point out that that was a density modification development.

That is why it actually got a variance to proceed as a density modification, because it didn't include the minimum lot area.

This site includes the minimum lot area for the density modification, and $I$ believe it prepares an appropriate use, a transitional use between a higher-density commercial and the residential.

MR. SAREEN: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Thank you.
Mr. Satterfield? Any questions?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Ms. Lafarge, any questions?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Holloway, any questions?

MR. HOLLOWAY: No questions.
MR. RICE: Okay. That was the party list.

MS. MAHONEY: No. No. Mary Ann
Mahoney, 5 Grant Lane.
MR. RICE: Ms. Mahoney, come on up.
MS. MAHONEY: Mr. Lambert, I have a couple of questions for you.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
MS. MAHONEY: I have been living at this property for 30 years. I live at 5 Grant Lane intersecting Strafford and Grant right on the corner.

And within the past month, my property has -- my basement has flooded twice. I have a severe problem with water.

And what you're explaining is like I can't really understand where these storm drains are going to go, but $I$ want to know, how is this going to affect me?

From what $I$ can see on your property
thing there, it looks like three quarters of my property will be protected.

But over the years, Strafford Avenue, Mrs. Hamilton had an erosion problem, and she would fill it in with topsoil all the time.

I've gone to Radnor $I$ can't tell you how many times asking them --

MR. RICE: Ms. Mahoney, let me caution you, your question for Mr. Lambert is, how is this going to protect Ms. Mahoney's property.

MS. MAHONEY: And also, will fixing my property help the people downstream of Strafford Avenue?

MR. RICE: Mr. Lambert, do you know where Ms. Mahoney's property is?

THE WITNESS: I just wanted to clarify that. I want to make sure I'm looking at the right one.

So using Exhibit $A-12$, sheet four, you're right at the corner of Strafford Avenue and Grant Lane?

MS. MAHONEY: That is correct. I'm
the one with the little dirty pond all the time that fills up with water. Nothing grows on my lawn, no grass.

THE WITNESS: So I'm going to use Exhibit A-15.

MS. MAHONEY: All right.
THE WITNESS: So your house, if we use A-15, let's see if we can -- Grant Lane is the blue area.

MR. BROSEMAN: Are you on A-15 A, Rob?
THE WITNESS: A-15 A, that is correct, is the blue area, and then we have the pink area. The pink area goes along Strafford Avenue. So on the right-hand side is Eagle Road.

And bear with me, I'm using a lot of words, but it's for the record, so when somebody reads it later, they can follow along.

And so we have Eagle Road on the right side, we have Strafford going across the top, and we have the blue area of Grant Lane.

So what you're describing is really
what is shown as the pink area, starting from roughly Eagle Road, going across the frontage of the property, along Strafford, and then it reaches your property.

So all of that pink area currently drains out towards Strafford and runs down Strafford, and some of it may go in your yard. Some of it may go beyond your property.

What we have shown, and I'm going to use $A-15$ B, this is the plan showing the proposed plan. I'm going to switch back to A-12 in one second.

So you can see that the pink area that is to the right of your property on this plan is vastly reduced, right?

And so if we go back to A-15 A for a quick comparison, you're going to see the size, $I$ don't have the exact square footage, but you can see just graphically the size of the area that drains there now and the size of the area that will drain to there in the future is much reduced.

So we're capturing that runoff. So if

I go back to Exhibit A-12, I'm going to go to sheet five. So how we're accomplishing that is we're actually installing inlets.

And so we're capturing the water that would get out to Strafford to the east or right of the driveway that's furthest to the west, so it's labeled Driveway $A$ on this plan, or Drive A.

We're going to install inlets, which will capture the runoff running down Strafford from this site and be able to put it into a controlled stormwater management system.

So we are removing that volume of water from the water, the flow of pressure.

MS. MAHONEY: Could you go back to the control one, the one that's before this? Yeah, that one.

It looks like my property is totally engrossed in that, so that means my property won't have any water, too?

THE WITNESS: What this is showing, A-15 B, is showing that the pink area is really just a -- it's showing all of the
drainage area continuing to go down Strafford, right?

And so we can't control that. That's downhill of where our site is.

We have added the inlet out in front of our driveway on Strafford, which really cuts off that runoff that currently comes from the property that gets out there.

So there will be a small area of Strafford that still gets to your property.

Your property, obviously, any rainfall on your property is still within that pink area that is shown.

MS. MAHONEY: But if you just do it to the end where the double line is, that's where $I$ have the problem.

That's where the water jumps the blacktop and lands on my lawn.

THE WITNESS: So we're reducing --
MS. MAHONEY: You're reducing, but you're not fixing.

THE WITNESS: We are reducing the water that leaves this site and currently gets there, so we're capturing it and
controlling it.
We're not doing anything on your property, no. We're capturing all the water so the amount of water getting there is going to be vastly reduced from what gets there today.

MS. MAHONEY: So you're just telling me you'll help, but you're not going to fix my problem.

THE WITNESS: We are not proposing any improvements on your property.

MR. RICE: Thank you. Mr. Schuda?
MR. SCHUDA: Good evening, Mr.
Lambert. Joe Schuda, 14 Forrest Lane. A couple questions.

Regarding your testimony, you mentioned probably at least two or three times the direction of the pre-construction runoff.

And if $I$ recall, that was, if $I$ use your reference, the lower left-hand corner of the property; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: So I used various examples. So $A-15 A$ was the blue area, the

A-4 area, which is predominantly the property, includes the rear of some of the Grant Lane properties.

And what this was just showing was where that runoff goes. So we're looking at, $I$ believe it's actually your house which we're showing at the bottom.

And what generated this plan was, I believe, your comments a long time ago about water and where the water was running, so we started an analysis to see where that water was coming from.

MR. SCHUDA: So that particular direction with the construction, regardless if it's townhomes or single homes, that direction, if $I$ understood your testimony correctly, will be -- will change or will it be eliminated?

Will there be runoff in that direction still?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand your question. However, I'll provide an answer.

So water is going to continue to drain
with the contours at the site, so it will continue to drain to the lower left corner out toward Forrest Lane.

What we're doing, when we look at Exhibit A-12, is we're adding all of the stormwater controls, we're adding all of the stormwater controls onsite to control the rates and volume.

So we're reducing, looking at delivery of stormwater, if we look at the points of interest, and so that lower left corner was called Point of Interest $A$ in our study.

And what that does was looking at how much water gets there currently, and we would reduce the rate and volume of runoff getting to that same point after development.

MR. SCHUDA: So if $I$ understand what you just said, that lower corner in this particular plan would capture the runoff into the retention basin; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: So, yes. So Exhibit
A-12, sheet four, shows the proposed development, and it has a series of
stormwater basins that will control the rate and volume of runoff.

MR. SCHUDA: And those basins have been designed to accept a hundred year rain. And what type of volume and what type of rate of rain does that reflect?

THE WITNESS: So that was looking at --

MR. SCHUDA: It was hard to see back there.

THE WITNESS: Yes, no problem at all. Let me just make sure I'm looking at the correct one.

So Exhibit A-13 was a summary table, and this would be Radnor Township, so this was where we were talking about fictitious pre-development condition.

And in that condition, for like the hundred year storm, you have 16, a little over 16 cubic feet per second running off, right, the CFS, cubic feet per second.

In the post-development condition, you have just over ten, right? So we're reducing from what currently runs off.

MR. SCHUDA: All right. So it's about a 30 percent reduction roughly?

THE WITNESS: A 39 percent, but again, I point out, that's the reason we provided the other, the exhibits which you've seen before, where we talked about actual conditions versus what the code-required conditions are.

MR. SCHUDA: Right.
THE WITNESS: So this is reflecting the code-required conditions, that we're exceeding the code by about 39 percent.

MR. SCHUDA: And again, I'm sorry to be redundant here. Is that, that amount of rain which equates to what?

THE WITNESS: I believe it's
7.43 inches over a 24-hour period.

MR. SCHUDA: A 24-hour period. All right. So at this juncture, the solution for runoff coming in that predominant direction that you pointed out, which is the lower left-hand area, would be captured in the basin, is that correct, and then would go into the Forrest Lane stormwater
line?
THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. SCHUDA: And that line, based on all your calculations, you feel is adequate to take that volume of water?

THE WITNESS: So we're reducing by 40 percent the amount of water that gets down to that location.

MR. SCHUDA: And taken a step further, have you or any of your colleagues looked further down the line where that Forrest Lane line discharges to determine if the line that it discharges in, the cadence, is adequately in a condition to handle any additional runoff?

THE WITNESS: We have not done a full analysis of the municipal stormwater system. As you know, it crosses municipalities. It reaches PennDOT.

We have not studied the full network of the stormwater system, but what we can say affirmatively is that we are making a great improvement in the reduction of runoff leaving the site.

MR. SCHUDA: Okay. So subsequently then, if there's any issues, in your opinion, if that line on Old Eagle School Road is not in good condition or it's not cadent, it has some form of blockage, the problem, even with a reduction, still could result in flooding in our area, do you think?

THE WITNESS: We are not in control of the Old Eagle School. I don't believe any municipality is. I believe that's a PennDOT line.

MR. SCHUDA: Again, I'm trying to figure out what's the best solution to get PennDOT on board here.

I don't know if the township has any leverage that could help us on that, but $I$ think that ought to be examined, the PennDOT line.

MR. RICE: Ask questions, Mr. Schuda.
MR. SCHUDA: Okay. Well, again, is there any chance that the applicant can work with the townships involved to at least solicit PennDOT to make some
evaluation of the line, something as simple as running a camera through it to see if it's open, you know, not go to any great expenditure.

If we find out what the issue is, possibly that could contribute to the solution.

THE WITNESS: We would have no issue requesting the municipality to work with PennDOT. I have no problems doing that.

But that would not be in the, necessarily purview of this application.

MR. SCHUDA: All right. Well, I appreciate your time. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Jennifer Pechet?
MS. PECHET: No questions.
MR. RICE: Greg Szary?
MR. SZARY: Gregory Szary, S-Z-A-R-Y, 6 Forrest Lane.

Mr. Lambert, I'd like to understand a couple of things about the stormwater management system, if you could help me.

I don't understand how the basins, the
underground basins work.
Do they -- are they a detention or are they a retention, and if you could explain the difference between those two.

THE WITNESS: So we have a series of basins. Some of the basins will, are designed for infiltration, where we've got a good infiltration rate.

Some of the basins are simply designed for rate control, and they're all interconnected with pipes, right?

So we have, the basin's really a large void space, so a volume underground that's meant to hold the water and release it at a metered rate, and that can be released through infiltration, and it can be released through the pipe network.

MR. SZARY: Okay. So the intent of the stormwater management system is to collect rainwater before it runs off the site and place it into these underground detention basins?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. SZARY: And that's why the numbers
look so good that you're proposing in that it's reducing the amount of runoff off of the site?

THE WITNESS: The numbers look at the runoff leaving the site after it goes through this stormwater basin.

So the basins are still releasing water. It's just releasing it at a metered rate.

MR. SZARY: But it's not releasing it at grade. It's not surface water?

THE WITNESS: It's not surface water, correct, but that table is not just looking at straight surface water.

It's just looking at total volume of water, total rate of water.

MR. SZARY: So you're calculating how much water is being percolated into the ground as well, being absorbed by the ground?

THE WITNESS: There is a volume that will be percolated back into the ground, yes.

MR. SZARY: And that's part of your
calculations?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: Okay. So were there soil tests and an evaluation of the soil properties on the site?

THE WITNESS: Yes, there were.
MR. SZARY: And based on those tests, were there any areas that indicate conditions where the soil was not percolating, was not absorbing water?

THE WITNESS: Yes. One of the areas, it wasn't a limiting zone, but it had very little permeability.

The other areas had good permeability rates with a friable soil, and we had again focused our infiltration in the area that had good rates, which is typical in a project like this.

MR. SZARY: Is it reasonable to expect that the construction activities on the site will further compact the soil and reduce its ability to percolate?

THE WITNESS: The basins, the bottom of the basins are protected. They're also
relatively deep, which would avoid the excessive compaction in those areas and would still allow for the permeability in the stormwater basins where we relying on.

MR. SZARY: So currently when water falls on the site, it lays in the field, it runs across the site, and it rejoins the water cycle; correct?

The water cycle being, like it's conducted to a lake, stream, river, it's evaporated, it's -- what are some of the terms -- evaporation, transpiration, where it's absorbed by plants and trees and then also it's conducted to a municipal stormwater system.

Is that a good description of what happens with that rainwater when it falls?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe there's just under two acres of impervious on that site, too. So there's -- water hits the impervious surface as runoff.

There's landscaped areas. There's impervious areas. And, yes, the runoff goes into the water cycle.

MR. SZARY: So if we look at the stormwater management system, if you can confirm that it is collecting roof runoff from all of the units via gutters and downspouts?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. SZARY: And it's collecting that water and conducting it directly to piping underground towards the basins?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: And water falling on the impervious areas is being collected by the stormwater inlets and conducted directly to those basins?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: And the water falling on Strafford Avenue which did not enter the site, it went down Strafford, and some of it into Grant, that water is now being collected and put into stormwater management systems as well; correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's being put into the system to control it.

MR. SZARY: So is it true then that
this system is sort of bypassing the natural water cycle?

It's not giving the water a chance to evaporate or to be absorbed by the plant material?

THE WITNESS: No. It would have the same opportunity it does today when you look at it from a site basis, right? Today it has that opportunity before it leaves the site and get direct runoff.

Here we have that opportunity where it's running across the surface in various areas, but then we collect it, and the infiltration component is meant to mimic natural conditions to promote that infiltration back into the ground.

MR. SZARY: Okay. So is it reasonable to believe that there's going to be an increase in the amount of water that's being introduced into the ground?

THE WITNESS: An increase from what?
MR. SZARY: By the use of these basins, that they're going to percolate.

THE WITNESS: What is your metric when
you say increase? What's the datum that you're referring to?

MR. SZARY: That's a very good question. I don't know the answer to that. I'm not an engineer.

But the way $I$ see it is, right now the water isn't being absorbed very well by the soil because of the amount of impervious and because of the poor condition of the soil.

But now with the improvements being made, the water is being placed in these detention basins, which will allow it to enter the soil over longer periods of time than it would if it just ran off the site during a storm.

So I'm anticipating that we're going to be seeing more groundwater coming off of this, leaving this site and heading downhill towards the residents on Grant Lane, excuse me, and Forrest Lane and Fairfield.

THE WITNESS: Groundwater doesn't necessarily follow the topography that you
have.
I would have to point out that this is a very, relative to groundwater, a relatively small site.

And the regulation that's required of us is that we provide infiltration of an increase in runoff from a two-year storm.

MR. SZARY: Well, the Radnor Township stormwater management guidelines indicate that runoff, as well as groundwater, is to be addressed.

And you say this system seems to be, and by your testimony, you've only addressed surface runoff. You haven't addressed groundwater to my satisfaction.

MR. RICE: Mr. Lambert, do you know how deep the groundwater is on this site?

THE WITNESS: Our testing -- I don't know how deep it is. Our testing went down to ten feet and had no signs of groundwater.

MR. RICE: Okay. So --
THE WITNESS: Our soil tests, we dug to a depth of ten feet and did not hit any
groundwater.
MR. RICE: So you dug with a backhoe ten feet and no groundwater?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. Sorry, Mr. Szary. I still have a question, but go ahead.

MR. SZARY: That's quite all right. So again, I'm trying to understand where this water goes when it does enter the ground, because there is, $I$ don't know if the term is an aquifer, but there is water that travels across the properties below the grade, and everyone in the neighborhood that I've spoken with and have gotten testimony from them, that they are getting increasing amounts of groundwater due to the rainfall intensities that we've seen.

But our concern is that if there is more groundwater, well, rainwater being injected into the ground by this system, which again we appreciate the fact that it's addressing the runoff, but I'm just concerned that it's jumping from a frying pan into the fire and that it's going to be
adding even more water into the ground, and that water is going to travel, $I$ guess, from wet to dry if it doesn't go downhill, and it's going to leave that site, so I imagine a good bit of it is going to be going towards the adjacent properties and contributing to --

MR. RICE: Do you agree, Mr. Lambert, with that statement?

THE WITNESS: $I$ do not.
MR. SZARY: Can you explain where that water's going to go when it gets put into the ground?

THE WITNESS: First off, I'm not sure the, I'm sorry, what you referred to as the testimony of neighbors about the groundwater, I'm not aware of individual issues in individual houses.

We, as a company, end up looking at a lot of properties after storm events, and extreme storm events, as you mentioned, and identify issues with individual properties that they have, whether it's gutters, grading, structural issues of -- when $I$ say
structural, I mean grades and the way topography directs water related to individual properties, and we help them, but I have not looked at any Forrest Lane properties for those conditions, just for the record.

From a groundwater perspective, if you look at groundwater and where groundwater is, and if you just wanted to look at simple, make simple assumptions, right, we have not kind of --

MR. RICE: Mr. Lambert, you'd agree that there are areas in the state where groundwater is very close to the surface?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. But we dug down ten feet and didn't find any.

MR. RICE: Correct. That's why I asked the question.

Do you know if there's any private wells in that part of the township?

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of any private wells. There are areas serviced by public water and public sewer.

MR. RICE: Like sometimes private
wells people use for landscaping, you know, irrigation.

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of any. MR. RICE: All right. Go ahead.

Finish.
THE WITNESS: And if we made an assumption that you have a groundwater that's uniformly distributed over the, let's call it the two blue areas and the green area --

MR. BROSEMAN: You're back to A-15 A?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry, A-15 A. And on the bottom of that table is an area, right, so we have the areas identified there, and there is about 550,000 square feet is the area that is identified.

If you took the volume of water that will infiltrate, meaning again, making massive assumptions without looking at anything, but I'm trying to answer the question, and you distributed that water into that uniformly-graded groundwater, I don't know what elevation that was.

We dug down ten feet and did not have
any on our site.
But let's assume it was a flat lake, and it was all surface water, and we put all our water we had in there, $I$ think it's an eighth of an inch, $I$ did the calculation, $I$ believe it's about an eighth of an inch of water would be evenly distributed.

It's not going to be evenly distributed. All of the water that we're infiltrating isn't going to get to that area.

And so $I$ would equate it to more like putting your finger in a bathtub, is that when you put your finger in the bathtub, the bathtub theoretically raises in elevation, but it's really imperceptible.

I would say that, just from a very simple area, look at it, volume, is that the amount of water that we're infiltrating here, although it meets all of the township requirements, and we are required to infiltrate it, $I$ just want to be clear, we are required to provide infiltration, our
calculations show we're meeting and exceeding that by a percentage, and we have infiltration rates that show that the soils will accept that water, will have drain-down times that are in conformance with the ordinance, and we did not hit any limiting features when we did those tests, so all of our infiltration will meet the code.

But even if we did immediately get that groundwater, which isn't going to happen, it's really going to be imperceptible to the depth of it.

MR. SZARY: You had mentioned just now that the soil would, I forget the exact wording, would retain the groundwater.

MR. RICE: Infiltrate.
MR. SZARY: Infiltrate. Well, I think he used another word.

But do you know how much soil is being removed from this site, will be removed from this site when the excavation takes place for the basements on these units?

THE WITNESS: I have not done that
calculation.
MR. SZARY: I've done that calculation. Am I allowed to provide new information?

MR. RICE: Why don't you wait till it's your turn to present that?

MR. SZARY: Okay.
MR. RICE: This is just crossexamination. If you have a study or a report or a calculation, you'll have a chance to do that.

MR. SZARY: All right. Very good. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Thank you.
MR. SZARY: If you don't mind, I'd like to piggyback some questions on to the questions Mr. Sareen had asked earlier in the evening.

MR. RICE: For the witness?
MR. SZARY: Yes.
MR. RICE: Go ahead.
MR. SZARY: Okay. Good. He was talking about the development and the nature of the development and single-family
units versus multifamily units, if you can bring up that map again.

So the properties that are immediately adjacent to the site you described as commercial, the Eagle Village, business where the offices are, but then the rest of the properties are residential.

So of the residential properties that abut this site, are any of them apartment buildings?

THE WITNESS: NO.
MR. SZARY: Are any of them townhouses?

THE WITNESS: Of the residential properties that we discussed, there are, they're single-family homes.

MR. SZARY: Okay. So they're all single-family homes.

And you mentioned that the St. Honore site development is single-family homes, because the site was too small to do multifamily, if that was the developer's option or choice.

But needless to say, it's being
developed as single-family houses; correct?
THE WITNESS: Yes, it's being developed, but $I$ don't know the history of the current developer.

MR. SZARY: And I appreciate the fact that you're calling this a transition site, I believe, between the higher density of commercial developments on two sides of it.

But if the property's intent as part of the conditional use approval is to maintain the nature of the site, of the properties, the neighborhood, single-family housing, to me, on this site would be more in order, in line with maintaining the nature of the site.

Does that sound accurate?
THE WITNESS: I don't agree.
MR. SZARY: All right. Well, we'll allow the township to make that decision then. All right. That's all I have for now. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Thank you. Amber Levy?
MS. LEVY: Yes. One question. Amber Levy, Radnor Conservancy.

My question for you is you used the standard of a meadow as a definition or as your metric for calculating stormwater.

What is the definition of meadow that you are using?

THE WITNESS: It refers to a runoff coefficient, and so there are runoff coefficients that are based on different soil conditions.

And then you have, you know, impervious coverage issue, you know, kind of the highest runoff, and then it goes down, and you have gravel, you have meadow.

So the metric that we use as the preexisting condition is meadow.

MS. LEVY: Got it.
THE WITNESS: It's really not runoff, right? And so you have, it looks at, I mean, there's a study that showed how much runoff comes from different characteristics, or different runoff characteristics from each type of cover condition, and it gets put into the model to determine how much runoff you get from
it.
MS. LEVY: Got it. And if $I$ wanted to look at that, when is that used? Like where is that model at? Is that --

THE WITNESS: In the table, it's --
MS. LEVY: Yeah. Is that like a basic element --

THE WITNESS: I believe it was under TR55, I believe, is where the model is, but in the township ordinance, I believe they have --

MS. LEVY: In the township ordinance.
THE WITNESS: I believe the township ordinance actually has the table within the stormwater ordinance. I'd have to double check, but it's common practice.

MS. LEVY: Got it. Okay. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Cheryl Lutz? No?
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(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. I think -- who do I have back there that $I$ missed?

MS. HANSEN: I'm sorry. Cindy Hansen.

MR. RICE: Come on up, please. Are you a party?

MS. HANSEN: Yes.
MR. RICE: What is your name?
MS. HANSEN: Cindy Hansen, H-A-N-S-E-N, 6 Hedgerow Lane.

MR. RICE: Say it again?
MS. HANSEN: Cindy Hansen, $\mathrm{H}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}-\mathbf{N}$.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right.
MS. HANSEN: I just have a couple of questions.

Last meeting you mentioned stormwater management controls during development.

Can you explain what they are?
THE WITNESS: Yes. They'll have erosion and sediment control measures that will be reviewed both by the township and by the county.

So Exhibit A-12, sheet six, shows our proposal for erosion and sediment control measures.

It has like a stone construction entrance for vehicles entering and leaving
the site.
It will have silt socks, silt fencing, inlet protection to be able to control the runoff from the site.

MS. HANSEN: And what happens if the runoff cannot be controlled, if it flows into everybody's property?

THE WITNESS: So, as I said before, both the township and the county will issue a permit for this.

If there are breaches to those erosion and sediment controls, typically there are remediation measures that are made to the breaches.

If they, say, for instance, say the silt fence or silt sock gets overwhelmed, there will be modifications made and additional measures installed to limit any such breaches.

MS. HANSEN: Thank you. There is an existing exit onto Eagle Road.

Did you consider using it and trying to fit it into your plan?

THE WITNESS: There's an ordinance
requirement in the township that says that, and $I$ don't have it.

I could look up the code section, but I won't take the time, unless you want me to read the code section.

MS. HANSEN: No, thank you. I've heard enough of the code.

THE WITNESS: That code, there's two sections. One is that if you are on a corner parcel with a major collector and a local street, so Eagle Road is a major collector, and then Strafford Avenue is a local street, that you should take your access off of the local street and not put the access on the major collector.

And so following the ordinance, we have the driveway shown on Strafford Avenue.

MS. HANSEN: Okay. And you keep referring to it as a driveway. Is a driveway different than a road?

THE WITNESS: Yes. This is a driveway. So the ordinance provides for driveways for this type of development.

MS. HANSEN: The 38 townhomes with driveways?

THE WITNESS: Yes. To be specific, Section 255-40 is multifamily and attached-dwelling residential development.

And I read it earlier tonight, subsection $C$, which was access and circulation, and subsection $E$, which was driveways.

And so this is a driveway providing convenient access to the units.

MS. HANSEN: So that means it's not as wide, I guess?

THE WITNESS: We've actually, one of the township engineer comments was to provide a driveway that was 28 feet in width, and so we've actually provided a 28-foot-wide driveway.

MS. HANSEN: You were mentioning there's two parking spaces for townhomes.

Is it a two-car garage or a one-car garage with a parking space?

THE WITNESS: It will be a two-car garage.

MS. HANSEN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And so the two-car garage is designed so you have two parking spaces within the garage.

In addition to that, spaces that we have not counted is the driveway apron for each individual unit is also actually sized to be able to fit two cars, but we did not count that in our calculation.

MS. HANSEN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Is that all of the parties, all of the resident parties? Okay.

So we had discussed, I know I have questions. The board has some questions.

It may be easier for me to go first, since I'm one person, and there's five other people here that are going to have questions.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

MR. RICE: So let me, I'm going to go backwards from that testimony, just to clarify some things on the plan.

Mr. Lambert, the question that was just asked about the driveway, what's the address? How are you going to put an address on a driveway?

THE WITNESS: I believe it's really up to the -- addresses are assigned I think it's partly by the township, partly by the post office, and there can be lots of different ways to associate it. It doesn't necessarily have to be a street.

There are campus buildings on campuses that all have addresses, and really it's a function of 911 also response to this, and so it isn't related to a driveway or a road necessarily.

It would be a, you know, it could be a unit on Strafford Avenue. You could say it was 230 Staffford Avenue, unit one.

They may assign a name to the internal driveway and be able to have different numbers on the internal driveway.

MR. RICE: But you realize that these are individual townhomes that are going to have to have addresses, right, of some
sort.
THE WITNESS: That's what $I$ just said. They could be --

MR. RICE: Let me, let me finish. And that Amazon is going to come to 201, driveway B, 202 driveway, whatever, whatever the designation is.

So that seems to me to be a practical issue if we're calling this a driveway.

The other question $I$ have about that is, is there going to be mail -- mail will be delivered house to house.

Is there a plan for like a group mailbox?

THE WITNESS: Oftentimes in a development like this there will be a group mailbox.

And again, it's really up to the postmaster. It's coordination of the postmaster.

MR. RICE: And maybe there's going to be a group of mailboxes for everybody, maybe more than one.

Then on the same issue, looking back,

I think we looked at A-4.
But the initial conditional use plan calls this Road $A$ and Road B. Now it's called Drive $A$ and Drive $B$. So why the change?

THE WITNESS: I think it was just really nomenclature. It caused confusion to call it Road $A$ and Road $B$, and so we tried to clarify that and call it Drive A and Drive $B$.

MR. RICE: There's no other reason other than that?

THE WITNESS: Correct. It was really just nomenclature that caused confusion.

MR. RICE: Okay. On this plan, on this plan, the units on the right side, 33 through 38, $I$ think it is, behind that green area is not any part of a calculated open space; right?

THE WITNESS: Correct. The area between 33 and 38 and Eagle Road is not counted in any of our open space.

Our open space is only counted in the internal area, the darker green on Exhibit

A-12, sheet four.
MR. RICE: So behind those units, between those units and the road then, is that area going to drain down to the underground basin that's underneath the driveway for units one through four?

Is that going to drain in that direction?

THE WITNESS: I'll pull up the grading plan, just to verify. There may be -- so in the area that is, that you referred to, the roof drains from those units, 33 to 38.

MR. RICE: Right.
THE WITNESS: The roof drains will all be collected. The surface runoff is going to be uncontrolled on that side.

If during land development there is a desire to collect and control it, we would be able to collect and control that runoff, but right now it currently shows it's uncontrolled runoff on that side.

MR. RICE: So, and again, this is just a practical question, because I've seen this over the years.

So the roof drains and -- will there be sump pumps, do you know?

THE WITNESS: I do not know if there will be sump pumps.

MR. RICE: Okay. But the roof drains that are going to come off 33 through 38, are they going to go out onto the ground, or are they going to be tied in?

THE WITNESS: They will be tied in to a collection system.

MR. RICE: Underground piping?
THE WITNESS: Underground piping, correct.

MR. RICE: So there won't be a swale over there running down behind those buildings?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. And is that true for the whole development?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. Going back to the green plan.

THE WITNESS: I believe it's A-12, sheet four.

MR. RICE: Yes. If you can go back --
THE WITNESS: The color helps.
MR. RICE: So in the middle, there's 84,807 square feet of open space, and then on either side, there's four units, four units, and then five units down at the bottom.

The buildings themselves, so if $I$ buy a townome, let's say number 32 , which is coming off of Drive $B$, it's got a little white area around there.

Is that all potential impervious surface? Because you have a building footprint, which is, $I$ think you said -- I don't know what, what is the building footprint for these units?

THE WITNESS: It's 36 by 56. Unit one in the bottom right of $A-12$, sheet four, gives both dimensions.

MR. RICE: Okay. But you have a building footprint, and then you have an area, a thin strip of white around that. What is that for?

THE WITNESS: That's to demonstrate
that we were not including that in the open space. It was area that was adjacent to the building that was just not included in the open space.

Still, you're going to have a mix of landscaping, there's going to be a little bit of hardscape, but mainly it's going to be landscaping.

You might have your stormwater pipe running in that white zone. So we were not running the storm pipe there underneath the open space. We're running it in that white zone.

MR. RICE: But am I going to be able to build a patio, a deck, pave that area that's in white?

THE WITNESS: It's not intended. All of the improvements related to the unit are going to be within that footprint as the, the code requires it.

But, for me, it's a concept footprint. It doesn't say that we, you know, it's not a precise footprint at this juncture.

There might be more undulations in the
depth of the unit to provide that outdoor space that you're referring to.

MR. RICE: But, I mean, you'd admit that on a townhome like this, someone's going to want to put a hardscape patio out the backdoor; right?

THE WITNESS: I didn't disagree, but what $I$ was clarifying was, what we're showing is kind of a unit footprint. We don't think of a unit as just being all interior space.

There may be a portion of that, in that 36 feet wide by 56 feet long, there may be a section of the structure that ends up being 46 feet long, and you wind up with a section of patio that's a ten-foot-deep patio within that footprint, right?

So we've shown the maximum footprint of that. Like really when it gets built, it may actually have a smaller portion to provide that outdoor space.

MR. RICE: Okay. But again, the white areas are outside of the open space; right?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. RICE: And theoretically, they could all be impervious surfaces; correct?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. When you say "they" --

MR. RICE: Could be, theoretically they could all be impervious surfaces?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm not sure what you're referring to when you say "they" all should --

MR. RICE: The white area.
THE WITNESS: The white area, yes. We would have to make sure that it would continue to conform with the impervious coverage requirements, but, yes, that area could be occupied.

MR. RICE: Okay. Okay. Could be impervious, not only occupied. It could be impervious.

THE WITNESS: It could be impervious.
MR. RICE: Okay. So is that considered in your stormwater calculations? THE WITNESS: No. We included our stormwater based on the footprints, knowing they're a maximum footprint right now.

If we exceeded the amount that is currently designed, then a stormwater system would be designed, but that's not what is currently proposed.

As we go through the land development process --

MR. RICE: But that would have to all be considered; right?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
MR. RICE: Because people want to put decks on, patios.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Any other changes are stringently-controlled during the land development and permitting process and then building permits.

They would need building permits for all of those and there are inspections of what gets built, and they all have to be in conformance with the proposed plans.

MR. RILEY: Can I interject? Sorry. You have it in other plans that shows like a deck.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's a different plan. I just want to be clear.

So at A-4 $A$, we were showing, these are actually different footprints on some of them, and this was showing those outdoor spaces.

When we prepared $A-12$, we actually simplified it and just said, this is kind of the maximum area that we're dedicating to the unit, was the $36-b y-56$ area. We simplified it.

MR. RICE: In the basin that you identified on here, and I guess I'm counting one, two, three, four underground stormwater facilities. So you have the --

THE WITNESS: There's actually one, there's one more on the Forrest Lane lot that you're missing.

MR. RICE: The extra lot. So they're all underground stormwater basins with piping and stone and --

THE WITNESS: Correct. There are some that are pipe systems. There are some that were proprietary products that have a larger void capacity.

MR. RICE: And there will be
infiltration at the bottom of those basins? THE WITNESS: Correct. And I would say there's a Hilbec Engineering and Geo-Sciences soil study that's included at the end of the stormwater report that shows where those permeability tests were taken to demonstrate conformance with infiltration.

MR. RICE: So the stormwater, there's no above-ground swales proposed on this development?

THE WITNESS: There may be. There are some swales for collection, and it would be a swale leading to an inlet.

It may be capturing surface runoff that we're trying to capture and control rather than have it run off.

So there will be a mix of swales, inlets, roof drains, all collecting the water.

MR. RICE: And the open space, the 84,807 square feet, are there inlets in the open space anywhere?

THE WITNESS: I believe a portion of
the open space includes the two stormwater basins, but if you --

MR. RICE: I'm just wondering, the water that's coming off the open space, which direction is it going?

THE WITNESS: There will be collection, but $I$ just wanted to point out, in the table on the sheet of $\mathrm{A}-12$, sheet four, on the left-hand side, there's the common open space requirement of 25 percent, and as we went over, there's a maximum of ten percent for stormwater management within that, and the table demonstrates that we have 26 percent open space proposed and 7.9 percent stormwater. So it shows that we're in conformance with that.

MR. RICE: Is there any, you testified last time and tonight about the size of the buildings, the area, the height, et cetera. Is there any plan to put anything on top of these townhomes, like rooftop living space?

THE WITNESS: No living space that I'm
aware of.
MR. RICE: Okay. So is there a builder selected for this?

THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.
MR. RICE: The plan that Mr. Broseman asked you about tonight, the single-family one.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RICE: Can you put that up for a minute?

THE WITNESS: A-16.
MR. RICE: A-16. So what was the purpose of presenting this?

THE WITNESS: It was just to demonstrate a conceptual layout of single-family homes under the $R-4$ zoning and what that could look like.

I know there was a question of Mr . Houder about building single families and what it would look like.

This was just a concept sketch that our office prepared to show what 7,000-square-foot lots would look like.

MR. RICE: But, $I$ mean, does it comply
with township ordinances?
THE WITNESS: Generally. It's not fully designed. As $I$ said, it's a concept plan. The size of all of these are greater than what is required by code.

Although they show 7,000, it's 7,000 measured to right-of-way lines and not to the center of the street as the township permits.

So some of the lots could get smaller, but this was an effort to show what it could look like as a single-family development.

MR. RICE: All right. So one, two, three, four, five driveways on Eagle Road, there's nothing in the code would prohibit that?

THE WITNESS: The code section talking about secondary access off of Strafford Avenue, I'd have to double check the code section to see if it would be feasible, or check on that language.

But we were showing it similar to the development directly across Strafford

Avenue of the single-family homes that have access directly to Eagle Road as being consistent with that development that was approved just a few years ago.

MR. RICE: Well, yeah, but that was fully engineered; right?

THE WITNESS: Understood. But they provided the access to Eagle Road, directly to Eagle Road for the properties at the corner of Strafford and Eagle.

So at the northwest corner of Strafford and Eagle, there are a few houses that have direct access to Eagle Road, similar to this development.

MR. RICE: So this has a horseshoe also, but this plan also has lots 25 and 26 with driveways right onto Strafford Avenue, relatively close to that intersection.

Is that permissible?
THE WITNESS: Yes. I can pull up the code section if you like, but it's to have a driveway that wasn't a great distance from the intersection.

MR. RICE: And how about the road on
this plan?
Does that meet the requirements for distance between $a$ road and an intersection?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RICE: But you haven't fully engineered it? This is just a concept?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely not. This
was a conceptual plan taking the kind of bulk requirements of what the code requires and depicting what that could look like.

MR. RICE: Okay. And then going back to A-12.

THE WITNESS: A-12, sheet four, I believe.

MR. RICE: Got it. So you testified that some part of the stormwater system is within the open space.

So can you just identify that again, please?

THE WITNESS: Yes. So using A-12, sheet four, to the left of unit 25 you see a dashed line, and then there's a text note.

MR. RICE: That dashed-line box?
THE WITNESS: Yes. That dashed-line box is a stormwater management system that says PCSMVNP infiltration bed number two.

MR. RICE: Right.
THE WITNESS: And on the other side of unit 28, you can see again that dashed line says PCSMVNP infiltration bed number one. MR. RICE: Okay. So that's included in the open space calculation, and it's also part of the stormwater system?

THE WITNESS: Correct. And as I pointed out in the zoning table on the left side of sheet four identifies that the stormwater management encompasses 6,654 square feet of the open space, which represents 7.9 percent, which is conforming with the ten percent maximum required by the code.

MR. RICE: And then just one other thing. I mean, this plan, what's being proposed here, this whole site will get bulldozed pretty much; right?

You're going to have to clear all the
impervious, including the paving, all the improvements, all of the houses that were there, all of that gets leveled and gets not quite back to meadow.

THE WITNESS: All of those
improvements, all of the existing improvements will be removed, yes.

MR. RICE: Okay. So we'll be starting with a lot of earth moving and basically clearing the whole thing. Nothing's going to be maintained?

THE WITNESS: There is certain areas that will be maintained. There's some groves of trees that we're maintaining.

But there will be earth moving, which is normal with the development of a site.

MR. RICE: Right. Okay. I don't really have anything else to ask right now. It's ten of 9:00.

MS. MULRONEY: I have some questions. THE PRESIDENT: I think we all do, yes. We all have questions.
(Discussion off the record.)
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MR. RILEY: I have a quick question. When you did the ten feet, where on the property was that done exactly?

THE WITNESS: So we did, so you're referring to, $I$ just want to make sure $I$ 'm clear, the infiltration testing when we did the digging?

MR. RILEY: Yes. Like everyone wants to know what the groundwater table is, and then --

THE WITNESS: We, we -- so, for the record, we did not run into any groundwater table.

MR. RILEY: For the ten feet, you didn't.

THE WITNESS: For the ten feet, we did not run into any groundwater table or signs of groundwater.

MR. RILEY: How much difference was -did you do that in the lower section or the highest?

THE WITNESS: We did several different locations. Some were kind of in the middle of the site.

Some were in the lower left and then in the, kind of bottom left of the site, not on the Forrest Lane property, but in the bottom left of the site, we also did tests down there.

MR. RILEY: At that spot, how deep is the basin?

THE WITNESS: How deep is the basin?
MR. RILEY: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Give me one second.
MR. RILEY: Typically, you want to be two feet above the groundwater table.

THE WITNESS: Right. And so when we did the test, we -- I don't have the, $I$ can look it up, if you want me to.

But we did the, testing down, we did not find any -- the bottom of the basin is above two feet from the bottom of the hole, right, so we were two feet above any --

MR. RILEY: And then the little panhandle down on the left, it really seems
to drop there, the grading, when I drove up Forrest.

THE WITNESS: The Forrest Lane parcel?
MR. RILEY: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes. It drops down, correct.

So we were not proposing any infiltration in that location just because we're not doing testing there. We just provided rate control in that area.

MR. RILEY: Okay. And then you said you were going to save some trees, but when I look at the satellite view of this property now, if I'm looking actually in the summertime, it seems like it's covered 40 to 50 percent with trees and leaves when you look down, in itself is retaining water on the property.

So the bio-retention on this property is fairly high. Did you use that in your calculations?

THE WITNESS: So one of the parties asked a question about the runoff coefficients, and those runoff coefficients
do take into account the soil coverage, the existing conditions.

With rainfall, once the initial tractions are full, you get that runoff, right, and that's really what those calculations show.

MR. RILEY: Okay. Thank you.
MS. AGNEW: Hi, Mr. Lambert.
THE WITNESS: Good evening.
MS. AGNEW: The testimony in the hearing prior, Mr. Broseman asked you about different sections of the code.

Do you recall?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. AGNEW: And he asked you about Section 280-91 D, and the question was, continuing on, this is, I'm sorry, Exhibit A-12, sheet four.

Continuing on to 280-91 D, it says, there's still another requirement. Take my word for it, I'm reading from the transcript. Okay?

And you say: Yes, considering the, and you said, reading from the code,
consideration shall be given to the arrangement and location of common open space to take advantage of physical characteristics of the site.

You say: Common open space within easy access and view of dwelling units, at the same time preserving and enhancing natural features.

Going further down now on the next page, 75, and Mr. Broseman asks you:

And is it an easy view of the dwelling units, generally speaking? And you say, yes, generally speaking.

So if we go to $A-12$, specifically speaking, unit 34 is behind unit 31 and 32. Can unit 34 can see the open space?

THE WITNESS: Yes. You'd see it at an angle.

MS. AGNEW: Where? How is that happening?

THE WITNESS: So you could see the angle of the open space, so on the opposite side of the drive being closer to Strafford, you can see open space.

MS. AGNEW: You have to be outside to see it?

THE WITNESS: You might have a window on the front that you can look.

MS. AGNEW: Might? Might?
THE WITNESS: I would like, I am not the architect, but $I$ would expect that unit 34 with frontage, with two party walls, would have numerous windows on the front and the back.

MS. AGNEW: But we don't see that here, even though you said this was basically almost a final full set of plans, full plan set.

THE WITNESS: Typically we wouldn't submit the full architecturals as part of that.

And I would go back to 280-135 C, which talks about the generalized site plan shall be submitted.

MS. AGNEW: Right. So really, we might probably disagree. We're talking, in my view, I can't see the open space.

How about from 31?

THE WITNESS: Again, you can see it at an angle, really on either angle.

MS. AGNEW: Isn't that a stretch, don't you think?

THE WITNESS: The code section doesn't say that every unit has to see every square foot, right? It says --

MS. AGNEW: No. It says, as you read: Common open space within easy access and view of the dwelling units. That doesn't --

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to object. It doesn't say "the" dwelling units. It says "of" dwelling units. You added a word.

MS. AGNEW: It says: 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 the dwelling units.

MR. BROSEMAN: It doesn't say "the" dwelling units.

MS. AGNEW: I'm reading from the transcript that you read from the code.

MR. MARLIER: The fact is that Mr. Broseman can, on redirect, clarify --

MR. BROSEMAN: ExCuse me. I'm looking at 280-91. I don't mean any disrespect, but the word "the" is not in front of "dwelling." That's all I'm pointing out.

MS . AGNEW: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: It says view of dwelling units. It doesn't say the dwelling units or all of the dwelling units.

MS. AGNEW: How about from unit 36?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I would, I would say the same. And I would go back again, just reading the code, "within easy access."

So all of the units have easy access to this. It's not like a hidden or precluded area, right? All of these units have easy access to the open space.

MS. AGNEW: That's not a qualified answer. Really, it's not a quality --
qualified in the sense of quality answer opposed to a quantity answer.

To you, it may be easy. To me, it's not. Is that right? Is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS: I would say this is easy access. I don't know how else to say it because I --

MS. AGNEW: Do you say the same thing about unit eight with regard to behind 27 , unit 27?

THE WITNESS: Yes. That has, you know, again, you just look at various angles to the open space.

MS. AGNEW: Right. So that's not considered open space, right, where you have the arrow right now?

THE WITNESS: The code section again says "view of dwelling units." It doesn't say every unit must have direct, unobstructed views of the open space.

MS. AGNEW: I'm saying, where you have the arrow right now, that's not considered open space?

THE WITNESS: That is considered open space, yes. Dark green is open space.

MS. AGNEW: What is that dotted line and all that?

THE WITNESS: Below the surface, you would not see it.

MS. AGNEW: What is that?
THE WITNESS: It's a stormwater facility.

MS. AGNEW: Okay. So again, unit 18 .
THE WITNESS: I would answer the same question, is that you can have views. They are not direct, unobstructed views, but the code doesn't say direct and unobstructed views.

The code says that you shall have easy access, which $I$ believe you will have easy access to the open space, and view of dwelling units, right?

So within view of dwelling units, so you can have a view of that open space.

MS. AGNEW: But you don't know if there's windows.

THE WITNESS: As I testified to, if
you have a unit that has two party walls on either side, every townhouse I've ever seen that has party walls on both sides has windows on the front and the back.

MS. AGNEW: That's all my questions. Thank you. Oh, oh, I have one more question. Sorry.

Do you know, are there sump pumps in the building presently on the --

THE WITNESS: I do not know.
MS. AGNEW: So if there were sump pumps presently on the Hamilton property, that would indicate there was maybe some groundwater higher up?

THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. It could be that water was infiltrating at a higher level due to gutters or roof drains, and they put that in as a preventive measure.

MS. AGNEW: Thank you.
MR. ABEL: Mr. Lambert, just to clarify, so where you have the arrow now, that is stormwater?

THE WITNESS: Yes. There is
stormwater under the ground there.
MR. ABEL: So you're saying it's open space. It's just not open space that's calculated into the formula; correct?

THE WITNESS: No. Open space, it is calculated into the formula. You are permitted stormwater up to ten percent of the open space.

MR. ABEL: I appreciate that clarification. Let's talk about the driveway.

You testified they're 28 feet in width?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. ABEL: Now, what would the difference -- compare that to the single-family plan.

What would the driveway be in that plan?

THE WITNESS: It would likely be the same width, 28 feet. We made it 28 feet in response to the township engineer's comment.

MR. ABEL: By code, what would be
required in the single-family plan?
THE WITNESS: I believe 28 feet in the single-family plan.

MR. ABEL: Okay. And A-12, page four, the driveway is private?

THE WITNESS: It would be owned by the HOA, is the intent, yes.

MR. ABEL: Where does, so during a snowfall, where is snow removal, where is it placed?

THE WITNESS: Snow can go, you know, I've lived in a condo for many years. There are areas along the driveway that snow could get placed.

There are areas between units or driveways that snow can get placed.

And, you know, like the condo that I used to live in, if you get an extreme amount of snow, they actually come and remove it.

MR. ABEL: Is there curbing on the driveway?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. ABEL: But the snow area would not
be one of the parking spots, would it?
THE WITNESS: No, that's not the intent.

MR. ABEL: Okay. I'm sorry. I
believe you testified to the square footage of the proposed townhomes.

Did you say 3,000 square feet?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ABEL: Not including the basement?
THE WITNESS: Not including the basement, no.

MR. ABEL: As these are built, will there be basements?

THE WITNESS: There will likely be basements, yes.

MR. ABEL: Unfinished?
THE WITNESS: I don't know. Again, I do not know the developer's proposal, but a lot of times in these type developments, that would be an option, to finish the basement.

MR. ABEL: Would they have egress?
THE WITNESS: They would have to meet the building codes. I'm not an architect.

MR. ABEL: But if they have an egress, that square footage would be included.

So it wouldn't be 3,000 square feet. It would be more than 3,000 square feet; correct?

THE WITNESS: Our 3,000 square feet did not include basements or garages, so if you were going to include a basement, the number may be more, yes.

MR. ABEL: So on units 21 to 24 , 25 to 28, and 29 to 32 , if the beige and the white is included, is that the full property, or is there a yard including --

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand your question.

MR. ABEL: So unit 21 , where is the yard?

THE WITNESS: So you have a common area -- when you say yard, right, these would be a townhouse. You would have your --

MR. ABEL: But they won't have a personal space where they'd be able to fence in?

THE WITNESS: No, they would likely not have any personal space they could fence in, correct.

MR. ABEL: Property 21, unit 21, what we see there is all they would have in their property?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ABEL: Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: A couple of questions. You talked about the inlet at the corner of Drive $A$ and $I$ guess the, Strafford, didn't have the open space. Is it stated on that side?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Where does that drain to?

THE WITNESS: So using Exhibit A-12, sheet five, there's an inlet out at Strafford, out at Strafford Road on the proposed driveway.

There's an additional inlet just into the property along the curb line, and that inlet then will go down and will have, there's another inlet in front of unit 23.

There's an inlet that it connects to in front of unit 17. And then it goes, and it will end up connecting to stormwater basin three.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that the triangular one?

THE WITNESS: I just want to verify. There's a lot of different pipes. Give me one second.

THE PRESIDENT: I'm just going to talk over you while you're thinking.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Go ahead.
THE PRESIDENT: I was concerned about Ms. Mahoney's concerns about her property and wondered if there was any way to have an inlet at the edge of the property to the left as we look at the Drive $A$ all the way down by her house.

THE WITNESS: So it's a grade issue. Down, all the way down by her house is elevation 429 or 430 .

Our driveway is at 434 , for reference. We're about four feet higher there.

We can -- and then all the way down at
what you're referring as the triangular basin, which we've been talking about it that way, it's basin three in the bottom left corner of $A-12$, sheet five, the basin that is down there at the top of the grade is 428.

So we're a little bit lower, but not enough to really get enough fall from --

THE PRESIDENT: What did you say hers was?

THE WITNESS: 430. So we've got two feet, which really isn't enough fall from Point $A$ to Point $B$ to have --

THE PRESIDENT: One is at the surface and one is going into the tank below the surface?

THE WITNESS: Correct, but there's water in that basin that we have to account for for tail water.

And so looking at it, we did make efforts to really minimize, and hearing the concerns of Ms. Mahoney early on, we really made every effort to be able to capture as much water as we could, allowing for
gravity.
And so we are not obligated to put that inlet in Strafford and collect Strafford water, but that was really an effort to address that concern. We looked at it.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you ever pump stormwater?

THE WITNESS: We have pumped stormwater. It gets very complicated.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, $I$ can imagine. All right. Well, it was just an idea. Okay.

Basements, $I$ know you're not an architect, but how deep is a standard basement?

Like if you were digging a foundation, a foundation, $I$ guess, is what $I$ should say.

I'm just wondering, what's the difference between the floor of the basement and dry zone?

THE WITNESS: So I'm going to have, again $I ' m$ not the architect, so $I$ will talk
about generalities. Typically, your finished floor will be a foot or two above grade. All right?

So when you walk into a house, you step up, because the way they frame it, they need the framing to make sure that it doesn't pop.

And so your kind of first floor, let's start off, and just take a foot, to be conservative, instead of two feet, say it's a foot above grade.

You probably have about a foot of structure, and say you have a, if you wanted a luxurious basement, you'd have a nine-foot basement; right?

So your excavation is probably nine, nine and a half feet down for that basement, depending on existing grades and how the proposed grade is, but in very general terms.

THE PRESIDENT: But it would be within that dry, ten-foot depth?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We have no signs to suggest otherwise.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. I should have asked it that way. Sorry.

You showed us a neighbor plan or neighborhood, neighbor plan, A-4 A.

THE WITNESS: A-4 A, yep.
THE PRESIDENT: When you used that, and $I$ don't know if you did something, but I can't read the plan. I need better glasses to read some of those tables.

What is the -- so I notice there are seven stormwater basins on this plan as opposed to the five that you have on sheet four of the A-12.

Any calculation on how much more that impinges on the open space, how much closer you get to that ten percent number you were talking about, or are you above it?

THE WITNESS: So in the -- let me see here. I want to figure out how to show you the best way.

THE PRESIDENT: I'm basically asking --

THE WITNESS: And so at the bottom -I hit the wrong button. Sorry.

The township got a new computer here, so it's a little bit more of a challenge. I'm trying to show both at the same time.

So if you look in the upper right, so this is kind of, and remember, this plan was trying to be responsive to neighbors' questions and concerns, and that's what really developed this.

THE PRESIDENT: I guess somehow I'm starting to get -- is there a larger plan?

THE WITNESS: It's close. I'm going to get to the punch line here in a second.

But the area next to unit 24 where it's showing the stormwater basin, and then I draw your attention to the bottom left.

So we're not even including that in the, what was counted as open space, right?

So that was a stormwater basin that was within the green space that we didn't count, right? We said, okay, that doesn't count.

We then took a look at the ones behind -- let me get the right unit numbers for the record -- between 19 and 23 there's
a stormwater basin.
And if you look at the bottom left, the green space looks a little bit funny, because it's held pretty far off of those units.

But the reason is is we didn't have that stormwater basin underneath that green space for purposes of that calculation.

The triangular portion, the bottom left-hand corner where we have the stormwater basin, again if you look at it, we didn't include that in the dark green calculation.

THE PRESIDENT: No. It looks like you didn't include any of it, the other ones.

THE WITNESS: And then we didn't include the one adjacent to 27. We didn't include that in the basin.

So the one stormwater basin that's included is the unit, is the one behind units 15 through 18. And so the basin behind units 15 through 18 is included in it.

But if you look at the table -- and I cheat, because $I$ can blow it up over here -- we had, the minimum open space requirement was 25 percent.

This plan in the green area in the lower left of $A-4 \mathrm{~A}$, this shows that we have 29.6 percent is the shaded, and then the stormwater management within that is about 3,000 feet or three percent.

So it would actually be under your ten percent. It was a longwinded answer to your question, but $I$ wanted to explain.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't realize that now the dark green is peripheral. It's not just central.

THE WITNESS: It's not just central, right. And so we were showing it, and that was --

THE PRESIDENT: I got it.
THE WITNESS: One of the questions for the neighbors of why we don't propose this plan is the code says that it should all be central unless approved by the board.

THE PRESIDENT: Got it. I didn't
understand that.
MR. BROSEMAN: Contiguous.
THE WITNESS: Contiguous.
THE PRESIDENT: It is contiguous, but it's not central.

THE WITNESS: Well, there are two portions of it. If you would consider the driveway --

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I see. If you count that as area.

THE WITNESS: Yes. So if you counted that as breaking up, as being contiguous, it wouldn't count.

If you would allow us to cross that, it would be considered contiguous, then we could look at that.

THE PRESIDENT: All right. Thank you. That was very helpful to me. All right. My last question.

Tell me the difference between a road and a driveway. I know we answered some of this at planning. I just don't remember.

THE WITNESS: It's really -- I wasn't at the planning meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: Someone answered it.
THE WITNESS: It's really based on your ordinance. So your ordinance has a specific requirement for -- let me get the right word of how they describe it.

It's 255-40. So you have an attached-dwelling residential development, and it has certain standards for that, and we're meeting those standards, providing driveway access to all these units.

It's really, it's consistent with how the township interpreted this for other attached-dwelling residential developments.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you know of any?
THE WITNESS: Villa Strafford, for instance, which is right down the street. So it's on Strafford, right?

And so everything internal there is a driveway accessing those units, and so it's kind of consistent with the way the township looks at it.

MR. BROSEMAN: You're looking at A-6?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, yes. A-6
identifies -- again, it says Madison Lane,
but it's the former Villa Strafford.
THE PRESIDENT: All right. Are there any benefits to being a driveway over being a road or are there benefits to being a road over being a driveway, that you know of?

THE WITNESS: For practical purposes, this is a planned community. It's going to be maintained and operated.

There won't be any necessary, you know, an easement for the driveway, because it's part of the, like it would be like a common element within the planned community.

So from kind of a use and ownership perspective, it is used by the planned community.

And so if you were creating a public street where the owners were not a cooperative arrangement, that's really when you get into the street, right?

If you needed a right-of-way so one neighbor could access the road or the street over another neighbor, and then you
sometimes have the municipality that's maintaining that street.

This is really just a planned community having a driveway that accesses the units.

THE PRESIDENT: Understood. Thank you. Last question, actually.

You talked about nothing on the roof as far as living space, and $I$ know you're not the architect, and $I$ know this is a land use issue, but $I$ just wanted to put it out there as far as green roofing, solar energy.

There's a lot of roof space up there that could be used for good things. And so I guess that wasn't a question. I'm sorry. That's it for me.

MR. RICE: Do you agree?
MS. MULRONEY: The benefit of going last is that my colleagues have asked all of my questions, so nothing from me tonight. Thank you.

MR. RICE: I guess we'll go off the record and see if we have a date beyond

March 7th. We don't have to pick it tonight. We can talk about it on March 7th.
---
$($ Discussion off the record.)
$-\quad-$

MR. RICE: After discussion off the record, the next hearing, tonight's hearing will be continued to March 7 th, and after that, we have a tentative date of March 20th for the hearing after that.

And is there any issues from any of the parties regarding mandatory time period?

Mr. Broseman, you're okay with the time period?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, we're okay with the time period.

MR. RICE: All the hearings in a prompt fashion, because this is pretty prompt, is my feeling.

MR. BROSEMAN: I have no objection to the dates we've been doing.

MR. RICE: Okay.

MS. MULRONEY: I'm just wondering, how many more nights do you think we need two and a half hours a night? Is two going to be enough?

MR. RICE: No, no.
MR. ABEL: Who can we expect to hear from?

MS. MULRONEY: So it's March 7th and the 20th, I guess.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, on the 7th, you will have your planner available?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes. Mr. Lambert is not available, so our other options are the planner, landscape architect, and traffic.

I'm not sure which order we would go, but $I$ know those are my other three possibilities, because Mr. Lambert can't make it then.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right. Well, let's see how far we get that night.

Everybody be prepared with your questions for traffic or the landscape architect.

Anything else from any of the parties
at this point? Yes?
MS. LEVY: You had mentioned earlier at the beginning of the night that there was notification that it was going to be --

MR. RICE: I'm sorry. You have to come up.

MS. LEVY: No problem. You mentioned earlier that there was notification that there was going to be a change and that we would be hearing from Mr. Lambert tonight.

Is that the type of information that the parties are able to receive, or is that just information that goes to the commissioners?

MR. RICE: Well, it's been going to the attorneys.

MS . LEVY: Right.
MR. RICE: You know, if there's a change in the witness? Is that what you're asking?

MS. LEVY: Yes, that is my question.
MR. RICE: I think $I$ sent one e-mail out to Mr. Schuda about that, because I know he was in touch with most of the
residents.
But if we're going to have changes in witnesses, $I$ mean, $I$ guess the easiest way to make sure everybody knows about it is, between Peggy and $I$, we'll have to -- we have a master list of e-mail addresses that we can notify?

MS . HAGAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MS. LEVY: That would be, that would be great.

MR. RICE: We'll let you know. But right now, Mr. Lambert looks like he's okay for the 20th, and the planner and/or traffic engineer would be here on March 7th. Okay?

MS. LEVY: Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: Can I have a motion to adjourn?

MS . MULRONEY: So moved.
THE PRESIDENT: DO $I$ have a second?
MS. AGNEW: Second.
THE PRESIDENT: We're adjourned. All
in favor?

Robert Lambert, Jr. - Cross
(The Board unanimously responds aye.)

-     -         - 

(Proceedings concluded at 9:23 p.m.) - - -
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