

Memorandum

Lisa L. Thomas, RLA, AICP,
LEED AP

Bernard S. Panzak, Jr., RLA,
ASLA, LEED AP

Chris H. Garrity, RLA, LEED AP

Glackin Thomas Panzak, Inc.

Paoli Executive Green 1
Suite 300
41 Leopard Road
Paoli, Pennsylvania 19301
610.408.9011
plans@glackinplan.com

To: John R. Hosbach
Registered Consulting Arborist

From: Bernard S. Panzak, RLA
Principal - Glackin Thomas Panzak

Date: 3/05/2024

Re: Response to Conditional Use application review- Hamilton
Trust Property, Radnor Township

Dear Mr. Hosbach:

Glackin Thomas Panzak, (GTP) has reviewed your letter to John Rice, Esquire, the Radnor Township Solicitor dated July 29, 2023, regarding the Conditional Use Plan for the Hamilton Trust property in Radnor Township.

GTP has revised the proposed landscaping and lighting plans based on changes made to the site plans since the original application and in response to your review comments. The revised plans are referred to as sheets 13-17 of the Conditional Use plan set prepared by GTP and consist of: (i) an existing conditions Tree Inventory Plan (sheet EX-1 / 13 of 17); (ii) the proposed Landscape Plan (sheet LP-1 / 14 of 17); (iii) Landscape Details (sheet LP-2/15 of 17); (iv) the proposed Lighting Plan (sheet LI-1 / 16 of 17); and (v) proposed Lighting Details (sheet LI-2 / 17 of 17) all dated 5/18/2023, revised 3/05/2024.

Your review letter addressed provisions contained within Radnor Township Code ("Code") Chapter 263 "Trees" and Chapter 255, "Subdivision and Land Development."

Your review letter confirmed that many of the Code requirements have been fulfilled, and that the required trees had been provided. This response memorandum provides responses to your remaining comments in ***bold italicized and underlined type*** below the original comment, as follows:

Remaining Comments from 7/29/2023 Review Letter/Responses:

[comments pp. 2-3]; [Code section] “263-8. Review of permit applications:

A. Land Development/subdivision. In addition to any applicable requirements of the Radnor Township subdivision and land development ordinance, all applicant shall submit to the Shade tree commission the following information contemporaneously with the filing of the land development or subdivision plan:

[comment p. 3]; A.(3) The plan(s) shall illustrate the location of protective tree preservation fence around trees to remain, including a detail of such. The subject tree protection is shown and is adequate. In review of the site, the existing fence will be sufficient for the TPZ. However, signage for TP must be displayed on the existing fence for the duration of the contract. The tree protection detail shall be inserted into the plan set.”

Response: We added the tree protection detail to the landscape plans. See Landscape Details sheet.

[comment p. 3] “(5) The Shade Tree Commission shall review the proposed application for compliance with the requirements of the Township's tree replacement formula. The Shade Tree Commission shall also consider the impact, if any, on all trees with a DBH of six inches or greater and shall make recommendations for the preservation of existing trees and for the species, location, and size of new plantings. Such recommendations shall be made in writing to the Planning Commission. To be discussed with STC.”

Response: It is noted that that the Shade Tree Commission review is not part of the Conditional Use review process and is part of the land development or permitting phases of the development review process. See, Code section 263-8.A.

As requested in the review comment, the Township's tree replacement formula has been incorporated into the landscape plans. The landscape plans are in compliance. The Tree Inventory Plan shown on the landscape plans identifies all trees with a DBH of six inches or greater, and their condition. The landscape plans identify the location, species, and size of the required new plantings. The applicant looks forward to a productive dialogue with the Shade Tree Commission and the Planning Commission regarding these matters during the land development review process.

[comment p. 4]; [Code section 263-8. C] "Removal of a heritage tree; trees greater than 30 inches in DBH¹.

(2) The plan shall illustrate the size, species and location of the heritage tree that is proposed to be removed, and the size, species, and location of new trees to be planted in compliance with the tree replacement formula. Three to five photographs of the proposed heritage tree to be removed must accompany the application: 1) at the base of the trunk at ground level; 2) the entire tree if possible; 3) the subject area of concern (defect, crack). If the applicant cannot produce photos, an on-site visit may be necessary. **Pictures of the subject heritage tree to be removed along with a hazard tree form (where applicable) shall accompany this plan set."**

Response: The Tree Inventory Plan identifies trees with a dbh diameter of 30 inches or more (i.e. heritage trees) on the site, and notes their condition. Several are dead or declining. The Tree Inventory List shown on the Tree Inventory Plan also identifies the proposed future status of trees with a dbh diameter of 30 inches or more (i.e. heritage trees) on the site. The Project Arborist will provide photos and all necessary tree-related forms for trees with a dbh diameter of 30 inches or more (i.e. heritage tree) during the land development or

¹ A "Heritage Tree" is defined by the Code as "a tree having a thirty-inch-or-greater DBH." Code section 263-4.B. DBH is defined as a "standard measurement of a tree's diameter taken at breast height (4 1/2 feet above the ground or 1.5 meters). Code section 263-4.B.

permitting processes. The applicant recognizes the value of on-site visits and will arrange such visits as required.

[comment p. 4]; Field Review and Notes:

There is a total of 223 trees to be removed based on the plan set removal sheets. The table block key denotes that the dark shaded trees represent 223 trees TBR. The lightly shaded areas denote trees in decline, dead, poor or decay and represent 109 trees that will not be compensated for. Based on these figures and a count of the trees, the proposed table block is incorrect. 223 trees to be removed (109 trees that are not be compensated for) = 114 trees to be compensated for based on my field review. The plan is compensating for 121 trees. Applicant to revise removal counts.”

Response: Proposed tree counts have been revised to include the appropriate number of trees based on the updated landscape plans. The required compensatory plantings are provided.

[comment p. 4]; “The applicants consultant is utilizing a high percentage of Sugar maple. Due to the common trend of decline, verticillium wilt, sugar maple decline, and other tribulations associated with sugar maple, I strongly suggest utilizing a more diverse palate. No more than 10 percent of one species. “

Response: The plant list on the landscape plans has been adjusted to diversify species so that there is no more than 10% of one species as recommended in the comment.

[comment p.5]; “Designated planting zones. There are several designated planting locations throughout that are planned for deciduous trees such as Nyssa sylvatica ‘Red Rage’. These trees grow 35’ in height and 20 feet and spread width. From my experience, this cultivar is very intolerant of urban conditions and pollution. Also, I believe the rooting structure could pose impact to the infrastructure. A small mass of shrubs or native grasses would be better suited. Below is a snapshot of the area in question.”

Response: The “snapshot” referred to in the comment above is one focused on the landscape strips between individual unit driveways in the community and is not reproduced here. On 12/04/23, our project Arborist, Steve Shreiner and I met via video conference with the Township arborist, John Hosbach.

This comment was reviewed, and it was suggested that the plans be adjusted to widen the landscape strips between the individual unit driveways. Mr. Hosbach also recommended the tree species be revised to trees that would not grow as large as the originally suggested Nyssa sylvatica. The site plans have been revised to widen the landscape strips to 5 feet in width and to revise the tree species to be planted in these spaces as suggested.

[comment p.5]; “Dead, hazard, poor or declining trees. A site meeting to review these is warranted due to the quantity. Also that STC will require pictures and a hazard tree form for each treaty noted in the list.

Response: The Project Arborist will provide photos and all necessary tree-related forms for trees with a dbh diameter of 30 inches or more (i.e. heritage tree) during the land development or permitting processes. The applicant recognizes the value of on-site meeting to review these trees, and looks forward to coordinating that visit when the Township Arborist and/or members of the STC desires to do so.

[comment p. 5]; “Species Content The applicant is using an excellent palate of trees for the mitigation replanting objective. However, I would like to see no more than 10% of one species utilize.”

Response: The plant list on the landscape plans has been adjusted to diversify species so that there is no more than 10% of one species as recommended in the comment.

I believe these responses and the revised landscape plans satisfactorily address the review comments. Should you or the Township have any questions and/or comments, or if you/they believe these responses and/or plan revisions do not satisfactorily address the comments, please provide us with a detailed response, so that we may have the opportunity to continue to address open issues.

Sincerely,

GLACKIN THOMAS PANZAK

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bernard S. Panzak, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

Bernard S. Panzak, Jr. RLA, ASLA, LEED AP
Principal

cc via email: D. Charles Houder, Trust Representative
George Broseman, Esq.
Site Engineering Concepts LLC