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THE PRESIDENT: Okay. We're going to get started. Welcome, everyone, to the April 30th, 2024, Board of Commissioners meeting for the conditional use hearing for the Hamilton tract.

We'll have a quorum. I assume Mr . Riley will come in shortly, so, John, do you want to get started?

MR. RICE: Yes. As we've done most of the meetings, we've had at least one or two commissioners unavailable.

They've all been instructed to either read the transcript. Of course, there's a video available for anyone that's not here.

Do any of the parties have any objection or anything regarding proceeding in that fashion?

George, any issue?
MR. BROSEMAN: No objection.
MR. RICE: Okay. Do any of the other parties have any objection regarding that?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Luckily, we have a transcript and we have a recording for any commissioners that can't be here.

So with that, we left the last time with Mr. Panzak. I believe, Mr. Marlier, you had finished cross-examination, and Mr. Broseman, you have some redirect?

MR. MARLIER: And I'm not sure if the commissioners asked questions. I believe we had ended with the neighbors, I think.

MR. BROSEMAN: That's what I recall, that the other parties had asked questions, and you thought the commissioners might have questions.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right. Well, let's go to the commissioners then.

Do any of the commissioners have any questions of Mr . Panzak regarding his testimony?

THE PRESIDENT: I do. Let me look over, because this was the last time.

BERNARD S. PANZAK, JR.,
having been previously duly sworn, was examined
and testified further as follows:

## EXAMINATION

THE PRESIDENT: We were talking about landscaping and lighting. So I guess first let me start with the wall along Eagle Road.

I saw several sections of wall along Eagle, taking that very steep embankment. I was wondering if you have any idea what the substance of walls would be made out of.

Would it be a manmade composite or you'll use the rock from the old mansion or is there anything interesting about that?

THE WITNESS: Great question. I don't think we're there yet.

THE PRESIDENT: NO, and I don't think we need to be.

THE WITNESS: No. We hope to have it be quite aesthetically pleasing.

THE PRESIDENT: Sure. So functional and will look good. All right.

THE WITNESS: Right.
THE PRESIDENT: Have you considered with your lighting plans using any solar lighting or trying to stay on the energy neutral side of lighting?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. At this time we have not. You know, they're LED, very low-wattage light fixtures, and we do think that they're energy sensitive.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, they're very low-energy use. We did, the township just did a review for the entire township of lighting, and $I$ understand that.

But they do make lovely solar, the batteries in the base, the panels at the top lighting, since your lighting is going to be going down and shielded from other eyes in the environment. It's just something to consider.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE PRESIDENT: And also to consider,
I know you were talking about a walking path going through the open space, some lighting there as well, because I think
that is something that would be necessary.
I wrote down a note that $I$ believe you answered already, but in the open space that already has quite a few mature trees, will you be adding more trees to that area?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The plan is to add more trees in that area, you know, leaving some measure of open space open.

THE PRESIDENT: Sure, especially if you're going to put a path through.

THE WITNESS: Right, yes, and for, you know, just passive recreation.

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. And are there any concerns about the wildlife that's there currently?

You know, it's very overgrown. I'm sure there are foxes and turkeys and you-name-it living in there.

I know that neighbors get distraught when construction starts and the wildlife all goes.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE PRESIDENT: Is there a plan for that, and $I$ don't even know if that's your
hat, but --
THE WITNESS: Probably not my hat. I actually took a walk over there yesterday, and it was pretty lonely, other than birds and squirrels, and hopefully they will congregate in these areas of preserved trees and undisturbed area.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Thank you very much. That's it for me right now.

MR. RICE: Any other board questions?
MR. LARKIN: So I wanted to take you back. You were asked questions about Section 280-95, which deals with site considerations, and one of the sections that you read was Section 280-95.A(4):

Landscaping shall be regarded as essential to every development plan. Not only must natural features, trees, and slopes on the site be preserved, but careful attention must be given to landscaping of parking areas and providing for street trees.

What landscaping is being proposed for the parking areas?

THE WITNESS: Well, our parking areas are adjacent to stormwater management facilities, and as such, along with their buffers, we feel that there are other code sections that actually prohibit the planting of landscaping at these particular parking areas.

MR. LARKIN: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Any further questions from the board?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Broseman?

-     -         - 

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Bern, we went over your qualifications when we started, but $I$ don't remember if I asked you if you had been involved in numerous projects in Radnor Township over the years.
A. Yes. We've done numerous projects in
the township.
Q. And over approximately how long of a period?
A. It's got to be over two decades.
Q. And do you regularly appear before the Radnor Township Shade Tree Commission in connection with those projects?
A. We do.
Q. At the last hearing, you were asked some questions, something along the lines as to whether you were given the plan of the townhomes that were desired by the applicant and then asked to work with that plan to preserve the trees given the layout.

However, those questions ignored the importance of other factors such as the township regulations, as well as the importance of the common open space?

MR. MARLIER: I'm going to object. It doesn't sound like he is asking a question. It sounds like he is testifying.

MR. BROSEMAN: I was in the middle of my question.

MR. RICE: Well, you were giving a
statement.
I understand that at a zoning hearing, we can ask very leading questions, but you're giving the answer when you're asking the question, so just ask him a question. BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. At the last hearing, you testified that the common centralized open space preserves one of the most significant pieces of wooded area within the property.

Can you elaborate on that and how the townhomes and the drive layout relates to the common open space and the other requirements of the township?
A. Yes. As anyone engaging in an effort of site planning, there's a multitude of factors that go into that, of course, the zoning, what's allowed from that, setbacks, buffers, adjacent land uses, natural features, and then you start to understand the programmatic elements that are being asked of you.

There's required circulation, number of dwelling units, what type of housing type you're interested in using, and then you go back
to the site, and on this particular site, a lot of the features, the existing features wrapped around in a bit a U-shape on the site.

And the other thing that factors into this is vehicular circulation, how are you going to get into and out of the site, back to other ordinance requirements, access from lower-order streets, so that sort of put us on Strafford Avenue.

And again, when we went back to the existing features, there was a significant piece of wooded area right in the center of the site between what might be described as the working side of this property and the residential side of this property.

And that, along with circulation, probably two access points probably, you know, definitely coming off of Strafford Avenue, that leads us into sort of this U-shaped configuration.

And then you apply your product to the site, apply the setbacks, and really this central wooded area became a focal point.

We knew we had to preserve, provide
common open space, and that looked like the very likely part of what was going to be required.

So that became sort of the
centerpiece, common open space, focal point of the project and provided us really good potential in regard to meeting all of the requirements that I believe we've met with this particular layout.
Q. Thank you. The topic of creating an earth disturbance came up in your testimony at the last hearing.

You did not have available the size of the area that would not have grading and earth disturbance. Do you have that information this evening?
A. We do. And just by way of a minor correction in our limit of disturbance, there's several wall features just to the, let's call it the Grant Lane side of our open space. We've eliminated those.

We understand that those will be disturbed by nature of removal of those, and that central open space becomes about an acre of ground, just under an acre, which is about 13 percent of the overall site.

The total amount of undisturbed area on this site is 62,966, which is about an acre, a little under an acre and a half or 19 percent of the site.
Q. I would like to go to the topic of heritage trees. The Zoning Ordinance of Radnor Township which we are proceeding under for the conditional use application does not regulate heritage tree removal; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And does the zoning ordinance define a heritage tree?
A. No, it doesn't.
Q. Where is that definition found in the township code?
A. That's found in Chapter 263 entitled Trees, and it's Section 263-4.B.
Q. And what is that definition?
A. Any tree, any tree that's 30 inches or greater in the DBH.
Q. And I think we've said last time, but is DBH a defined term?
A. Yes, it is. That's defined as diameter at breast height, or roughly four and a
half feet above grade. That code section is 263-4.B.
Q. And based on that definition, is it my understanding that a heritage tree would apply to any species of tree based solely on the DBH size; is that right?
A. Yes. It's strictly a size consideration.
Q. And does that mean that various undesirable trees, such as invasive species or trees in poor condition, trees susceptible to disease or other decline, would fall under the definition of a heritage tree, as long as it was 30 inches or more in DBH?
A. Yes, it can, and often does.
Q. In your professional opinion as a landscape architect, are some species of trees more worthy of preservation than others?
A. I think, yes. And I think that sort of longevity and heartiness in their DNA really, native is a good characteristic as well, but I think longevity and condition really kind of, in my view, point to trees that are more preferred for preservation.
Q. And what about if it was invasive?
A. Well, $I$ guess less so. We're trying to manage invasives constantly, I think, throughout our region, and $I$ think that would certainly not create an environment where that would be the most desirable tree to retain.
Q. In your experience in Radnor Township, when is heritage tree removal dealt with in the development process?
A. Typically in the land development stage. We've tried to reach out and meet with the shade tree commission prior to planning commission meetings and other meetings in that land development process.
Q. Is the topic of heritage trees and the required replacement tree formula addressed in Chapter 263, Trees?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And do these code provisions prohibit the removal of a heritage tree?
A. It's strongly discouraged but does not prohibit.
Q. And there's a replacement formula if a heritage tree is to be replaced?
A. There is, and if a heritage tree is removed, the formula dictates that there would be six replacement trees for every one 30-inch tree and over.
Q. And that replacement formula is applied by the township to healthy trees not susceptible to disease and noninvasive trees; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's generally correct. In our case, we are providing compensation for healthy, for some healthy invasive trees such as Norway Maple.
Q. Do the plans for this project satisfy the applicable heritage tree replacement formula?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. In your experience in doing projects in Radnor Township, does the township shade tree commission regularly approval the removal of heritage trees, coupled with replacement trees, in connection with land development projects?
A. Yes, it does. A recent project that I was involved in was the St. Honore development across the street more recently, and one that took place quite a while ago was Radnor Corporate

Center along Matsonford Road.
Q. And those involved removal of heritage trees and replacement in accordance with the applicable formula?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. At the last hearing, Mr. Rice asked you to state the sizes of the heritage trees to be removed.

In reviewing your testimony from last time, did you discover an error in the answer that you gave?
A. I did discover an error, yes. I inadvertently gave the answer to heritage trees to be preserved as opposed to the trees that were being removed.
Q. So the answer, you didn't give the answer to what was being removed. You gave the answer to what was being preserved.

Could you go over the DBH sizes, I believe was the question, of what was to be removed or what is proposed to be removed for heritage trees?
A. Yeah. Trees being preserved are eight. The healthy trees being removed are
seven.
I could go through each one, but I did the math, and it turned out that there was two inches of difference when you totaled the preserved trees versus the healthy trees being removed.

We're removing two more additional inches. I mean, $I$ can go through each one if that's --
Q. Why don't you, because you went through each one last time, just to make the record clear.
A. Okay. Yeah. Thirty-inch White Pine; a 34-and-a-half-inch Blue Moss Cypress; a 33-and-a-half-inch Chinese Chestnut; a 45-and-a-half-inch Sugar Maple; a 43-inch White Pine; a 35-inch Copper Beech; and a 30-and-a-half-inch Norway Maple.
Q. Are any of these trees to be removed invasive species?
A. As $I$ mentioned just a minute ago, the Norway Maple tree is considered an invasive species, and we are removing one defined heritage tree as that Norway Maple.
Q. Are any of these trees non-native species?
A. Yes. In fact, the Blue Moss Cypress, the Chinese Chestnut, and the Copper Beech would all be considered non-native.
Q. In the township arborist's review that was marked Exhibit A-9 C, which we had put into the record quite some time ago, did he indicate that Sugar Maples were undesirable due to various conditions?
A. Yes, he did. And basically his quote was "these adverse conditions include Verticillium wilt, Sugar Maple decline, and other tribulations associated with Sugar Maple."

And just kind of to add a bit onto that, I've attended tree conferences in the area where the description of Sugar Maple is that it's becoming a species that is intolerant of a warming environment, so that's the reason why more diseases are afflicting these trees and the arborist community is really beginning to discourage the use of them in our area.
Q. And did the township arborist's review, again marked Exhibit $A-9 \mathrm{C}$ in the record,
confirm that the landscaping plans had met the applicable requirements, including the applicable tree replacement formula?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. Moving on to another topic, you had received some questions. I believe it was from, mostly from some of the parties that live in Tredyffrin Township asking about the effect that tree removal could have on stormwater management.

Are you generally familiar with a project being done by Radnor Township itself at the property it calls the West Wayne Preserve property?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And have you reviewed various materials on the township website about that project?
A. I have.
Q. Have you seen that site recently?
A. I have seen the site, yes.
Q. I don't know if you could bring it up on your screen, but we have an Exhibit A-26.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-26 was marked
for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. There we go. So is this a letter on the township's letterhead that we've marked Exhibit A-26?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And does this talk about the West Wayne Preserve property?
A. It does, and I believe that it's an extremely positive forward-looking project that takes a degraded site of low-quality vegetation and turns it into an asset with really multiple community benefits by way of natural systems, stormwater management, and I believe these benefits will be felt in the community for years to come as this project establishes itself and really again takes that degraded woodland area and allows this to become a canopy of the future.
Q. And so at least in this case, the township felt that removing a substantial number of trees could also help to provide a stormwater management project; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the letter indicates that 406 trees, including 60 healthy trees, would be removed for the stormwater project?
A. That's what's stated in the letter, yes.

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

MR. RICE: Mr. Marlier, any recross? Before we get off of this letter, is it just a one-page letter?

THE WITNESS: Two pages.
MR. RICE: Okay.
MR. BROSEMAN: I can get you copies.
We got it from the township website.
Actually, $I$ have a couple, if you would like it.

MR. RICE: Let's distribute the exhibit. Do you have copies, George?

MR. BROSEMAN: I left without all of my copies, but $I$ just have two, so I apologize for that.

MR. RICE: Mr. Marlier, do you want a copy?

MR. MARIIER: Thank you.

MR. RICE: And we'll have one for the board.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'll get you more copies. I'm sorry about that.

-     -         - 


## RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. Mr. Panzak, good evening. You mentioned the working side of the Hamilton property. What did you mean by that?
A. Well, Mrs. Hamilton loved flowers. She was an active participant in the Flower Show for years and years and had greenhouses and other facilities for forcing and growing plants.
Q. So when you were talking about the working side, were you talking about the current conditions?
A. That's correct, which is the Eagle Road side of the property, roughly splitting the property into halves, the residential side and kind of the working side.
Q. Thank you for the clarification. You were talking about the central location of the
open space being chosen for certain reasons.
Would you agree with me that one of the main reasons you chose the central location for the open space was that the open space has to be contiguous; correct?
A. Yes, plus it featured the large swath of trees that $I$ had mentioned in my previous testimony.
Q. Understood. Understood. You gave some testimony regarding heritage trees, reading from the zoning code, certain sections of the zoning code.

Just to be clear, none of your testimony tonight would conflict with your testimony regarding the number of heritage trees you're removing; correct?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And none of your testimony tonight would conflict with your testimony from the last hearing regarding the number of heritage trees that you're removing from where the footprint of the townhomes will be; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You testified that, in your
experience, typically the discussion of heritage trees and the removal of heritage trees would take place during land development.

Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. But just to be clear, during land development, months down the line, if there was an issue with the removal of certain heritage trees from where the townhomes are supposed to go per your plan, that would be a major issue for the development.

Would you agree with me?
A. Well, I think that as the process goes on, we get together with the shade tree. It's always been a cordial and productive interaction. We typically walk the site.

Shade tree gets to get a visual picture of the condition of these trees, and we will be trying to retain all of the trees that we project to be preserved.

But I think there would be some openness for the possibility of coming to an agreement with the folks charged with preservation of trees in the township, that if
they thought a particular tree should be removed, then we would provide compensation as required by the ordinance and the tree formula.

But it's our intention to retain all of the trees that are being planned for preservation.
Q. I understand. But if you're walking the grounds of this property with the shade tree commission, and they cordially say to you, you're not going to take these three heritage trees down, and say those three heritage trees are in the footprint of where the townhomes are supposed to go, that would significantly change this development as proposed; correct?
A. I think that it's been my experience that we've worked, like $I$ said, worked with the shade tree commission, and we provide all the appropriate paperwork.

There's no absolute prohibition of removal of heritage trees, and it's been my experience that we've never been in a situation where there's been an absolute hard stop on a heritage tree.
Q. So my hypothetical then, you don't
want to answer the hypothetical. Your answer is the hypothetical just simply would not happen?
A. It's not been my experience in all of the experience that we have in dealing with the township and the shade tree advisory.

I think when you come right down to it and you look at these heritage trees, some might say that in the future, really the better option would be to provide compensation for it and allow those trees to, as I've said multiple times, become the canopy of the future and really look to the future, whereas in some cases heritage trees are in decline.

We've talked about some of these trees being invasive, non-native, and in walking the site yesterday, there are defects within these individual trees.

And if we are imagining, like is being done in the West Wayne Preserve, a new environmental reality, you know, having new trees compensating for old trees that may be approaching end of life, maybe the better thing would be to compensate and replant and allow this development to be a positive impact both from a
stormwater management standpoint and a tree replacement standpoint, and then all of these trees would grow in their new spot and have a better chance of canopy fulfillment, I guess I would describe it as.
Q. This canopy fulfillment, canopy of the future, just to be clear, $I$ believe you testified at the last hearing that it would be in decades that this canopy of the future would be fulfilled; correct?
A. Well, $I$ think $I$ referred to that, if you look at one two- to two-and-a-half inch tree, which is what the requirement is, versus a heritage tree.

But, you know, once you've grouped six two- to two-and-a-half inch trees and allow them to be growing in appropriate space, you begin to recapture that canopy loss of the heritage tree, I think, quicker than -- it might be a decade or 15 to 20 years, but by nature of the six-to-one relationship, $I$ think you're going to gain that canopy mass back sooner.
Q. You mentioned in the last few minutes, you focused on the unhealthy trees. Just to be
clear, there are seven healthy heritage trees being removed; correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You testified as to A-9 C, the township arborist's review letter. That township arborist review letter was written in August of 2023; correct?
A. I've got July 29th, 2023.
Q. So it's been since July of 2023. And just to be clear, your A-22, your plan for trees, sheet 13 through 17, was last updated in March of 2024; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You mentioned a plan, a letter marked A-26, the letter that's on the screen now.

Is this West Wayne Preserve property, is this plan that's described in this letter identical to the Hamilton project?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Are there significant differences?
A. Yes. The West Wayne project has no homesite features, no structures.

MR. MARLIER: I have no further
questions, Mr. Rice.

MR. RICE: So we'll go to the residents. And this is recross based on the testimony that was given today, tonight by Mr. Panzak.

So Amber Levy, questions?
MS. LEVY: Yes.

-     -         - 


## EXAMINATION

MS. LEVY: Amber Atwood Levy, Radnor Conservancy. Okay.

Mr. Panzak, how many trees were removed in the $S t$. Honore development that you referenced as a comparison?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, $I$ don't have that number at my disposal right now.

MS. LEVY: Is it comparable?
THE WITNESS: I do know that there were seven healthy heritage trees being removed, and we have seven healthy heritage trees.

MS. LEVY: But the number of trees overall, is that comparable to the number of trees being removed from the site, would
you estimate?
THE WITNESS: I think there were a comparable number, if not a few more.

MS. LEVY: Okay. The other question that $I$ had for you was that --

THE WITNESS: That was a few more on the $S t$. Honore site, rather than our site.

MS. LEVY: Your reference, the term degraded woodlands, talking about the West Wayne Preserve, would you define this as a comparable degraded woodlands?

THE WITNESS: I don't think it's as degraded. I don't know how to define degrees of degraded woodlands, but I believe that our site is degraded, perhaps not to the degree that the West Wayne site was.

MS. LEVY: And on the letter, it said that there were 406 trees to be removed in the West Wayne Preserve, including 60 healthy trees.

Can you remind me again the ratio of healthy trees being removed and the total number being removed at the Hamilton site?

THE WITNESS: Total trees being removed is 225, and healthy trees would be 114.

MS. LEVY: Right. There is a difference there. That is all the questions $I$ have at this time, $I$ think.

One question $I$ did have. Sorry. Damean Snyder of Shreiner Tree Care, do you know if he is TRAQ certified?

THE WITNESS: I do not know the answer to that.

MS. LEVY: Okay. Is that the arborist at Shreiner Tree Care who did the update?

THE WITNESS: Yes, he did.
MS. LEVY: Okay. All right. And when he did the update, were new DBH measurements taken?

THE WITNESS: Would you repeat that, please?

MS. LEVY: Were new DBH measurements taken for every tree when he did the update?

THE WITNESS: He did provide us with DBH updates for each and every tree, yes.

MS. LEVY: All right. And with an official DBH tape?

THE WITNESS: I was not onsite with Mr. Shreiner, so $I$ don't know what the methodology of the DBH measurement was.

MS. LEVY: All right. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Mr. Chawla, any questions?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Clemente?
MR. CLEMENTE: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Curley?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mark Gaeto.

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Cindy Hansen?
MS. HANSEN: No questions.
MR. RICE: Cas Holloway?
MR. HOLLOWAY: Good evening. Cas

Holloway, 241 West Wayne Avenue, Wayne, PA. Good evening, Bern.

THE WITNESS: Good evening.
MR. HOLLOWAY: How many trees are
being removed on the Hamilton site?
THE WITNESS: Total tree removal is 225.

MR. HOLLOWAY: And how many trees are being planted in place of those trees being removed?

THE WITNESS: We are proposing 332 trees. When you total all of the requirements, there are 202 replacement trees, 80 of which are canopy trees.

MR. HOLLOWAY: The lady that was just here, Amber, I believe, asked you if more trees were taken down on our site at St. Honore, and $I$ believe your answer was, yes, you thought.

THE WITNESS: I think I said it was comparable.

MR. HOLLOWAY: We were, our -- the number of trees taken down were under 200 .

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. HOLLOWAY: But we did have a comparable number of replacement trees relative to the number of heritage trees, so I just wanted to be clear.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. HOLLOWAY: I would say it's comparable from the standpoint of you have seven acres and we have five acres. So thank you.

MR. RICE: Mr. Hymel?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Catherine Lafarge?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mary Ann Mahoney?
MS. MAHONEY: No questions.
MR. RICE: Okay. Jennifer Pechet.
MS. PECHET: No, thank you.
MR. RICE: Margaret Ruschmann?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Sareen?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Mr. Satterfield?
MR. SATTERFIELD: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Scheri?
MS. SCHERI: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Schuda?
MR. SCHUDA: Joe Schuda, 14 Forrest Lane.

Mr. Panzak, I believe you mentioned in your testimony that you worked with the shade commission to determine which trees should be saved or rescued or however you want to describe that, but I'm curious about, how do you determine the types of trees that are going to be used for replacement?

THE WITNESS: Well, the township points us to an approved tree list.

We utilize that tree list, and we also feel like there are additional species that
perhaps could be updated to that tree list at some point, and we actively utilize things that we think are positive, native, and good trees that also don't appear on the township's list.

So, you know, I think there's an understanding that not everything on the township list is appropriate, and other things that aren't on the list would be appropriate.

So there's a discussion and agreement at the end of the day as to what species would be appropriate.

We, as has been mentioned, we do have a review letter from the township arborist on the project that we've submitted.

There were comments made by the arborist, one being that he felt like we were using too many Sugar Maples, as it turned out, and that we should balance our species so that there would be less of a percentage of any one species, and we attempted to do that.

So we've responded through this
process to the township arborist's interest and feel like we've got a better plan as a result.

MR. SCHUDA: So if I recall your testimony also, you said there were a number of trees that were not native or indigenous to this area.

THE WITNESS: Are these proposed trees you're referring to?

MR. SCHUDA: No, they're the current ones that are in the -- being removed, $I$ believe.

THE WITNESS: Oh, being removed, right. That's correct.

MR. SCHUDA: And if I understood what you just said correctly would be that in conjunction with the shade tree commission, you would use indigenous native trees and trees that would flourish versus trees that may be indigenous and native but be less -what's the best word to use?

THE WITNESS: Less robust perhaps.
MR. SCHUDA: Less robust.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think we're
constantly trying to put the right tree in the right spot.

There's shade conditions and other microclimatic factors that come into play when we're dealing with a proposed landscape, and we try to be specific about those trees in those locations.

MR. SCHUDA: And with respect to those replacement trees, the size you have mentioned is a two-and-a-half-inch diameter. I couldn't remember the term you used for that.

THE WITNESS: Oh, that's a caliber size.

MR. SCHUDA: Caliber size. Thank you. That caliber size, is there an area of the property that could be planted with larger-caliber trees that would sustain or be sustainable that would provide a more expedient shade or buffer?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think that it's possible, and those are things that, you know, our responsibility here is to prepare a, really a conceptual plan, which has gone
far beyond the concept stage here. So as the process evolves, it's possible.

MR. SCHUDA: And my last question would be relevant to the, you mentioned the West Wayne Preserve. Thank you.

I've noticed and watched that from the initial construction or destruction, however you want to call it, to where it's at now.

They've planted a number of, $I$ don't know if they'd be considered saplings, $I$ don't think so, but somewhat mature trees.

But in that regard, you said that the community would benefit?

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. SCHUDA: I'm curious. What type of benefit, I may be a little bit naive here when $I$ say this, but what type of benefits are you saying the community would accrue?

THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, the obvious one is the stormwater management component of that site.

You know, that's really the purpose
and why there was perhaps a justification to remove the trees that were removed and to start anew there, which is really, I think, part of our thought process here.

Where there is no stormwater management, there would be stormwater management.

And as the, once we start anew, there will be a new and refreshed landscape here that will be appropriate for this site and for the surrounding land uses and neighbors in this community.

MR. SCHUDA: I think that's all I have. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Kaitlin Silver?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Szary?
MR. SZARY: Yes. Gregory Szary, 6 Forrest Lane.

Mr. Panzak, are you aware of Radnor Township's Zoning Ordinances, I believe
it's Article XIX, Density Modification Development?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
MR. SZARY: Okay. And are you aware that in Section 208-90, objectives and interpretations, under item $A(2), I$ guess it would be, are you aware that the sentence reads, the purpose of this, the objectives are:

To encourage land development which preserves trees, along with several other elements.

THE WITNESS: Exactly what section and line are you referring to?

MR. SZARY: A (2).
MR. RICE: Let me just, so it's clear, because I think what was said was 208 . It's 280-90 A(2), is what Mr. Szary was reading:

To encourage land development which preserves trees and natural topography, prevents soil erosion, and promotes the best interests of the township from an aesthetic, ecological, and natural resource
standpoint.
Mr. Szary, that's the section you're referring to?

MR. SZARY: That is. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: So it's 280-90 --
MR. RICE: A (2).
THE WITNESS: And the question was?
MR. SZARY: Are you aware of that section of the code --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Yes.
MR. SZARY: -- that requires preserving trees?

Do you see anywhere where it says to replace trees?

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to object. It doesn't say "requires preserving trees." It says "to encourage."

MR. RICE: Well, okay.
MR. SZARY: It's an objective, the following objectives. So the objective --

MR. RICE: Mr. Szary, hold on. Hold on.

MR. SZARY: I'm sorry.
MR. RICE: Let's deal with the
objection.
So just rephrase your question specifically what you want to ask Mr. Panzak.

MR. SZARY: So the Radnor Township ordinances specifically state "to encourage land development which preserves trees."

Am I reading that correctly?
THE WITNESS: Yes, you are.
MR. SZARY: And do you see anywhere in here where it indicates that trees can be replaced?

THE WITNESS: Well, the ordinance has a prescription for tree replacement, and we're going with that. We did the best we could with preservation of trees.

We believe we've preserved a fair amount of trees across the site, and we're replacing those trees according to the ordinance requirements.

MR. SZARY: Yes. I believe that there are other sections of the zoning ordinance that allows replacement of trees.

However, in the section about density
modification development, which is really the crux of this problem, do you see anywhere where it says replacement of trees?

THE WITNESS: I don't look at a zoning ordinance completely in a vacuum, and there are preservation requirements that we feel we've honored, and we've provided compensatory plantings for those items, those trees that are being removed.

MR. SZARY: Okay.
MR. RICE: Mr. Panzak, answer the question, because he's just asking you about this part of the ordinance.

Is there any reference in there or not?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe there's a reference to tree replacement.

MR. BROSEMAN: He should be allowed to explain though. This is sort of --

MR. RICE: But he's not explaining, George.

MR. BROSEMAN: This is sort of a misleading --

MR. RICE: He's not. He's not answering. It's a simple question.

MR. BROSEMAN: These are misleading though, because Mr. Szary first tried to suggest it was a requirement, and he's trying to suggest that there are no other requirements.

MR. RICE: Mr. Szary is not a lawyer, and the witness is not answering the question. It's a simple question, yes or no or $I$ don't know.

MR. BROSEMAN: But he can explain.
MR. RICE: But he wasn't explaining. He was talking about the tree removal ordinance, not what he was asked about.

So, Mr. Szary, do you have another question?

MR. SZARY: Yes, I do. Same section of the code, 280-95, Site Considerations.

Under section $A$, line item three, are you aware of this section that states:

Location of trees and other natural features must be given first consideration in planning common open space, location of
dwellings, walkways, pavings, et cetera.
THE WITNESS: Yes, $I$ am, and I believe --

MR. SZARY: Was this used in conjunction with the land plan?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I believe my testimony earlier this evening stated that when we set out on the planning journey, we have a multitude of factors that come to bear on any land development design, and once we synthesized all of that information and then went back to the site, we realized that our open space requirements would be well served if we were to preserve the center section, which $I$ described as a significant stand of trees on the property.

MR. SZARY: Am I allowed to ask for an exhibit to be displayed, the exhibit that Mr. Panzak is looking at right now?

MR. RICE: Sure. What exhibit are we talking about? Do we have a number for it, Mr. Szary?

MR. SZARY: Exhibit A-22.
THE WITNESS: Sheet 13 of 17.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to object.
We did not cover this in the redirect.
Mr. Szary had an opportunity to do a cross-examination the last time.

MR. RICE: The objection is overruled.
I mean, there was discussion about the number of trees that will be planted.

This is the tree inventory. This is what you want to see. Which sheet, Mr. Szary?

MR. SZARY: Sheet 13 of 17.
MR. RICE: Okay. That's the front page of the exhibit.

MR. SZARY: Yes. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Ask your question.
MR. SZARY: So, Mr. Panzak, you had mentioned seven heritage trees would be removed. Can you identify their location on this plan?

THE WITNESS: I certainly can, but it might take a little time.

MR. SZARY: Let me help make it quicker.

Are any of those heritage trees
located at the location of any dwellings, pavements, or walkways?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SZARY: That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Sharon and David Willis?
MS. WILLIS: No questions.
MR. RICE: Cheryl Lutz?
(No response.)

MR. RICE: Okay. Any other board questions for Mr. Panzak?

MR. RILEY: Yes. Sorry.

-     -         - 

EXAMINATION

MR. RILEY: The last time we were here, somebody brought up about the trees, and then there were also comments there's no stormwater management there right now.

But most people these days consider trees for stormwater management. They help. So this site, it has trees on it
right now.
But it does have flooding issues to the people that live downstream, downhill from the site that are here.

The trees that are on there, like if they were all gone and it's, say, dirt there and it rains, would we have more flooding or less flooding?

THE WITNESS: Well, if there was nothing there, it would certainly run off faster, which may give the perception of more flooding.

MR. RILEY: Yes, right, because there wouldn't be trees there to help; right? The roots of the trees go down in the ground and help infiltrate the water.

So, I know, I went to engineering school umpteen years ago. They didn't talk about it, but now they do.

I know Penn State extension has courses in it and talks about the trees and the amount that it helps every year stormwater management. It's just a natural way to do it.

And it's really hard, even as an engineer, it's hard to beat nature. So it helps to keep the trees there. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Does that complete Mr.
Panzak's testimony?
MR. BROSEMAN: Could I ask one follow up based on Mr. Riley's question?

MR. RICE: Sure.
MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Bern, Mr. Riley just gave you a hypothetical that if -- basically removing the trees and having dirt there.

There is on the property, according to sheet $A-12$, sheet four, I'm looking at the chart, there is 83,643 square feet of impervious coverage on the site, and under his hypothetical, that would be removed as well.

So if that would be removed, there would be less runoff as a result of that removal; correct?
A. Yes, that be would correct. There would be more permeability as a result of, you know, anything -- everything being removed from the site.

MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.
MR. RILEY: One more question.

## EXAMINATION

MR. RILEY: Grass, infiltration of grass, like if there was grass, it might be like two, maybe four inches, or like ten inches. Some studies done at Penn State state that.

So removing the trees, just removing the trees, leaving the rest as grass or whatever, would there be more flooding when it rains?

THE WITNESS: I can honestly say I'm not a stormwater expert when it comes to how much stormwater might be derived from a tree.

What $I$ do know is that we provided significant design, stormwater management,
according to the Radnor Township ordinances.

And that, in combination with the rather robust tree replacement and other landscape code requirements, we are going to rebuild that canopy and, you know, within a fairly short time, I believe, we're going to rejuvenate the canopy that you suggest would be removed.

MR. RILEY: The last time we were here, you said it was going to take 30 to 50 years to get back to the way the trees are now. We're talking about heritage trees.

Is that still the case?
THE WITNESS: Well, as I stated earlier this evening, $I$ believe what $I$ was referring to was one tree at two, two and a half inches versus a heritage tree.

When you start to couple six new trees in the right spot in an open site where they're allowed to grow to their full capacity, $I$ think that combination is stronger than the one-to-one comparison,
and $I$ believe that we can achieve that canopy sooner than this 30- to 50-year cycle.

MR. RILEY: Yeah. And I understand because you want six, but two to three inch compared to 30 inch, I'd like to figure out the area of the circle there or the squaring rate compared to this tiny little one that we're squaring.

THE WITNESS: Right, but this is not a static condition. Our trees and our plants are growing.

They're going to be arrayed in locations that will be appropriate to the new features.

And this will be a site that gets kind of resolved for the next 50 to 70 to 100 years, we'd like to think, with new canopy.

MR. RILEY: Thank you.
MR. RICE: I think we've completed Mr. Panzak's testimony.

Mr. Broseman, you have another witness? We'll take about five minutes before we start.

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, that would be good, and I could get organized. Thank you.

MR. RICE: You have one more witness here; correct?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: All right. We'll take a break.

-     -         - 

(Recess taken at 7:42 p.m., resuming proceedings at 7:57 as follows:)

-     -         - 

THE PRESIDENT: All right. We're going to get started again.

MR. RICE: Mr. Broseman, you have another witness. Let's have him sworn in.

ERIK W. HETZEL,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Erik Hetzel, E-R-I-K H-E-T-Z-E-L.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Erik, would you describe your educational and professional background?
A. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in geography and planning and a Master in regional planning, the bachelor degree from West Chester University, the master's from University Pennsylvania, and I've been working for 30 years as a professional planner.
Q. And we have what I've marked as Exhibit A-17.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-17 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN:
Q. Is this a written summary of your background?
A. It is. I would add that I'm also a member of the American Planning Association, and I've been a certified planner as a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners since
2001.
Q. Is this A-17 that I've handed out, this is a summary of some of your professional background?
A. It is.
Q. Have you been recognized as an expert witness as a land planner before numerous municipal bodies, including zoning hearing boards and governing bodies, like the board of commissioners?
A. I have.
Q. Have you previously been recognized as an expert witness by the board of commissioners?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'd like to offer Mr.
Hetzel as an expert in the field of land planning.

MR. RICE: Mr. Marlier, any questions?
MR. MARLIER: No questions.
MR. RICE: He will be accepted as an expert witness as a land planner.

MR. BROSEMAN: Thank you.
BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. Erik, have you been engaged by the
applicant in connection with this conditional use application?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Are you generally familiar with the property that is the subject of this application, as well as the general area?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And are you generally familiar with the proposed conditional use plans for the redevelopment of the property that are the subject of this hearing?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Have you observed prior conditional use hearings that have been held on this application?
A. I have.
Q. In Code Section 280-135, there's some general conditional use provisions, in particular, 280-135.G provides that a development impact statement should be submitted along with a conditional use application; is that correct?
A. It is.
Q. And did you prepare a fiscal impact analysis memorandum that was incorporated into
the development impact statement that is part of Applicant's Exhibit A-1?
A. I did.
Q. And that impact analysis memo, the original one was dated $5-17,2023$, that is in A-1?
A. That's correct.
Q. Have you recently updated that fiscal impact analysis memo?
A. I did. It's dated March 18th, 2024.
Q. And I'm going to hand you a copy and then hand out additional copies.

Is this document that updated memo?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Why did you update the fiscal impact memo?
A. I wanted to use more current Radnor Township and Radnor Township School District budget documents.

I wanted to use the current tax rates and the current common level ratio when establishing assessed values and the taxable rates that will be applied here.
Q. And did you update any other
information?
A. I also updated the anticipated sale prices for the proposed dwelling units. I believe they're more consistent with what the current market is exhibiting right now.
Q. And was this fiscal impact analysis that you have prepared including, and I'm going to be talking now about Exhibit $A-18$, was this prepared in accordance with generally-accepted practices for fiscal impact analysis for proposed land development projects?
A. It was.
(Applicant's Exhibit A-18 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. BROSEMAN :
Q. And did you utilize this methodology in other analyses that you've prepared in Radnor Township?
A. I have. It's the per capita multiplier method that was developed and published by the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research published in several
different books, one being the New Practitioner's Guide to Fiscal Analysis and the Development Impact Assessment Handbook, and it's customarily used by land planners as an order of magnitude gauge of the impacts of development from a fiscal perspective on townships and school districts and municipalities overall.
Q. And could you review the analysis that you did at Exhibit A-18?
A. Sure.
Q. And you might want to put something up on the screen, $I$ understand, as part of A-18.
A. Yes. This is the summary table that is contained on the last page of Exhibit A-18. It's a concise summary. The narrative of the memorandum explains how these numbers were estimated.

Just going through line by line, the top section summarizes the background assumptions, the number of units being 38 residential units.

The value per unit assumption $I$ used was $\$ 1.75$ million per unit, times 38 , gets you a total market value of $\$ 66.5$ million.

The assessed value is estimated by applying the Delaware County common level ratio to the market value to arrive at $\$ 43.75$ million. That's the basis on which the taxes are levied in the township and the school district.

Next summarizes the population profile of the proposed development. We're projecting there would be 84 new people residing here on this property, including eight school-aged children that would be attending Radnor Township School District.

The next section shows the revenues and costs that are projected to accrue to Radnor Township.

Starting first with the real estate tax, applying the millage rate that's noted there to the assessed value, $\$ 106,597$ in real estate tax revenues.

Non-property tax revenues would include things like permits, fees, fines, and things that would occur on an annual basis.

The real estate transfer tax is a one percent tax that is paid to the township every time a unit sells.

We're estimating that five percent of the units would sell each year to get to that number. Summing those up, we're looking at total township revenues of $\$ 192,741$.

Next we move on to the township cost calculation. I mentioned that's based on a per capita cost model.

And to arrive at per capita cost per resident in the township, I examined the township budgets and the relative mix of land uses to establish a per capita cost per resident versus per capita cost per nonresident. That would be employees working in the township.

So it is tailored to the way the township currently spends its money today to provide services to residential land uses.

In this particular analysis, I considered 100 percent of the general fund expenses to arrive at a per capita multiplier per resident of $\$ 1,010.05$.

Extending that across the 84 proposed residents establishes a township annual expense of approximately $\$ 84,000$ a year to service the new residents in the development.

Subtracting that from the township revenues arrives at the net positive township fiscal impact of $\$ 107,897$.

Moving down to the Radnor Township School District section, the real estate tax revenue is levied at that millage rate indicated there, 14.6329 mills, to arrive at tax revenue on an annual basis of $\$ 640,189$.

We have a modest amount of non-property tax revenues that's generated by things like activity fees and the like.

Again, these numbers come from the way that the school district spends its money according to its most current budget document.

Intergovernmental revenues are noted. They're calculated on a per capita student basis based on the annual revenues that the district receives from state and federal sources.

And then the real estate transfer tax, similar to the township calculation, we assume five percent turnover of properties a year once it's been fully stabilized and fully occupied.

The district levies the real estate transfer tax at a half of a percent.

Adding those revenues up together, you get $\$ 700,633$ in school district revenues on an annual basis, and again the expenditure or the cost number for the school district was calculated on a per capita basis once again by establishing a cost per student.

By looking at the school district budget document, dividing the total enrollment into that total expenditure number in the budget document, we arrive at a per student cost of $\$ 32,179$ per school-aged child attending the school district.

Together that results in a net impact to the school district, net positive fiscal benefit of $\$ 443,198$ per year.

Adding those township and school district benefits together yields a total net annual fiscal impact to the combined taxing authorities of over $\$ 551,000$ annually.
Q. You mentioned that you projected the school-aged children.

Is it possible that if there were school-age children in this development, that they would not go to the Radnor School District?
A. That's correct. There's a certain percentage of students in the school district that attend private schools or other educational facilities.
Q. And if that were the case, then there would obviously not be any cost to the Radnor School District for any, typically for any student that went to a private school, for example?
A. That is correct. So for every student that doesn't attend Radnor Township schools, you would see an increase in the net fiscal impact of \$32,179 or somewhere thereabouts order of magnitude.

I do believe that there is some responsibility for busing of students that the school district accounts for, so that number could vary, but in general, it's meant to be an order of magnitude impact assessment.
Q. But you didn't take any credit or reduce any of the projections based on the fact that they might not all go to the school district; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If your values were higher than 1,750,000, would that be a more positive, tend to be a more positive fiscal impact?
A. It would be.
Q. Since the time of the application, have you gotten any information from the Radnor School District about the actual experience of the school district with school-aged children that live in other townhome communities in the township?
A. I did. There's actually a paragraph in the report that speaks to that.

I spoke to the transportation
department of the school district on March 7th just to understand the amount of school-aged children that are generated by similar developments in the township, and I picked five developments comprising a total of 39 units that we believe to be comparable, at least in form and cost or value profile, to the proposed.

Out of those 39 units, there were only three school-aged children that the transportation department considers in their provision of services to those communities.

That relates to a demographic
multiplier of 0.077 students, school-aged children per residential unit.

The number $I$ used, again it came from a Rutgers University study specific to single-family attached housing in Pennsylvania.

That was 0.21 school-aged children per unit, which is somewhat higher than the reality in the units that the school district reported to me in Radnor Township.
Q. And what were those developments that were considered?
A. We looked at 11 units at Villa Strafford, eight units at Wayne Walk, six units at Jardin, eight units at Wicklow Court, and six units at Bloomingdale Avenue. They're all single-family attached projects.
Q. In your professional opinion, will the proposed redevelopment have adverse fiscal impacts that would not normally be associated with a similar townhome development?
A. No, it wouldn't. In fact, I think anecdotal evidence notes that, to me, that what I've seen, that this type of development would
probably have less of an impact than one of a lower-value profile where you may have more school-aged children attending schools or larger families living in them.
Q. I'd like to turn to some other topics. Code Section 280-135.G(1) (a) addresses consistency of the proposed use with the Radnor Township Comprehensive Plan.

Are you generally familiar with the current Radnor Township Comprehensive Plan?
A. I am.
Q. And in your professional opinion, is the proposed use generally consistent with the Radnor Township Comprehensive Plan?
A. I believe it is, yes.
Q. And would you give some examples?
A. Sure. Looking at the current version of the township comprehensive plan, Page VI of the executive summary, item six notes a goal to undertake a variety of strategies to preserve and/or increase housing density and diversity in appropriate locations, and one of the mechanisms to do that is to, quote, "allow for increased housing density immediately surrounding
commercial areas and particularly near transit centers."

And this property exhibits that characteristic. It's directly adjacent to two commercial facilities, and it's located in very close proximity to the train station.

Another plan goal and objective is noted on page 25 of the executive summary.

That would be to accommodate reasonable growth using innovative growth management techniques such as transit-oriented development, traditional neighborhood design, and other flexible design techniques that harmonize with and enhance the existing community.

I believe this proposal is consistent with that goal using the density modification provision of the $R-4$ underlying zoning district.

Moving further into the plan, there is
a goal to promote conservation development strategies for new development on large parcels.

I believe that the density
modification provisions promote that at this location insofar as they require the open space that we're providing, and that open space is
provided as a direct result of that density modification provision.
Q. Thank you. Moving to another code provision, 280-135.G(1) (e) addresses the proposed use's impact on nearby commercial facilities within the township and surrounding municipalities.

What is your professional opinion as to the impact of the proposed use on nearby commercial facilities?
A. I think the increased residential density at this location would have a beneficial impact on surrounding and nearby commercial facilities in that it would be providing additional customer base to patronize those facilities.
Q. And, in fact, this property is immediately adjacent to the Eagle Village Shops; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And a pathway is provided to provide easy access from the residence to that commercial center; is that correct?
A. That's correct. And I believe that
the sidewalks that are being provided also open that access up to the surrounding community to access the commercial facilities that are adjacent to this proposed development.
Q. Code Section 280-135.G(1) (g) addresses impact on police and fire protection.

Was that covered in your memo?
A. It was. I noted on page four of the memo that there would be very minimal projected demand for public safety services to be provided to the facility.

Based on published demand factors again from Rutgers University, they were the best factors I had available to me, but they all indicate very fractional demand increases as a result of the proposed development.

And the comp plan notes on page 93 that historically Radnor Township has a low crime rate and is known as a safe place to live.

So I believe that this is a compatible type of a land use within a community that exhibits that type of a safety profile.
Q. Code Section 280-135.G(1) also addresses the proposed use's impact on the
township's open space and recreational
facilities.
What is your professional opinion as to the impact of the proposed use on the township's open space and recreational facilities?
A. The proposed use will be, will contain its own open space for passive recreation enjoyment by the residents onsite. So, I mean, they wouldn't need to go elsewhere for that.

Not to say that they wouldn't, but they would have that directly available to them, whereas another type of use could be developed at this location within the existing zoning that wouldn't require such open space.
Q. In your professional opinion, will the proposed redevelopment have any greater impact on the township's open space and recreational facilities than would normally be associated with a similar townhome development?
A. I believe it would not have any greater impact than a similar townhome community.
Q. The Code Section 280-135.G(1)(i)
addresses impact on the character of the
surrounding neighborhood.
In your professional opinion, is the proposed use consistent with the character of the neighborhood?
A. I believe that it is, and I believe it's consistent with the township's vision for this locale, the way that they have chosen to zone it based on the goals of the comp plan allowing for the use of flexible design techniques that would promote harmony with the surrounding uses.

I believe that this type of development at this location forms a nice transition between the commercial, more intense use and a lower-density residential use.

By introducing residential use here at a slightly higher density, it represents that sort of a transitional use zone.
Q. And, in fact, the zoning ordinance specifically allows townhomes by conditional use as part of density modification in the $R-4$ district on a tract that's five acres or more; is that right?
A. That's correct, and there's over seven
acres here.
Q. And does the fact that the project has the large common open space in the location central and abutting Strafford Avenue also inform your professional opinion on consistency with the character of the neighborhood?
A. Yes, it does. And also I'd like to note that the proposed development preserves the existing streetscape and enhances it with appropriate landscaping plantings.

There's only two curb cuts, the proposed driveways onto Strafford Avenue, whereas an alternative form of development could significantly alter the character of the streetscape in a way that is different from what is proposed.
Q. And does the fact that the plan has a significant amount of landscaping, including buffer provisions as was described by Mr. Panzak, also support your opinion?
A. It does. There's buffers provided along the Grant Avenue side and Forrest Lane, as well as a buffer along the commercial portion of the site.
Q. In your professional opinion, will the proposed redevelopment have any greater impact on the character of the surrounding neighborhood than would normally be expected with a similar townhome development?
A. No, it won't.

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

MR. RICE: Okay. Mr. Marlier, cross.
$\qquad$
CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. You testified a lot to, Mr. Hetzel, to your conclusions and your findings on the last page. I'd like to further understand how you got to these a little bit more specifically.

Is your testimony -- and keep in mind, I just got your report this evening. But is your testimony assuming three-bedroom units?
A. It is.
Q. And how many occupants?
A. Eighty-four. That would be 2.2 persons per unit.
Q. It's your testimony that these 38 townhomes will have on average just over two people in each?
A. 2.22 , correct, yes.
Q. And how many vehicles at each property is that assuming?
A. I can't speak to that. I'm not a traffic expert.
Q. So that wasn't part of your analysis?
A. That was not part of my analysis.
Q. And what is the footage of each townhome that you made your calculations?
A. I didn't base it on square footage. I based it on the number of bedrooms, which is how the methodology assesses population. It's based on bedrooms and unit type and value.
Q. And a three-bedroom unit, if we're looking at these houses, the square footage, your testimony has been, $I$ believe around 3,000 square feet; correct?
A. I'll take your word for it.
Q. These are large townhomes; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And your testimony is that there's
only three bedrooms, but there certainly could be more; correct?
A. There could be. I also, in anticipation of the question, $I$ looked at if it were a four-bedroom townhome.

Assuming all of the units were four bedrooms, $I$ believe the traffic analysis used a number of a mix of three and four, is the number that I recall.

If we assume that all units were four bedrooms, the number of persons per unit would go up from 2.22 per unit to 2.95 persons per unit, which under this analysis would add about 28 people, equating to about $\$ 28,000$ additional in public costs, which would reduce the fiscal impact by about 28,000, from 107,000 down to maybe 89,000 net positive impact per year.
Q. Are any of those numbers that you just went over in your report?
A. They're not, but $I$ can furnish them, if you would like me to.
Q. And when you're thinking of bedrooms, three bedrooms in these townhomes, are you contemplating that the basements could be used
for a bedroom?
A. I'm not contemplating how they use the interior space. I'm just contemplating how many bedrooms it may be.
Q. Are you contemplating how large the bedrooms could be?
A. No.
Q. You have updated the sales prices, I believe, in your analysis, because I think everyone in this room knows the housing market is pretty thriving right now; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. When you're looking at a projection of how much these townhomes would sell for, do you take into account whether the home can have a backyard?
A. I look at comparable similar developments in terms of configuration, community, size, things like that, so it's really more based on the fact that it's a single-family attached unit, and $I$ would say that the way the open space is configured could be considered a premium element to this type of development.
Q. Are the -- I believe you mentioned
five developments, correct, that you looked at five other developments?
A. I looked at five developments on the basis of school-aged children, that's correct.
Q. In those five developments, do those townhomes, do any of them not have backyards?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Looking at those townhomes, do any of them not have the ability to have patios?
A. I don't know.

MR. BROSEMAN: What did you say? I didn't catch that.

MR. MARLIER: The question asked, was he contemplating -- do any of those developments have patios?

MR. BROSEMAN: Oh, patios. Thank you.
I couldn't hear.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know. BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. Looking at those other townhomes, the comparables, do any of them not have back steps out of the house?
A. I don't know. None of those elements were really aspects that the methodology
considers in these types of projections.
Q. Well, when you're buying a home, people are going to be looking for a backyard; is that correct?
A. Not everybody necessarily. I think it's a matter of personal preference.
Q. Certainly it's something that can increase the value of the home; correct?
A. I think the value can also be increased by not having a backyard and having that be something that's not a maintenance element for the homeowner.
Q. Well, I mean, if you have school-aged children, most people would trade off the maintenance for having a backyard for their children to play in; correct?
A. I suppose that could be true.
Q. You mentioned you have a study for the four bedrooms; correct? You were stating a few minutes ago you didn't put it in your memo, but you did run those numbers?
A. I did.
Q. Did you do that for, run numbers for a five-bedroom townhome?
A. I did not, because $I$ don't believe that I have multipliers for that. I think the Rutgers multipliers top out at four bedrooms per single-family attached unit.
Q. Do you have studies available for single-family homes, detached homes?
A. I have not conducted that study on this.
Q. So again, just getting these exhibits tonight, not being able to review it, can you state what the sale price would be, the average sale price would be for the homes, in your opinion?
A. Could you clarify?
Q. Sure. I believe that you testified again with regard to the sale price, the average sale price of a home. Do you have those numbers for these houses?
A. I'm estimating $\$ 1.75$ million per unit.
Q. So that's over twice as much as in Hamilton-1?
A. I'd have to go back and look at my analysis, but this is a different market, a different time, and different comparables to be
considered here. It's a different format of development.
Q. Do you remember, you did -- I should lay some foundation. You did testify in Hamilton-1; correct?
A. I did, but that was a couple of years ago.
Q. I totally understand. But you didn't review the transcripts from Hamilton-1?
A. Not for this hearing.
Q. If I told you that in Hamilton-1 you testified that the price point of the homes, in your opinion, would lead to smaller families occupying them, does that refresh your recollection? Do you remember that testimony?
A. I vaguely remember that testimony.
Q. If these homes are now developed --

MS. AGNEW: Excuse me. Could you read
back that question? Could you read it back, read back the question?
(The Court Reporter read back as follows:
"Question: If I told you that in

Hamilton-1 you testified that the price point of the homes, in your opinion, would lead to smaller families occupying them, does that refresh your recollection? Do you remember that testimony?")

MS. AGNEW: Thank you.
BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. So you would agree, obviously, that the sale price has changed, the projected sale price has changed dramatically in the last three years?
A. Along with the market.
Q. Understood. Understood. What impact would that have, a home selling for twice as much, what impact would that have on the number of school-aged children? Would it go down? Would it go up?
A. I don't believe it would have much of an impact. I think you've got number of bedrooms. You have the housing type.

You have the pattern, the population pattern that's exhibited by five other developments in the township that $I$ would
consider similar.
I think there are a lot of factors that contribute to that, not just price.
Q. You mentioned in your testimony there would be 84 new residents on the property. How many currently, how many residents are there currently?
A. I didn't factor in how many residents would be there currently. I guess the more correct statement would be 84 residents would be living here under the projections estimated using the multipliers that $I$ used.

So that's not a net number. I'm not taking any discount for residents that are there today. That's just replacing what's there today with what is proposed.
Q. And your testimony is that there would be one student per five homes roughly, if I'm doing the math correctly?
A. That's correct.
Q. Why so low? Why is it that there wouldn't be more students at the property, in your opinion?
A. In my opinion, $I$ think if you look
around at a lot of developments like this, you may have people living in them that are empty nesters.

They don't want to downsize, but they want to move out of a house that has lots of maintenance requirements.

They may only be here several months of the year. If they're retired, they may spend some time elsewhere.

They may be young professionals with the means to afford such a home that don't have families yet.

That's sort of been an observation that $I$ had looking at similar communities in the area.

It's just a different family structure than might be in a single-family detached house or a smaller single-family attached or that would be in an existing older community that was built 40 years ago.
Q. So the five other developments that you looked at, if we looked at those, we would see, according to your projections, you believe in those five homes, there would be one student
per five properties?
A. I was told by the school district transportation department. They didn't get down to that granular of a level as to which of those communities might have had more or fewer children.

The bottom line is, out of those 39 units in those five communities, there are only three school-aged kids that the school's transportation department has accounted for.
Q. You testified that the housing was a transition, correct, from commercial to residential?
A. In terms of use and intensity.
Q. But just to be clear, it's surrounded by residential on three sides; correct?
A. It's got commercial on two sides, I believe.
Q. Which sides are those?
A. The east and the south.
Q. Eagle on one side; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You have Strafford on the other?
A. Correct.
Q. You have Grant on the other?
A. Right.
Q. So the commercial is on the southern side?
A. Generally southern and -- I guess I can't picture the north arrow in my head, but it's towards the south, closer to Lancaster Avenue, which is where more of the dense commercial development exists.

As you move away from Lancaster Avenue, that's where the residential land use pattern begins to take hold.
Q. And I understand it's your testimony this is a transition, but if you're Mr. Szary and you live down near Grant and Forrest, on the bottom left of the plans we keep looking at, he's right up against the property right now, and it's wooded residential, and now it's going to have townhomes.

Would you consider that more transitional for Mr. Szary than it is now?
A. I would consider it transitional as expressed in the policy guidance of the township, both in the aspirational context of the comp plan
and in the zoning policy that was enacted as a result of that comp plan.

MR. MARLIER: If $I$ can just have a minute to bring up an exhibit.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. Mr. Hetzel, what we've done is we projected, -and thank you, Mr. Broseman, for helping with this -- projected $A-16$, what's been previously marked as A-16 up onto the screen. Have you reviewed this plan?
A. I've seen it in the context of these hearings, but $I$ haven't reviewed this in the course of my analysis, no.
Q. In your opinion, is this a viable plan?
A. Again, $I$ can't really opine on it. I think if it can comply with the zoning provisions, $I$ suppose it could be a viable plan.
Q. It's a little difficult to see, but lots 19 and 20 , you have a U-shaped road, 19 and 20, thank you, are in the middle, the bottom two.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm going to object.
Mr. Hetzel didn't prepare this plan. He didn't testify about it.

And he said he's really not done analysis of it, so $I$ don't think it's proper scope of cross-exam.

MR. RICE: Well, let's hear what the question is first.

BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. If you look at 19 and 20, they're roughly one-third of the size of lot 14 , which is over to the right. In your professional experience, is that a practical plan?

You have two lot sizes in the same development that are a third of the size of other lots. Is that feasible? Is that sellable?

MR. BROSEMAN: I renew my objection. He didn't testify about this plan.

MR. RICE: Mr. Marlier, when you ask him if it's feasible, you mean in terms of layout?

Because the testimony from Mr.
Hetzel's been about the tax implications vis-a-vis services, school district services, township services.

So if your question has to do with that, let's go there, but otherwise, he
didn't draft it. He's not an engineer.
MR. MARLIER: Well, my questions are focused on the sellability.

He's testifying to how much these properties are going to cost, what the townhomes are going to sell for and the benefit to being able to sell those townhomes in the plan that they have proposed and all the benefits that's going to give to the township.

To me, the applicant --
MR. RICE: The feasibility is, are these lots feasible to be sold in the current market?

MR. MARIIER: Correct. Correct. That might be a better way of saying it.

MR. RICE: Okay.
BY MR. MARLIER:
Q. If you look at lot 19 and 20 relative to lot 14, Mr. Hetzel, is it feasible in the current market to sell 19 and 20 when they're roughly a third of the size of lot $13 ?$
A. I don't know. I haven't looked at single-family developments like this in this
market in this configuration.
I suppose it could be. There could be other ways to add premiums to lots that make them more sellable.

I just don't have enough information about this plan to really render an effective opinion on that.
Q. Understood, but your client brought in this plan. This was an exhibit that they put into the record, or marked at least.

And they must have marked it for a reason, that there's an alternate plan of some sort of single-family detached homes.

So I'm asking you as the expert on fiscal studies and fiscal impact if this plan is even feasible or sellable in this market?
A. Again, $I$ don't know, because $I$ haven't reviewed it in that context.

MR. MARLIER: I have no further questions.

MR. RICE: I'm going to go to resident questions.

Amber Levy?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MS. LEVY: Amber Atwood Levy, the Radnor Conservancy.

During the testimony, you described that the configuration of open space could be considered a premium element.

Could you please define "premium element"?

THE WITNESS: I think it provides an amenity that might not otherwise exist under a different design configuration that could be done under the existing zoning.

I think any time you have a contiguous open space like that, that most people would consider that to be a neighborhood benefit.

MS. LEVY: And what in particular about this open space contributes to the premium element?

THE WITNESS: It's accessible, easily accessible to all units. Everybody in the community can use it, in this neighborhood can use it.

It has the potential to be designed in a way that is attractive and preserves natural features in a naturalistic environment for the enjoyment of passive open space for residents.

MS. LEVY: And the mature trees have a positive property valuation; correct? They raise that premium element and have a positive valuation?

THE WITNESS: I have not evaluated the value of trees and the impact they have on houses, but open space and healthy habitat that has safe and healthy vegetation can also have that premium that maybe a healthy large tree could have as well in terms of limiting it to large trees, but small trees as well.

MS. LEVY: Thank you.
MR. RICE: Mr. Clemente?
MR. CLEMENTE: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Curley?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

Norma Gerrity Reporting Service

MR. RICE: Mr. Gaeto?
MR. CURLEY: Brian Curley, 136
Fairfield Lane, Radnor.
Mr. Hetzel, in your fiscal impact study, there's quite a few lines in there about revenue and only one line in each section about expenditures.

You reference a study at Rutgers that you used as the basis for figuring expenditures, and the number $I$ wrote down was $\$ 1,010.05$ per person per year.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. CURLEY: I'm a Radnor resident. Could you give me an example, with your professional opinion, of the types of expenses that $I$ cause the township or a person would cause the township? Give me some items.

THE WITNESS: Bear with me. I'm just going to bring up the township budget where I derived that from.

So the number that $I$ used, what I'm looking at, $I$ don't have a printout with me of the 2024 general fund budget.

I'm looking at the 2023 one that I used for the previous analysis, which is very similar.

The township has total expenses in the 2024 budget of nearly $\$ 40$ million annually, and that includes things like wages and compensation for township administration, payroll liabilities, employee development, supplies and materials, contract services, utilities, fleet, community organizations, capital outlay.

I think there's probably public safety in there as well, all the things that it takes to run a township.

We just assume that the new development will utilize those services at the same rate that all the existing population in the township does today.

And there were no discounts taken for certain things that may not be used to the same extent, because development is kind of incremental.

You're not going to add more commissioners just because you added 38
more people.
MR. CURLEY: So would there be an impact to expenditures based on the fact this big development is going to have some significant stormwater maintenance items, one specific about the need to check the drainage areas for the basins after a one-inch storm?

So if, say, on a yearly basis we had a one-inch storm once a month, do you think that the cost of a township employee going out to inspect that and the township's responsibility to make sure that the stormwater plan is working, is that accounted for?

Do you think that's accounted for in \$1,010, or do you think it's even accounted for in your expenditure?

THE WITNESS: I actually think the \$1,010 number is a bit high. I think it's conservatively high.

I don't think it's going to -- I don't think that every person in the township today necessarily costs that much money.

Oftentimes in fiscal impact analyses we'll reduce elements of expenses to account for the fact that new residents don't necessarily incur additional costs for certain functions.

It's my belief that by using the full general fund expenditures of $\$ 39,680$, that we have taken a more conservative cost approach.

MR. CURLEY: And you noted that this was a study done at Rutgers University out of New Jersey, and you indicated that your professional background is the University of Pennsylvania in Pennsylvania.

So would there be any reason why the University of Pennsylvania wouldn't have something more local for that?

THE WITNESS: There is nothing local about it. It's really, things like multipliers and market values are local factors.

Methodologies like per capita assessment of costs or proportion of value of costs are just that, they're models.

And that methodology is customarily used all over the country by planning agencies and planning consultants supporting public agencies and private landowners as well.

MR. CURLEY: And they would all use the same Rutgers study that you used?

THE WITNESS: They would use that methodology. There are other methodologies available.

This one is considered to be a very strong indicator of order of magnitude impacts.

It's fairly transparent in that you can see the impact of taxes and how they're calculated.

It's not based on some aggregated multiplier of imputed economic impact. It's specific to the township that we're modeling here.

MR. CURLEY: Well, again, as I pointed out at the beginning of my questioning, there's a lot of lines for revenue, one line for expenditures.

In my mind, having more detail about what expenditures are involved with this development, I think, would be more transparent. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Mr. Gaeto?
(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Ms. Hansen?
MS. HANSEN: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Hymel?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Ms. Lafarge?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Ms. Mahoney?
MS. MAHONEY: No questions. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Jennifer Pechet?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Margaret Ruschmann?
MR. RUSCHMANN: Can I speak? I'm her husband. I'm her husband. Can I speak?

MR. RICE: You are?
MR. RUSCHMANN: Mark Ruschmann.
MR. RICE: Mr. Ruschmann?
MR. RUSCHMANN: Yes.
MR. RICE: You need to ask questions. Okay?

MR. RUSCHMANN: You had questioned that the train was a benefit to this new community.

How many -- have you made an assessment of how many people will be using the train?

THE WITNESS: I have not, but studies have shown that transit-oriented development is considered a benefit to many people.

I do believe people choose to locate near a train station if they need to avail themselves of that service.

MR. RUSCHMANN: My interest is that,
are there any impacts that -- I know this is Radnor, but are there any impacts to $T / E$ as far as sidewalks or anything else that has to be constructed for the safety of the people coming from Radnor to Tredyffrin?

THE WITNESS: I haven't evaluated that. That wasn't a cost or revenue element.

MR. RUSCHMANN: Okay.
MR. RICE: Mr. Ruschmann, what is your first name?

MR. RUSCHMANN: Mark.
MR. RICE: Mark?
MR. RUSCHMANN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Thank you.
Mr. Satterfield?
MR. SATTERFIELD: Dave Satterfield, 207 Strafford.

In your experience, $I$ know you stated that you didn't look at single-family homes, but in your experience, would you say a development that yields the same fiscal benefit to the township but with less homes, would that be more or less
desirable to the township?
THE WITNESS: It depends on the population profiles.

Typically, a single-family detached development, while less dense, tends to have higher population, people living there year-round.

Usually, there's more school-aged children projected in single-family developments.

So you may or may not have a premium in value just because it's single family. Premiums are attributable to many attributes of the development itself.

I believe you can have a more dense development that could potentially have a lower fiscal cost impact to a township when you look at it on a net basis.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Are you aware of what single-family homes in that area right now are going for, new single-family homes?

THE WITNESS: I'm not.
MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. If you just look across the street, the new
development, $I$ think, roughly doing the math, 24 of those would be about the same fiscal benefit to the township as the 38 townhomes, if you just do the math.

All right. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Ms. Scheri?
MS. SCHERI: No questions.
MR. RICE: Mr. Schuda?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

MR. RICE: Kaitlin Silver?
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(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Mr. Szary?
MR. SZARY: Gregory Szary, 6 Forrest Lane.

In your earlier cross-examination, when you were discussing the numbers of children and the family structures that might be in these townhouses, you indicated that -- and I'm not a stenographer. I don't have your exact wording. We can
probably call it up.
But you indicated that it would have a different population than the single-family houses; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I didn't state conclusively that it would, but I stated based on my experience, looking at some of the surrounding or similar comparable properties, I'm not speaking to family structure, I'm speaking to school-aged children, and it's maybe my hypothesis that the reason there aren't many school-aged children in the comparable properties is because maybe they're empty nesters or maybe they're young professionals with the means to afford the property that don't have children or just people, families that value the life-style amenities that an attached housing product affords them.

MR. SZARY: Okay. So then just to simplify that question, the townhouse development would attract persons without children more so than single-family houses would?

THE WITNESS: Not every townhouse community, but the ones that are similar to this exhibit that characteristic.

MR. SZARY: Okay. So then is it fair to say then that the net result of this development would be changing the fabric and the nature of the neighborhood by changing the family types?

THE WITNESS: I haven't done an evaluation of all the family types surrounding this property, but I see no downside to having diversity of family size and spending ability in a community.

I think it makes for a healthy community to have people that can help to offset public costs by having a higher fiscal benefit.

MR. SZARY: So if I go back to the first part of your answer, yes, it would change the nature of the family?

THE WITNESS: I haven't examined the families in the community, so $I$ can't say exactly what is there today.

MR. SZARY: If the community is
comprised of single-family houses, and you stated there is a certain type of population in single-family houses, and this is going to be high density, which is different, then it would, in fact, change the nature of the neighborhood?

MR. BROSEMAN: I object. He's answered this several times. The answer was no.

MR. RICE: Well, I think he said he doesn't know because he didn't study it.

MR. BROSEMAN: Right.
MR. RICE: Go ahead and answer that if you can, that last question.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that, please?

MR. SZARY: If the neighborhood is comprised of single-family houses, and this development, proposed development is townhouses, which you've stated would have less children than people living in single-family houses, then the net result of this type of a development would be a change in the family structure, the types
of families in the neighborhood?
THE WITNESS: I suppose that could be said, yes.

MR. SZARY: All right. Thank you.
MR. RICE: Mr. and Mrs. Willis?
MR. WILLIS: Good evening. Dave Willis, 335 Strafford Avenue.

Would you agree that building a new development in an existing neighborhood has an effect on the existing neighborhood? It could be positive or negative.

THE WITNESS: I would agree that any time there's a change, there could be impacts, positive and negative.

MR. WILLIS: And is it possible that you could build too many units in a development for an existing neighborhood, to the point to where it starts to have a negative effect on the existing neighborhood?

THE WITNESS: I don't know that it relates to number of units so much as the configuration and execution of a plan.

MR. WILLIS: I guess I'll ask a
different question then.
How would you know if you're proposing too many units for an existing neighborhood?

THE WITNESS: I don't know how you would measure that.

I think if you were to look at it and see that it has measurable negative impacts from the standpoint of form, the standpoint of the physical structure and the economic profile of that development, there could be.

I think the case could also be said that having too few units could have a negative impact on a community as well.

MR. WILLIS: And so if it's not measurable, would we then rely on more subjective things to make that determination?

THE WITNESS: I think at the end of the day, if an individual, when they're coming to subjective terms, it could be an individual assessment.

MR. WILLIS: Or a board assessment
perhaps?
THE WITNESS: I think a board has to assess things in the context of a planning policy that is before us today.

MR. WILLIS: Thank you. No more questions.

MR. RICE: Cheryl Lutz?

-     -         - 

(No response.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: Okay. Any board questions of this witness?
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## EXAMINATION

MS. AGNEW: Good evening. How are you doing? So you updated this report? This report is an updated report; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: It is, primarily because I wanted to use the most current budget of the township and the current tax rates and all of that.

MS. AGNEW: And you took into account
the comp plan, the information from the comp plan?

THE WITNESS: That doesn't really factor into the fiscal analysis.

MS. AGNEW: But did you take into account information from the comp plan?

THE WITNESS: I testified to that on other aspects, but the comp plan doesn't really speak to the fiscal aspects of my analysis.

MS. AGNEW: I think you said something about the aspirational aspects of the comp plan. Did you put that into your information?

THE WITNESS: Not in a fiscal analysis, no.

MS. AGNEW: So in regard to anything else you testified there was not fiscal analysis, it's not really counted in your testimony?

THE WITNESS: NO. I think the comp plan represents the aspirations of the community, the desires to set policy moving forward.

And $I$ believe that the elements that $I$ testified to about additional density being appropriate adjacent to commercial uses and focusing on transit as a reason to have additional density at a location resulted in the township's zoning policy allowing this density of development here under the R-4 district and then under the density modification plan under which this is designed and $I$ think complies with in all aspects.

MS. AGNEW: Which comp plan are you talking about?

THE WITNESS: The current one that is, the current of-record plan of the township, which is, $I$ believe, 2003.

MS. AGNEW: Okay. Twenty-some years. Okay. I thought you were referring to the comp plan that's sort of ongoing, not that.

THE WITNESS: Has that been adopted yet?

MS. AGNEW: No, but that was the most recent, so $I$ thought you were referring to that.

MR. BROSEMAN: We're referring to the one that's in effect --

MS. AGNEW: I understand.
MR. BROSEMAN: -- which is referred to in the ordinance.

MS. AGNEW: He answered. I understand.

MR. BROSEMAN: I want it to be clear.
MS. AGNEW: I understand.
So let me ask you, what is the typical age distribution of the people who will be occupying these units that we'll be looking at?

THE WITNESS: I can't really speak to the age. I can hypothesize, based on the number of school kids that are projected that are comparable to other units, that it could be all over the place.

It could be empty nesters. It could be young professionals. It could be people in their middle age that have kids that may have recently graduated high school.

We're projecting school-aged kids here. It doesn't mean that there aren't
young families with young children as well.
MS. AGNEW: So things have changed in the past 20 years, right, since the first comp plan, and the township should be looking for expanding the middle-aged residents, so people in their $30 s$ or $40 s$. Would they be the sort of people who would be moving into these projected plans? THE WITNESS: I think they could be. I think people of all ages could be living here.

It's just, $I$ don't know that there's any one housing type that is considered most appropriate for a specific age group, especially in a community like Radnor Township and where we are in the Philadelphia suburbs, where there is a lot of diversity and economic means and earning potential and nearby jobs and just overall quality of life. People want to live here.

MS. AGNEW: But 1.75 million isn't necessarily diversity of income. We know that people are making pretty good money, but it's not really economic diversity, is
it? It's okay if it's not.
THE WITNESS: I mean, that's what the market, that's what the market's supporting right now.

There really is, the market indicators, because of -- the values indicate that there is a low supply of units available.

That's what drives prices of supply and demand typically, that coupled with a desirable locale in which to live.

There are a lot of factors that come into play when you're talking about the social fabric of a community.

MS. AGNEW: So three-bedroom homes in Old Oaks, do you think they sold for 1.75 million?

THE WITNESS: Where?
MS. AGNEW: Conestoga Village, Radnor Township.

THE WITNESS: Is that a new or old development?
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MS. AGNEW: '50s?
THE WITNESS: Typically not.
Typically the newer, new homes sell for higher values, because people have input on the premiums they want to put into them.

They're designed for a different life-style than some of the houses were originally designed for.

And what we've seen in the numbers as far as population profiles go, new housing tends to have fewer people living in them and fewer school-aged children living in them than older established housing.

That's been borne out in other analyses I've seen.

MS. AGNEW: Okay. Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: I have one. Have you, in looking at all of this and talking about the $\$ 1.75$ million price, have you actually done any real estate comps like in the similar units you've looked at for school children?

THE WITNESS: I have. There haven't been a whole lot of units that have traded
recently, but there have been a few, ranging from 1.2 million up to 2 million. I don't have that in front of me right now, but --

THE PRESIDENT: I just wanted to know we were in the ballpark and not just hoping.

THE WITNESS: I try not to pull numbers out of the air.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
MR. RILEY: I have a question. The proximity to the train and other points, you said they could walk to the train.

Would it be better if they had a sidewalk they could walk on to get to the train?

THE WITNESS: It definitely would.
MR. RILEY: And then the plan of 38 townhomes, is that the max of this site?

THE WITNESS: I haven't done a yield analysis or done any of the planning myself to lay it out to establish if there could be more, but $I$ believe that's the density that is permitted.

MR. RILEY: And then earlier you said if you have too few, there could also be a negative impact, and then too many could be the same negative impact.

It seems that if the max is the 38 , if that was the max, a number lower would be lower, but you're saying if it gets too low, it would be bad, but somewhere in between zero and 38.

Would that be like --
THE WITNESS: I haven't modeled it, but there would be commensurate impact.

There would be fewer people, fewer costs, but also fewer revenues to the township being generated from sale prices or from the assessments if there's fewer units.

Fewer units would be selling, contributing transfer taxes. So from a fiscal standpoint, it could be a sliding scale.

MR. RILEY: And the existing neighborhoods that are already there, who have been there when there was only two
lots that were there, not 30 townhomes, what happens to them?

I mean, it would seem they may have a negative impact. Would that happen?

THE WITNESS: I can't speak to that. I didn't analyze that.

I believe that this development can be designed and has been designed in a way that provides appropriate buffering and mitigates all site impacts that aren't currently mitigated today, specifically, stormwater.

I think from that standpoint, a plan like this will have a beneficial impact to the neighbors.

MR. RILEY: Mr. Hetzel, I saw in your, right in the middle of the exhibit LEED AP. Can you tell us what all these things mean?

THE WITNESS: That's Leadership in Environmental Design. It's primarily an architectural designation.

It means that I studied for and took an exam that established a certain level of knowledge in following LEED principles,
which this development has not strived to achieve any sort of a LEED certification, so I've not analyzed it in terms of a LEED certification.

MR. RILEY: If you put something in, let's say, it's going to have to have a heater or an $A C$, in the summertime, doesn't it create more heat in the summertime sort of out in the atmosphere?

So it would be cooler inside, and the more units that are doing that has an impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Would you agree to that?
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I'm not an HVAC professional. I do know that --

MR. RILEY: Right, but you know LEED though.

THE WITNESS: I do know that systems have become more and more efficient.

MR. RILEY: Yes, which is good. Will these be efficient?

THE WITNESS: I have not evaluated it on that basis. I would think that modern building supplies and modern systems would
probably, by default, be more efficient than older systems that were deployed 30 years ago and may be failing and need to be replaced.

MR. RILEY: Yes, or less of an impact. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. COATES: I just have a couple of questions about the data in your memo. Okay?

When you did the analysis here for population impact, you're citing the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research which estimates the 2.22 and the . 21.

But it says this was published in 2006. Is that dataset in 2006?

THE WITNESS: That's based on, yes, that dataset was based on population information for the entire state of Pennsylvania at that time.

Specific to the type of structure, it breaks it down by single-family detached, single-family attached, rental units
attached, for-sale units attached, and then by a range of values and by number of bedrooms.

So from that perspective, it's the most granular data we have available to us.

We can look at other developments in the area to elaborate on multipliers, but my experience has been that the Rutgers multipliers tend to overstate, which then leads to generally higher cost.

So if we can say there's, we're projecting this many school-aged kids, for instance, but experience, local data shows that there are fewer kids than that, then the fiscal impact is only improved compared to what we've shown here.

MR. COATES: Sure. Thank you. Is there a more recent version of that dataset available?

THE WITNESS: There is not.
MR. COATES: Are you familiar with the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and their demographic multiplier summary statistics for multifamily housing
in Greater Philadelphia?
THE WITNESS: I am. That is
multifamily housing though.
MR. COATES: Right, but I'm just going by their average household, which is taking into consideration single family and multifamily. All right?

And if I took a look at this from 2012 to '16, because it says it uses the PUMA data, which I'm assuming the Rutgers data is similar, and $I$ also saw they release annual data, their numbers are suggesting 2.91 on the median, 2.7 versus the 2.2 , up to three bedroom, right, and you stated earlier that for a four bedroom, it can go up to 2.9 people per unit; right?

So if we use that same math, we could potentially be over three and almost four per unit. Does that sound right?

This is the same data that's in the Rutgers. I'm just suggesting that this is more recent.

THE WITNESS: It's not exactly the same data, but $I$ haven't reviewed it in
detail to opine on whether or not it's comparable.

But the way the analysis is set up, you're free to play out different scenarios. I've explained what the cost per person is that $I$ derived.

And if you believe that it's a higher number, you can apply that per capita cost to that.

If you believe it's a lower number, you can apply it to that, and sort of see how it plays out.

MR. COATES: Sure. I appreciate that, and $I$ can do the math. I'm just not an expert. I shouldn't have to do the math.

Their data on school-aged children in here suggests that there's almost . 6, and you've got . 2 in your data.

And the reason I'm bringing this up is because $I$ think this can materially change your financial assessments based on the population that we're looking at in the dataset; right?

We went down to 80,000 , $I$ think, net
value, when we went to up 2.9 . If we went up to four, it could go down to what, 50,000 or so?

THE WITNESS: I haven't done the math on that. I could say though that under this scenario, it would take almost 14 more school-aged kids just to bring the school district impact to neutral impact.

MR. COATES: True.
THE WITNESS: And I find that to be very hard to believe, given what we know about the demographics of similar projects that we examined.

MR. COATES: Okay. On the public safety, services, and facilities, it looks like we used the Development Impact Assessment Handbook; right? When was that published?

THE WITNESS: That was published in the '90s.

MR. COATES: '95; right? So would that data be different now than it was in '95, or that assessment of -THE WITNESS: It could be, and it
could also change due to local factors.
MR. COATES: It could be up or down; right?

THE WITNESS: It could be up or down. I haven't had the opportunity to talk to any public safety officials about that specifically here.

I'm going off of what the comp plan notes, that one benefit of Radnor Township is it's a safe community that doesn't seem to require a heavy level of policing, as opposed to other communities possibly.

MR. COATES: I would agree with that. They do a great job.

I think the reason I'm bringing this up and the reason I'm asking the question is because you have multiple cites in the memo, '85, '94, 2006, '95, and here we are in 2024, with more local and recent data, that I'm just confused as to why we didn't use the newer data.

THE WITNESS: Well, the methodology doesn't change over time. The methodology is what it is.

MR. COATES: I'm not talking about the methodolgy. The dataset.

THE WITNESS: And I feel that I've used data, underlying data where $I$ have used it, that provides at least a conservative estimation.

I do believe that if we went more locally, we'd probably find lower population numbers, and we do see that as borne out in the school-aged kids --

MR. COATES: More local than Delaware Valley?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think if we went school district wide or countywide, you've got a lot of difference between parts of southern Delaware County and Radnor Township.

MR. COATES: Yes, arguably across the whole state; right? The dataset is referencing the entire state of Pennsylvania?

THE WITNESS: Right. Again, this is meant to be an order of magnitude analysis.

MR. COATES: I guess I'm just, listen,

I'm not arguing the methodology. I think it's appropriate.

I just, I'm confused, because it seems like the data you're using presents a more favorable financial analysis than what I'm seeing for Delaware Valley here.

I just did a Google search. I'm not an expert; right?

I'm just confused as to why we didn't use something that's more recent to try to get a more conservative look at the fiscal impact.

That's just my point of view; right? That's all I really had to ask. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Just a couple other clarifications.

## EXAMINATION

$$
-\quad-
$$

MR. RICE: Ms. Myers asked you how you arrived at the 1.750 purchase price for the townhomes. You said you relied on some recent sales recently?

THE WITNESS: I don't have it in front
of me.
It was based on discussions with my client and what they expect, I think, that this could sell for, and my knowledge of just, anecdotal knowledge of the market, $I$ believe it to be a fair assessment of the value of these types of townhouses at this location.

MR. RICE: So you can't -- you're not really identifying the sales. Were they in Radnor Township?

THE WITNESS: There were two that we looked at, at least two or three. All the ones that $I$ cited anecdotally were Radnor Township.

MR. RICE: In Radnor Township?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. RICE: Okay. You got that information from your client?

THE WITNESS: I got that -- well, discussions with my client, but also research online, looking at recent sale data that's available through, you can find it on realtor.com, zillow.com.

MR. RICE: But I'm looking for a specific address. Give me an address in Radnor Township where a townhome sold for 1.75.

THE WITNESS: I can provide it. I don't have it in front of me right now.

MR. RICE: And the other part of that, I didn't hear the answer. The Hamilton-1 hearing, what was the market value for those townhomes?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall. I mean, I didn't review that for this.

MR. RICE: But you did the report before?

THE WITNESS: I did a similar report, but that was a couple years ago.

Again, I've literally done dozens of these types of studies since then and since COVID, and the market has definitely changed in the intervening years. So $I$ can find out for you.

MR. RICE: I can dig through my file and probably find it, too. That was three years ago, more or less?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. MARLIER: My notes, Mr. Rice, my notes were $\$ 850,000$.

MR. RICE: Okay. So 850, does that sound about right?

THE WITNESS: That sounds about right from that timeframe.

MR. RICE: And we're more than doubling that today because of the market we're in. Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RICE: The other question I had, I was wondering what the date of the Development Impact Assessment Handbook was, but it's 1995?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. So just for the township, just so $I$ understand how you calculated the $\$ 1,010.05$ cost per resident, you took the general fund budget of Radnor for 2023 for 2024?

THE WITNESS: Yes, for 2024.
MR. RICE: 2024, and you divided that by the number of residents?

THE WITNESS: It's a little more nuanced than that. The analysis establishes two separate multipliers.

One is a residential-based multiplier based on, $I$ believe it's a blended average of the number of residential parcels and their values in the entire township versus the number of nonresidential parcels and their values in the township, and it comes up with a percentage of the township that is considered residential versus nonresidential, and then it's that ratio that's applied to the general fund expenditures, divided by the number of people in the township to arrive at a per capita multiplier.

So it's specific to the residential/ nonresidential mix of the township as expressed in the assessment data at Delaware County.

MR. RICE: Okay. To get the values, you took the assessment data that Delaware County has online?

THE WITNESS: Right, and it's both
values and number of parcels to apply it to the --

MR. RICE: Parcels, residential, nonresidential. The nonresidential, did you distinguish between types of nonresidential?

Commercial? Institutional? Industrial? There's a lot of tax exempt properties.

THE WITNESS: Right. That's factored in as well in that analysis, exempt properties versus nonexempt.

MR. RICE: But this, this number is basically frozen by the year we're in. So ten years from now, what's the number? Any idea? Any projection?

THE WITNESS: I can't project it without knowing what values are going to do and what assessments are going to be like, how many more residential developments come in versus nonresidential developments. It could change that ratio a bit.

In my experience, I've looked at studies that $I$ did ten years prior, and it
really tends to be a very minimal difference in that ratio of residential to nonresidential, especially in a community like Radnor where it's fairly developed as it is today.

If you were going into a rural community where there's lots of open land and there's no, they have no idea how much residential is going to come in versus nonresidential, that could have more variability.

But $I$ think in Radnor, you probably wouldn't expect to see that much of a swing in the residential versus nonresidential ratio as far as the percentage goes.

MR. RICE: So you're attributing \$84,844 today based on the current budget and the current value, which would then be offset by revenue, but costs are going to increase over time to the township.

THE WITNESS: And typically, so does tax rates.

MR. RICE: Revenues will also increase over time?

THE WITNESS: Usually that's what happens, yes.

MR. RICE: That's all I have. Any other questions?

## EXAMINATION

THE PRESIDENT: I have one. Have you factored in the fact that the township has a separate stormwater fee versus that being part of the general funded budget?

THE WITNESS: NO.
THE PRESIDENT: Okay. That would be a separate stormwater fund.

THE WITNESS: That would be a separate fee. I'm not sure the basis of how that's applied. Is that a one-time fee that's applied?

THE PRESIDENT: It's an annual fee, yes, based on the acreage that you have and whatnot. Maybe it's home value. I'm not sure.

THE WITNESS: What also doesn't get reflected in here is other one-time fees,
like recreation fees that you pay up front, the transfer tax fees that are paid on the sale of the property to the developer, and then on the sale of each new home, each new homeowner. None of that is captured in this table of annual revenues.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. That's helpful.

MR. RICE: Okay. So, Mr. Broseman, do you have any redirect? We're at 9:34 now.

MR. BROSEMAN: I'm thinking, with the hour, that $I$ would take that under advisement and maybe close down for the night.

MR. RICE: And you'll think about whether or not you want to redirect?

MR. BROSEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICE: Okay. So let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)

-     -         - 

MR. RICE: We're going back on the record. After discussion of dates, the
parties all agree that the hearing will be continued to May 28th at 6:30 p.m. and then also June 4th at 6:30 p.m.

All parties have agreed that we're waiving all required time periods in terms of completion of the proceedings?

Mr. Broseman?
MR. BROSEMAN: Yes, I'm okay with the time periods, and I'd also like to confirm that hearings will be in this same location?

MR. RICE: Same location. Okay. So we're continued to May $28 t h$ and June $4 t h$, 6:30 in this building.

And with no other comments, thank you very much.

$$
-\quad-
$$

(Proceedings concluded at 9:41 p.m.)
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