

ALYSON M. ZARRO  
[alyson@rrhc.com](mailto:alyson@rrhc.com)  
extension: 202



October 4, 2021

*via hand delivery and e-mail*

Tony Scheivert, Township Manager  
Upper Uwchlan Township  
140 Pottstown Pike  
Chester Springs, PA 19425  
[tscheivert@upperuwchlan-pa.gov](mailto:tscheivert@upperuwchlan-pa.gov)

**Re: Toll Brothers/100 Greenridge Road  
Conditional Use Application Resubmission**

Dear Tony:

As you know, this firm represents Toll Mid-Atlantic LP Company, Inc. ("Toll") in connection with a property located at 100 Greenridge Road in Glenmoore ("Property"). On August 11, 2021, Toll filed a Conditional Use Application with the Township seeking conditional use approval for development of 64 single-family detached dwelling units on the Property pursuant to the F-1 Flexible Overlay District ("Application"). Toll has updated the Conditional Use Plans and reports in response to Township Consultants' comments, Township Planning Commission comments, and comments received from residents.

Accordingly, enclosed for filing in connection with the Application are the following materials:

1. Six (6) copies of a Conditional Use Plan prepared by ESE Consultants, Inc. dated August 10, 2021 and last revised October 4, 2021, consisting of thirteen (13) sheets;
2. Three (3) copies of a Fiscal & Recreation Impact Analysis prepared by David C. Babbitt & Associates, LLC, revised October 3, 2021;
3. Three (3) copies of a Water Will Serve Letter from Aqua dated May 19, 2021; and
4. Three (3) copies of a letter from ESE Consultants, Inc. dated October 4, 2021 with responses to the Gilmore & Associates, Inc. letter dated September 7, 2021.

A link to download electronic copies of all materials has also been included with this letter.

---

Toll hereby further amends its Application to request conditional use approval under the following Sections of the Zoning Ordinance (in addition to the conditional use requested for the F-1 residential development):

Tony Scheivert, Township Manager

Upper Uwchlan Township

October 4, 2021

Page 2 of 2

1. Section 200-107.D(3)(b)[1] to permit dwellings and related improvements within areas of Precautionary Slopes;
2. Section 200-107.D(3)[b][2] to permit roads providing preliminary access to the lots in the development to be located in areas of Precautionary Slopes; and
3. Section 200-107.D(3)[b][4] to permit sanitary and storm sewer conveyances to be located in areas of Precautionary Slopes.

Section 200-72.B(2)(c)[4] of the Zoning Ordinance requires the applicant to provide a preliminary indication of any waivers or variations from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance ("SALDO") which may be required for the proposed development. As noted in the ESE Consultants, Inc. response letter, a waiver from Section 162-30.D of the SALDO to permit a maximum road grade and minimum curve radii is no longer requested. However, a potential new waiver has been identified from Section 162-54.D(3) of the SALDO to permit recreation land under Section 162-54.D(3) to be comprised of greater than 25% environmentally sensitive areas. A portion of the proposed trails would be located within woodlands and slopes exceeding 15%. Toll proposes these trails in naturalized areas, which have been relocated from the western portion of the Property, while minimizing disturbance to environmentally sensitive areas where these trails would be located.

As always, please feel free to contact us with questions or if you need additional information. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

*Alyson M. Zarro*

ALYSON M. ZARRO

AMZ/mrm

Enclosures

cc: Gwen Jonik, Township Secretary (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Kristin Camp, Esquire, Township Solicitor (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Andrew Semon, Toll Brothers (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Brian Thierrin, Toll Brothers (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Mike Downs, Toll Brothers (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Robert Hadzor, Toll Brothers (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Justin Barnett, RLA, ESE (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
Guy DiMartino, P.E., TPD (*w/encl. via e-mail*)  
David C. Babbitt, AICP (*w/encl. via e-mail*)



May 19, 2021

Michael Downs, P.E.  
Vice President, Land Development  
Toll Brothers  
1140 Virginia Drive  
Fort Washington, PA 19034

**Re:** Water Availability  
100 Greenridge Road  
Upper Uwchlan Township, Chester County

Dear Mike:

This letter will serve as confirmation that the above referenced property is situated within Aqua Pennsylvania Inc.'s ("Aqua") service territory. Service will be provided in accordance with Aqua's Rules and Regulations.

This proposed development will require a main extension(s) for service to be available. The main extension can originate from Aqua's existing 8-inch main in Stonehedge Drive provided the main in Laura Lane is replaced with 8-inch main (it's only a 4-inch main) and permanent access for Aqua maintenance vehicles is provided to the development within the emergency access drive. In addition, the proposed main will have to extend to Greenridge Road and terminate at the intersection to allow a potential Aqua tie-in that is being contemplated for this area by Aqua. A main extension plan utilizing Aqua plan standards must be prepared and submitted to this office for review and approval. Following approval of the main extension design and plan, construction of the main extension project would be completed by the Builder under our standard Builder's Extension Agreement.

Flow data information may be obtained from our Production Department so that you may determine the adequacy of our supply for your project needs. Please fax a written request to Lisa Thomas Oliva at 610-645-1162 containing the address, street, cross street and municipality and all pertinent contact information.

If I can be of further assistance, you may contact me at (610) 645-1105.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David C. McIntyre".

David C. McIntyre  
Manager, New Business and Contract Operations

October 4, 2021

Tony Scheivert, Township Manager  
Upper Uwchlan Township Administrative Offices  
140 Pottstown Pike  
Chester Springs, PA 19425

**Re: Greenridge Road: 64-Lot Residential Community  
Conditional Use Plans (Second Submission)  
Upper Uwchlan Township, Chester County, PA  
UPI Nos. 32-2-17.1 and 32-1-11**

Dear Mr. Scheivert:

On behalf of the applicant, Toll Mid-Atlantic LP Company, Inc., please accept for review our responses to the review letter prepared by Gilmore & Associates, Inc., dated September 7, 2021/ The Greenridge Road: Conditional Use Subdivision Plans, dated August 10, 2021, revised October 4, 2021, and the Fiscal & Recreation Impact Analysis revised October 3, 2021, have been updated in response to the review.

The review letter prepared by Gilmore & Associates, Inc., dated September 7, 2021 has been addressed as follows:

## **II. ZONING ORDINANCE REVIEW**

1. Section 200-54.A(2)[3] – The site contains a Zone A (General) Floodplain. No development is proposed within the Floodplain, and a 150-foot DEP Buffer is shown.

**Response:** *No response required.*

2. Section 200-69.C(5) – For any proposed activity requiring the submission of a wetland delineation report, stream or wetland encroachment permit, or mitigation plan to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and/or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or successor agencies, a copy of all such documentation shall be submitted to the Township. Note #5 on Sheet 2 indicates that a Wetlands Jurisdictional Determination from US Army Corps of Engineers is pending. A copy shall be provided to the Township upon receipt.

**Response:** *A copy of the Army Corps Wetlands JD will be furnished to the Township upon receipt.*

3. Section 200-69.D(1)(a) – To ensure that a significant portion of the restricted open space is potentially usable for a variety of permitted open space purposes, a portion of the minimum required restricted open space (26.38 AC.) equal in area to no less than 15% of the gross tract area (9.92 AC.) shall fully exclude areas comprised of structures or other impervious surfaces permitted within the open space as set forth herein. Computations should be provided indicating this requirement has been met.

**Response:** *The usable open space plan (Sheet 7) has been updated to exclude areas comprised of structures or other impervious surfaces permitted within the open space. The new usable open space total is now 21.0 Acres.*

4. Section 200-69.D(1)(b)[1] – Any area within 25 feet of any structure not devoted to open spaces must be exempt from contributing towards required Restricted Open Space. Therefore, a 25' setback line should be provided along the lot lines which abut open space areas which are contributing towards Restricted Open space.

**Response:** *A 25' setback line has been proposed along all residential lot lines that abut areas contributing towards Restricted Open space (Sheet 6). The proposed Restricted Open Space acreage has been updated accordingly.*

5. Section 200-69.D(1)(b)[2] - Any area narrower than 100 feet must be exempt from contributing towards required Restricted Open Space. The applicant should verify this requirement has been met for all areas being considered as Restricted Open Space.

**Response:** *Dimensions have been added to the Restricted Open Space plan (Sheet 6) to verify this requirement has been met.*

6. Section 200-69.D(4) – The proposed tot lot seems to be rather smaller relative to the size of the development. It also is rather isolated. We defer to the Township Planning Commission on this matter.

**Response:** *The proposed tot lot has been relocated towards the center of the development, adjacent to the proposed paved trail and Lot 19, and enlarged ( $\pm 5,300$  SF) as part of this resubmission.*

7. Sections 200-72.C(2)(a)[1] and (b)[1] – Where permitted by the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use, an applicant may utilize the flexible\open space development option for development of any of the uses permitted within the R-2 zoning district. Single-family detached dwellings are proposed and are permitted in the R-2 and F-1 Districts.

**Response:** *No response required.*

8. Section 200-72.C(2)(a)[3] and (b)[3] – Open space uses as set forth in § 200-69 of this chapter is permitted within the F-1 District. The plans propose 31.15 ac. of Restricted Open Space; 26.38 ac. is required.

**Response:** *No response required.*

9. Section 200-72.D(1)(a) – We note that the plans list 40% as the required minimum, with 47% actually proposed. However, the Zoning Requirements table Proposed Open Space is incorrectly listed as 51% and should be revised to 47%.

**Response:** *The Zoning Requirements table noting Proposed Open Space has been updated to reflect the updated proposed percentage of open space.*

10. Section 200-72.D(2)(a)[3][b] – Any area comprising wetlands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection shall be excluded. The plans indicate that a USACE JD is pending for the site; therefore, the acreage listed on the plans may change.

**Response:** No response required.

11. **(V) Section 200-107.D(2)** – Prohibitive Steep Slopes will be disturbed to construct at least Road A. A variance would be required for this disturbance and the applicant indicates one will be sought.

**Response:** No response required.

12. **Section 200-107.D(3)(b)[2]** - Although this section does permit disturbance of “Precautionary” Steep Slopes for the construction of a primary access as part of a conditional use process, the applicant has not requested this relief in their conditional use application. If it is being sought, the application should be updated accordingly.

**Response:** *The application and plans have been updated to request conditional use approval to permit disturbance of “Precautionary” Steep Slopes for the construction of a primary access.*

13. **Section 200-107.D(3)(b)[4]** – Although this section does permit disturbance of “Precautionary” Steep Slopes for the construction of a sanitary and stormwater conveyance systems as part of a conditional use process, the applicant has not requested this relief in their conditional use application. If it is being sought, the application should be updated accordingly.

**Response:** *The application and plans have been updated to request conditional use approval to permit disturbance of “Precautionary” Steep Slopes for the construction of sanitary and stormwater conveyance systems.*

14. **Section 200-107.D(3)(c)** – The Applicant shall provide computations which confirm the slope disturbance requirements outlined in this section can be complied with.

**Response:** *A Precautionary Slopes Impervious Chart has been added to the plans (Sheet 4) noting the allowable impervious coverage permitted within areas of precautionary slopes on lots that contain those slopes.*

15. **Section 200-117.E** – The applicant shall provide verification adequate screening is provided between the site and the surrounding properties to screen the facility from view, preclude any glare from lighting or excessive noise from being ascertainable beyond the boundaries of the property. We defer to the Township Planning Commission and Brandywine Conservancy as to whether or not this requirement has been met.

**Response:** No response required.

16. **Section 200-117.G** – The applicant shall provide verification adequate water supply is available for normal daily use as well as for fire protection.

**Response:** *The applicant has provided a copy of the AQUA will-serve letter as part of this resubmission.*

17. **Section 200-117.I** – The applicant is requesting relief from the requirement to submit an historic impact statement that documents conformance to all requirements of Section 162.9.H of Chapter 162. We defer to the Township Planning Commission and Historic Commission on this matter.

**Response:** No response required.

### **III. SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REVIEW**

**1. (W) Section 162-30.A** – Maximum grade for a local access road is 10%. The applicant is requesting a waiver to permit a maximum grade of 12%. If this waiver is to be considered as part of the conditional use process, a plan and profile of the roadway should be provided so an evaluation can be made. Otherwise, we would recommend this waiver request be defer until the land development submission.

**Response:** A plan and profile of the roadway has been included as part of this resubmission for review.

**2. (W) Section 162-30.D** – Under no circumstances shall maximum grades be permitted using the minimum curve radii. Section 162-31.B states that minimum centerline radii on a local street is 150-feet minimum. Neither proposed road slopes nor curve radii are labeled on the plans. However, this section is included in Requested Variances/Waivers on Sheet 4, to allow for maximum road grade and minimum curve radii on Road A between Lot 4 and Lot 64. As stated above, a plan and profile of the roadway should be provided so an evaluation can be made. Otherwise, we would recommend this waiver request be defer until the land development submission.

**Response:** The applicant is no long requesting a waiver from Section 162-30.D.

**3. (W) Section 162-33.D** – Single access streets, permanently designed as such, shall be not more than 500 feet in length for lots containing less than one acre. Proposed Road “A” exceeds this length. This section is included in Requested Variances/Waivers on Sheet 4. We defer to The Township Traffic Engineer as well as the Township Fire Marshall as to the acceptability of this waiver.

**Response:** No response required.

**4. (W) Section 162-39.E** – All curbs shall conform to specification for Class A concrete. This section is included in Requested Variances/Waivers on Sheet 4, to permit Belgian block curbing. We have no objection to this waiver as Belgian Block is a suitable material substitute and has been successfully installed in several other developments in the Township.

**Response:** No response required.

**5. (W) Section 162-41.A** – Sidewalks may be required on both sides of new streets in residential subdivisions or land developments. The plans propose sidewalk on only one side of Road A and Road B. This section is included in Requested Variances/Waivers on Sheet 4. We defer to the Township Planning Commission on this matter.

**Response:** No response required.

**6. (W) Section 162-46.B(1)** – All lots shall have direct access to a public street. This section is included in Requested Variances/Waivers on Sheet 4, to permit Lot 65 (The sanitary sewer disposal Lot) to exist as an interior lot accessed only via an easement. We defer to the Township Planning Commission and Township Sewer Consultant on this matter.

**Response:** *No response required.*

7. Section 162-46.B(3) – An interior lot shall have an access strip, with a minimum width for its entire depth of 25 feet if a deed restriction prohibits the lot from further subdivision. The trail and access easement for Lot 65 should be increased to meet this requirement.

**Response:** *The plans have been updated to show a 25' access easement to meet the requirement of Section 162-46.D(3).*

## **V. FINANCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ANALYSIS REVIEWS**

### **Recreation Impact Analysis**

1. SLDO 162-9.H(3)(d) requires a description of existing municipal recreational facilities. The Recreation Impact Analysis indicates that Hickory Park is 26.7 acres in size, while the Open Space Plan indicates that this park is 42.3 acres in size. Upland Farms Park is shown as 46.9 acres in size, while the Open Space Plan and Township website state this park is 56 acres in size. It appears that the acreage listed for Fellowship Fields is incorrect as well. In addition, the report refers to Upland Farm as a proposed facility, which is incorrect. The report shall be revised to accurately describe the existing Township park facilities.

**Response:** *The Recreation Impact Analysis has been revised as requested.*

2. SLDO 162-9.H(3)(d) requires a description of the impact of the proposed development on recreational facilities, using the accepted standards established in the Upper Uwchlan Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan and the Township Comprehensive Plan.

- Page 61 of the Open Space Plan provides a table calculating projected Township park needs based on population projections, prepared in accordance with Chester County Park and Recreation guidelines (which are derived from NRPA guidelines).
- Page 62 of the Open Space Plan provides a table calculating projected Township outdoor activity/facility needs based on population projections, also prepared in accordance with the Chester County guidelines.

The report shall be revised to include an analysis of how the proposed population increase and private recreation facilities will affect the Township's adherence with the Chester County Recreational Park Guidelines.

**Response:** *The Recreation Impact Analysis has been revised, as requested.*

3. SLDO 162-54.C provides recommended guidelines for the provision of playground or neighborhood park acreage in residential land developments. With 64 proposed dwelling units, a total of 3 acres of recreation area is recommended. 2.28 acres of active recreation area are proposed. We defer comment on the suitability of the amount of active recreation area to the Planning Commission.

**Response:** *The Conditional Use Plan and Recreation Impact Analysis have been updated to reference and show 3.29 Acres of active recreation area proposed for the development.*

## Fiscal Impact Analysis

1. SLDO 162-9.H(4)(a) requires an analysis of the potential fiscal impact to Public Works, including potential effects on the maintenance, repair and upkeep of roads, signal systems, sewer, water and drainage systems, open space and recreation areas, or any other applicable function of this department. The Fiscal Impact Analysis shall address any projected cost increases for the above items in terms of administration, personnel, equipment and materials. The Fiscal Impact Analysis shall be revised to specifically address this requirement.

**Response:** *Section 162-9.H(4) provides that the applicant shall utilize a methodology offered in the Fiscal Impact Handbook, adapted as appropriate to the Board of Supervisors' satisfaction. Although the "case study method" is referenced a preferred alternative, the Board of Supervisors may authorize alternative methods be utilized. In this instance, as with other fiscal impact studies prepared in the Township in years past for developments of equivalent size, the Fiscal Impact Analysis utilizes the per capita multiplier method, which is the most widely used method for fiscal impact analysis. Accordingly, the applicant requests the Board of Supervisors' approval of this accepted alternate methodology. The Fiscal Impact Analysis includes an analysis of annual operating expenditures for future residents based on the Township's four operating funds, which include nearly all of the Township's expenditures, including those listed above.*

2. SLDO 162-9.H(4)(b) requires an analysis of the potential fiscal impact to the Township Administration, including time that would be required by the Board of Supervisors, Manager, Administrative Assistant, and clerical personnel to process the application and handle the project during construction, as well as long-term administrative demands. This should include, but not be limited to, the handling of plans, contracts, various legal instruments or agreements, permits, special problems, and escrow. The analysis shall also address projected demands on code administrative staff. The Fiscal Impact Analysis shall be revised to specifically address this requirement.

**Response:** *Section 162-9.H(4) provides that the applicant shall utilize a methodology offered in the Fiscal Impact Handbook, adapted as appropriate to the Board of Supervisors' satisfaction. Although the "case study method" is referenced a preferred alternative, the Board of Supervisors may authorize alternative methods be utilized. In this instance, as with other fiscal impact studies prepared in the Township in years past for developments of equivalent size, the Fiscal Impact Analysis utilizes the per capita multiplier method, which is the most widely used method for fiscal impact analysis. Accordingly, the applicant requests the Board of Supervisors' approval of this accepted alternate methodology. The Fiscal Impact Analysis includes an analysis of annual operating expenditures for future residents based on the Township's four operating funds, which include nearly all of the Township's expenditures, including those listed above.*

3. SLDO 162-9.H(4)(c) requires an analysis of the potential fiscal impact to fire and emergency (ambulance) services, incorporating the development's impact on fire company capabilities, including but not limited to municipal water supply, pumping capacity, specialized equipment and training requirements. The Fiscal Impact Analysis shall be revised to specifically address this requirement.

**Response:** *Section 162-9.H(4) provides that the applicant shall utilize a methodology offered in the Fiscal Impact Handbook, adapted as appropriate to the Board of Supervisors' satisfaction. Although the "case study method" is referenced a preferred alternative, the Board of Supervisors may authorize alternative methods be utilized. In this instance, as with other fiscal impact studies prepared in the Township in years past for developments of equivalent size, the Fiscal Impact*

*Analysis utilizes the per capita multiplier method, which is the most widely used method for fiscal impact analysis. Accordingly, the applicant requests the Board of Supervisors' approval of this accepted alternate methodology. The Fiscal Impact Analysis includes an analysis of annual operating expenditures for future residents based on the Township's four operating funds, which include nearly all of the Township's expenditures, including those listed above.*

4. SLDO 162-9.H(4)(d) requires an analysis of the potential fiscal impact to police services, including a projection of the overall effects of the proposed development on existing Township police personnel numbers, equipment, vehicles and working space. Any facilities or assistance the development will provide to handle emergencies, criminal investigations, armed robbery, or other security-related problems shall be included in the analysis. The Fiscal Impact Analysis shall be revised to specifically address this requirement.

**Response:** Section 162-9.H(4) provides that the applicant shall utilize a methodology offered in the Fiscal Impact Handbook, adapted as appropriate to the Board of Supervisors' satisfaction. Although the "case study method" is referenced a preferred alternative, the Board of Supervisors may authorize alternative methods be utilized. In this instance, as with other fiscal impact studies prepared in the Township in years past for developments of equivalent size, the Fiscal Impact Analysis utilizes the per capita multiplier method, which is the most widely used method for fiscal impact analysis. Accordingly, the applicant requests the Board of Supervisors' approval of this accepted alternate methodology. The Fiscal Impact Analysis includes an analysis of annual operating expenditures for future residents based on the Township's four operating funds, which include nearly all of the Township's expenditures, including those listed above.

5. On page 2 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis, the assessments paragraph indicates that the total assessed value of all properties in the Downingtown Area School District is \$5,375,400,000. However, the Downingtown Area School District 2021-2022 Final General Fund Budget indicates the total assessed value of all properties as \$5,638,921,798. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** Page 2 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis has been revised to reflect the Downingtown Area School District 2021-2022 General Fund Budget assessed value of all properties of \$5,697,963,007..

6. The pass-through funds table on page 4 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates that \$5,000 for Pavilion Rental is to be excluded as a pass-through fund. However, the Upper Uwchlan 2021 Budget indicates that this amount is \$500. The pass-through funds table and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** The pass-through funds table and subsequent calculations of the Fiscal Impact Analysis has been revised, as requested.

7. The monthly mortgage calculation outlined on page 6 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis appears to use a down payment of 10% in order to calculate the monthly mortgage payment. We find that using a standard 20% down payment for the mortgage calculation is more appropriate and would then yield a more accurate household income and EIT estimates. We recommend that a 20% down payment be used in this calculation.

**Response:** A 10% down payment has been utilized in order to calculate the monthly mortgage payment, which is higher (and, consequently, more conservative) than the national median down payment of 6.1% in the first quarter of 2021 for home purchases.

8. The franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue calculation on page 7 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates a total yearly Cable TV and Miscellaneous Revenue amount of \$11,111. However, the calculated annual cost per person (\$72) multiplied by the number of

housing units (64) would equal \$4,608. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The yearly Cable TV and Miscellaneous Revenue amount on Page 7 has been updated, which results in a calculation of \$4,231. See calculation for further explanation for the multiplier utilized.*

9. The liquid fuels revenue calculation on page 7 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates a total annual Liquid Fuels revenue of \$6,883. However, following the calculation provided in the text results in liquid fuels revenue of \$6,271.54. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The liquid fuels revenue calculation on Page 7 has been updated.*

10. The interest earnings calculation on page 7 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates total annual interest earnings of \$456. However, following the calculation provided in the text results in interest earnings of \$1,303.75. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The interest earnings calculation on Page 7 has been updated.*

11. The Downingtown Area School District Expenditures calculation on page 8 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates total general fund budgeted expenditures of \$244,248,119. However, the DASD 2021-2022 budget indicates total expenditures of \$244,086,119. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The Downingtown Area School District Expenditures calculation has been updated to reflect the DASD 2021-2022 budget.*

12. The Downingtown Area School District Expenditures calculation on page 8 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates a total annual school district expenditure of \$1,065,244. However, following the calculation provided in the text results in expenditures of \$1,060,020. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The total annual school district expenditure calculation has been updated.*

13. The State and Federal revenue calculation on page 9 of the Fiscal Impact Statement indicates total budgeted revenue from State and Federal sources as \$56,560,616. However, the DASD 2021-2022 budget indicates a total of \$56,587,660 for these revenues. In addition, the calculations indicate total annual State and Federal revenues to the School District of \$255,434. However, following the calculation provided in the text results in an amount of \$254,186. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The calculations for the total budgeted revenue from State and Federal sources as well as the annual State and Federal revenues to the School District have been updated.*

14. The earnings on investments calculation on page 9 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates that the School District's total taxable assessed value is \$5,375,400,000. However, the DASD 2021-2022 budget indicates a value of \$5,697,963,007. This section and subsequent calculations shall be revised accordingly.

**Response:** *The School District's total taxable assessed value has been updated to reflect the DASD 2021-2022 budget, as requested.*

## **VI. GENERAL COMMENTS**

1. Clarify the sources of the Minimum Front Yard and the Minimum Lot Width at Building Setback Line in the Zoning Requirements table.

**Response:** *The Zoning Requirements table has been updated to reflect the correct minimum front yard setback (which in this instance, is minimum setback from edge of cartway). The reference to the Minimum Lot Width at Building Setback Line has been removed.*

2. It should be clarified whether or not the proposed trail (existing driveway) will be available for public use.

**Response:** *The plans have been updated to note that the proposed paved trail will be offered to the Township for dedication and made available for public use.*

## **VII. TOWNSHIP TRAFFIC CONSULTANT COMMENTS** **McMAHON ASSOCIATES, INC.**

1. SALDO Section 162-9.H(2) – The traffic counts were completed in July 2021, when school was not in session, and during the current COVID-19 pandemic. However, the applicant's engineer increased the July 2021 traffic counts upwards by 69 percent during the weekday morning peak hour and 27 percent during the weekday afternoon peak hour based on historic traffic counts conducted in September 2016. Since the traffic counts were adjusted to reflect typical conditions during the school year, in this instance, we can support the use of the July 2021 traffic counts.

**Response:** *No response required.*

2. SALDO Section 162-9.H(2) – Based on the results of the traffic study, all of the study intersections will operate at overall LOS A, and all movements will operate at acceptable LOS C or better during the study peak hours in the future with the traffic generated by the proposed homes. In addition, no auxiliary turn lanes are warranted at the site access intersection.

**Response:** *No response required.*

3. SALDO Section 162-28.A – Greenridge Road currently provides an approximate 20 to 21-foot cartway width along the site frontage, which does not meet the Township's requirements for a local road of 32 feet. As such, with Greenridge Road classified as a Distributor Road, the southbound Greenridge Road travel lane should be widened along the site frontage to provide a 16-foot half width cartway.

**Response:** *The applicant has met with Township Staff on-site to evaluate the level of impact to steep slopes and existing vegetation that would occur should Greenridge Road be widened along the site's property frontage. The applicant has agreed to prepare multiple exhibits for the Township Engineer and Traffic Consultant to review so they may consider whether the widening is warranted.*

4. SALDO Section 162-28.A – Roads A and B each provide a 32-foot wide cartway,

which meets the Township's cartway width requirements for a local road. However, as with other recent residential developments in the Township, we could support a 28-foot wide cartway for Roads A and B, provided parking is only allowed on one side of the street. A 28-foot wide cartway would require a waiver. Furthermore, there is a long section of Road A with no homes, and with an excessively wide road, there is a greater chance for increased speeding.

**Response:** *The applicant has elected to maintain a 32-foot wide cartway through the site.*

5. SALDO Sections 162-30.A – The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow a 12 percent grade along Road A between Lots 4 and 64, which exceeds the required maximum grade along local streets of 10 percent. In order fully evaluate the waiver request, additional detailed information should be provided to justify the waiver request, and plans should be provided to show detailed information for the vertical geometry for Road A, including roadway profiles which label the stopping sight distance along the vertical curves and the proposed grades along the vertical profile.

**Response:** *A plan and profile of the roadway has been included as part of this resubmission for review.*

6. SALDO Sections 162-30.D and 162-31 – The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow the a section of Road A between Lots 4 and 64 to provide the maximum roadway grade and minimum curve radii. In order to fully evaluate this waiver request, the plans should be revised to provide detailed information for the horizontal geometry for Roads A and B, including roadway stationing, horizontal curve radii, and PC and PT stations.

**Response:** *The applicant is no long requesting a waiver from Section 162-30.D.*

7. SALDO Sections 162-32.F – Please provide truck turning templates for the largest anticipated delivery vehicle, as well as the Township's largest emergency service vehicle to show the circulation of these vehicles within the site. All curb radii should be a minimum of 35 feet, or larger in order accommodate the anticipated design vehicles.

**Response:** *The applicant has provided truck turning templates for the requested service vehicles as part of this resubmission. Further, all curb radii have been designed to meet the Township standard of 35'.*

8. SALDO Section 162-33.A – A single access shall not be approved wherever a through street is practical, except where the single access is clearly the basic principle for design of the subdivision. In this case, it appears a roadway connection to Lauren Lane is feasible, and if so, we recommend providing the road connection. Historically, the Township has endorsed connecting adjacent developments when feasible for creation of better access options, emergency access and community planning purposes. The applicant's proposed plan shows this connection as an emergency access only, which would be a reasonable solution only if the full connection is not feasible or approved for some other reason.

**Response:** *The applicant is proposing an emergency access via a grass-pave connection to Lauren Lane with an offer of right-of-way dedication to the Township for an extension of Lauren Lane should the Township desire a full vehicular connection between the Property and the Stonehedge*

*residential development. Residents of Stonehedge, through their attorney, and other residents of the Stonehedge development have requested that this connection be emergency access only.*

9. SALDO Section 162-33.D – The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow a single access street that exceeds 500 feet. In order justify the waiver request, the applicant proposes the emergency grass paver connection to Lauren Lane, as well as offer a 50-foot wide right-of-way for an extension of Lauren Lane in the future, which would intersect Road A opposite the southern Road A/Road B intersection. Our office recommends the full road connection to Lauren Lane. Also, the Township's emergency service personnel should review the proposed community layout and emergency access.

**Response:** *No response required.*

10. SALDO Section 162-32.A, D, K – The Planning Commission should determine whether other connections should be considered, such as to the existing Shea Lane and/or Foxclove cul-de-sacs; however, it less clear whether these connections are feasible as there may not be an available receiving right-of-way at the end of these roads.

**Response:** *As discussed with the Planning Commission at its September meeting, there is no available receiving right-of-way and accordingly, such connections are not proposed.*

11. SALDO Section 162-33.J – No driveway locations are shown on the plan. However, it is noted that no more than four lots are permitted to access the cul-de-sac turnaround.

**Response:** *Driveways will be shown on the land development plans.*

12. SALDO Section 162-41 – The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow sidewalk along only one side of Roads A and B in areas that provide homes on both sides of the road. We will defer to the Township on this; however, it has been our experience that sidewalk on both sides of the road are generally welcomed by the home owners especially in those areas where homes are located.

**Response:** *No response required.*

13. SALDO Section 162-28.B – This section of Greenridge Road is the future location for the Brandywine Trail. This should be explored further with the Township and County in the event the trail is to be located along the site frontage, and in which case an easement or additional right-of-way should be established for the future trail.

**Response:** *The plans have been updated to provide for a 20'-wide easement along the property frontage for the future trail.*

14. The existing on-site trail terminates as a dead end in the southwest corner of the site. We recommend modifying the trail for a continuous loop network that also connects to Greenridge Road for a future connection to the Brandywine Trail.

**Response:** The plans have been updated to propose a revised trail network, as requested in other comments provided by Township Staff. There is no longer a trail network and subsequent dead-end proposed between the proposed subdivision and the Stonehedge development.

15. ZO Section 200-75.H(3) – Based on the information provided in the traffic study, as well as a brief field view conducted by our office, it appears that adequate sight distance can be provided at the proposed Road A/Greenridge Road intersection. The plans should dimension and label the sight distances for vehicles exiting Road A looking to the left and right along Greenridge Road, as well as for left-turn vehicles entering Road A looking ahead and behind. In addition, the plans should include a PennDOT-style sight distance note which states the required sight distances, as follows:

“All sight distance obstructions (including but not limited to embankments and vegetation) shall be removed by the permittee to provide a minimum of XXX sight distance to the left and XXX sight distance to the right for a driver exiting the proposed driveways onto the through highway. The driver must be considered to be positioned ten feet from the near edge of the closest highway through travel lane (from the curbline if curbing is present) at an eye height of three feet six inches (3' 6”) above the pavement surface located in the center of the closest highway travel lane designated for use by approaching traffic. This sight distance shall be maintained by the permittee.”

**Response:** The plans have been updated to include a sight distance exhibit that dimensions and labels the sight distances on Greenridge Road, as requested. In addition, the PennDOT-style sight distance note has been added to the plans, as requested.

16. Chapter 79-8.C – The proposed redevelopment is located in the Township’s Act 209 Transportation Service Area, and as such, this development is subject to the Townships Transportation Impact Fee of \$2,334 per weekday afternoon peak hour trip. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers publication Trip Generation 10th Edition, the proposed 64-unit single family home community will generate 66 new trips during the weekday afternoon peak hour. As such, the number of new weekday afternoon peak hour trips subject to the Township’s Transportation Impact Fee is 66, and the resultant Transportation Impact Fee is **\$154,044**.

**Response:** No response required.

17. Upon resubmission, the applicant's engineer should compose a response letter that describes how each comment has been addressed and where any plan and/or report revisions are located.

**Response:** No response required.

18. Additional comments regarding the traffic improvements and/or land development plans may follow upon receipt of future submissions.

**Response:** No response required.

## **VIII. TOWNSHIP PLANNING CONSULTANT COMMENTS BRANDYWINE CONSERVANCY**

The property, located at 100 Greenridge Road, consists of 65.95 acres in the R-2

Residential District and F-1 Flexible Development Overlay District and is currently in residential use. The Applicant proposes to develop the property with 64 single family dwellings pursuant to the F-1 Flexible Development Overlay District. The proposed residential use is permitted when approved as a Conditional Use by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to § 200-72.B(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. The intent of the R-2 District is to provide for low to moderate density residential development and to encourage continued agricultural and conservation uses. The Flexible/open space development option provides for flexibility in lot designs and building arrangement and for preservation of unique and sensitive landscapes and site features by locating new roads and dwelling sites in the least sensitive areas of the site. Below is a summary of municipal planning documents and ordinances for the Township's consideration relevant to the intent of the F-1 Flexible/open space development option and the Conditional Use application.

**Comprehensive Plan**

The proposed residential use is consistent with the vision for future land use as articulated in the Upper Uwchlan Township Comprehensive Plan (2014). The Open Space, Recreation, and Environmental Resources Plan (Chapter 6) includes recommendations for municipal open space planning relevant to the Conditional Use application.

1. Municipal Open Space Planning recommendation MP 1 states that recreation needs and wastewater disposal needs should be considered planning priorities whenever the township considers acquisition of open space. The proposed 5.4- acre sanitary sewer disposal lot to be conveyed to Upper Uwchlan Township for sanitary disposal is consistent with the recommendation. The proposed tot lot and neighborhood trails are also consistent with the recommendation.

***Response: No response required.***

2. Municipal Open Space Planning recommendation MP 3 states that the Open Space Committee and the Park and Recreation Board should review land development plans for consistency with the Open Space, Recreation, and Environmental Resources Plan and provide their written comments and recommendations to the board of Supervisors.

***Response: No response required.***

3. Future Neighborhood Parks recommendation NN 1 states that the Board of Supervisors should consider setting conditions of Conditional Use approval that requires a continuing offer of dedication of any restricted open space to the Township for a public neighborhood park.

***Response: No response required.***

4. Hiking and Biking Trails recommendation HB 6 is to require a continuing offer of dedication of new trails located in planned residential subdivisions.

***Response: No response required.***

Community Trails Master Plan (2005)

We recognize the Applicant's efforts to include neighborhood trails in the subdivision. We are in full support of the adaptive re-use of the existing residential driveway as a low impact, multi-purpose trail for use by residents in the subdivision.

5. The proposed trail connection/emergency access along Lauren Lane promotes pedestrian and bicycle access between neighborhoods and facilitates access to the proposed lot. We support the Lauren Lane trail connection as a recreational asset for residents on Stonehedge Drive and on Road A.

**Response:** *No response required.*

6. We strongly discourage the proposed trail between the back yards of the existing Stonehedge Drive lots and the future Road A lots for the following reasons:

- a. the trail could potentially infringe on the rear yard privacy of neighboring residences that have relatively short rear yards;
- b. the trail will require clearing of vegetation that provides a vegetated buffer between rear yards;
- c. the trail has no clear destination or purpose;
- d. the trail dead-ends in a secluded area behind Lot 63 and is likely to become a security risk; and
- e. the trail is redundant with the proposed sidewalk along Road A.

**Response:** *The proposed trail between the Stonehedge development and the proposed development has been removed and relocated. The plans have been updated to show private nature trails through the existing woodlands in addition to the re-use of the existing driveway which will be paved and available for public use.*

7. The Community Trails Master Plan identifies priorities for a future municipal bicycle and pedestrian trail network. Map 6-3 Pedestrian Trails identifies a future Sidepath (6' minimum asphalt trail) located along the property's Greenridge Road frontage. In lieu of the proposed trail adjacent to the Stonehedge Drive subdivision, we recommend that the Township include a condition of Conditional Use approval that requires the Applicant to design, engineer, and construct the Sidepath trail along Greenridge Road as recommended in the Community Trails Master Plan and require a continuing offer of dedication to the Township.

**Response:** *The applicant has provided for a 20'-wide easement along Greenridge Road for the future sidepath trail.*

General Regulations

The 100 Greenridge Road site includes sensitive landscapes including areas of precautionary and prohibitive slopes, wetlands, floodplain, woodlands, and surface waters. The existing stream that is located at the eastern corner of the property is a tributary to the Black Marsh Creek and is defined as a high quality stream by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. The site generally drains to the east towards Black Marsh Creek.

8. To ensure the protection of water quality in a high quality watershed, we recommend that the land development plans shall strictly adhere to regulations set forth in §152 Stormwater Management.

**Response:** *No response required.*

**Zoning Ordinance**

9. The Steep Slope Conservation District, § 200-107.D(2) does not provide for access roads as a permitted use in areas of Prohibitive slopes. A short section of Road A is proposed to disturb areas of Prohibitive slopes. The Applicant will be required to seek a zoning variance to disturb areas of Prohibitive slopes along the access road (Road A).

**Response:** *The applicant has indicated on the plans and application a zoning variance to permit the disturbance of areas of prohibitive slope necessary to build Road A will be sought.*

10. The Steep Slope Conservation District, § 200-107.D(3)(b)[2] provides that an access road proposed is permitted within areas of Precautionary slopes when no practical alternative exists in an area of lesser slope and when approved as a Conditional Use by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that the Applicant consider amending the Conditional Use application pursuant to § 200-107.D(3)(b)[2].

**Response:** *The applicant has updated the plans and application indicating a request for Conditional Use approval to permit an access road in areas of Precautionary slopes.*

**Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance**

11. The Upper Uwchlan Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance § 162-54 Community Facilities and Public Open Space requires that in subdivisions with more than 25 families in which the average lot size is less than 30,000 square feet, the Township shall consider the need for suitable areas for recreation. The standards for said open spaces are 2.0 acres for 25-50 residences plus 1.0 acres for each additional 50 residences or fraction thereof. The Fiscal & Recreation impact analysis prepared by the Applicant states that active recreation land is proposed to be 2.28 acres which includes the re-use of the existing driveway as a trail, the perimeter trail next to the Stonehedge Drive subdivision, and a tot lot. It also states that there are 23.36 acres of usable open space. The Township should decide whether the proposed recreational open space and trails satisfy the standards for recreational open space.

**Response:** *Applicant now proposes active recreation land of 3.29 acres.*

12. The ordinance provides for a maximum disturbance of existing woodlands up to 25% per the Natural and Historic Features Conservation ordinance §162-55.B(3)(c). Disturbance in excess of 25% of any existing area of woodland requires woodland replacement in accordance with Subsections B(6) through B(9). The Applicant shall provide calculations for woodland disturbance and woodland replacement plantings at the time of subdivision and land development application.

**Response:** *No response required.*

### Impact Statements

The adjacent property (UPI No. 32-1-15) is described as having a Class II historic resource which is eligible to be nominated as a Class I historic resource on the National Register. The nearest structure on the adjacent property is over 700 feet from the shared property line. The Applicant requests a waiver for a Historic Resources impact statements due to the location of the proposed improvements.

13. We are in support of this waiver request. However, we recommend that the Upper Uwchlan Township Historical Commission consider potential impacts to historic resources on the adjacent property and provide recommendations regarding measures to mitigate impacts, if applicable.

**Response:** *No response required.*

### **IX . TOWNSHIP SEWER CONSULTANT COMMENTS** **ARRO CONSULTING, INC.**

1. The Developer is proposing 64 Single family detached lots. Utilizing 225 Gallons Per Day/Equivalent Dwelling Unit (GPD/EDU) the sanitary sewer capacity required is 14,400 GPD. The proposed capacity should be noted on the plan.

**Response:** *The plans have been updated to show the proposed capacity of the development.*

2. Note 15 indicates “*The proposed subdivision will be serviced by the Route 100 Sewage Treatment Plant. Disposal of Effluent will occur on-site through drip irrigation, or, as otherwise directed by the Municipal Authority. The proposed drip irrigation fields will be offered for dedication to Upper Uwchlan Township.*“

• **Treatment Component** - The required treatment capacity, from the Phase 3 Expansion, will need to be purchased. Reservation of sanitary sewer capacity is not guaranteed until purchased.

• **Disposal Component** - The Conceptual Plans indicates proposed disposal areas on-site. The ultimate disposal capacity will be subject to the required evaluation design and permitting as required by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP).

• **Storage Component** – There appears to be no storage capacity proposed on this Plan. The adequacy of capacity for the project, within the Authority’s existing storage capacity will be reviewed pursuant to PaDEP requirements.

• **Collection and Conveyance System Component** - Review of the capacity within the downstream collection and conveyance system is necessary in order to determine the extent of improvements necessary to accept the proposed flow 14,400 GPD.

**Response:** *No response required.*

3. Ultimately the above items numbers 1 and 2 will need to be formalized into a Developer’s agreement with the Authority. The necessary financial security shall be posted with the Authority, which shall be in a form and amount acceptable to the Authority. The design, sewage planning, permitting and construction shall need to be to the satisfaction of the Authority and PaDEP.

**Response:** *No response required.*

4. A note indicating “*All sanitary sewer improvements shall be design and constructed in accordance with the Upper Uwchlan Township Municipal Specifications.*” Shall be on the plans.

**Response:** *The plans have been updated to include the requested note.*

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.  
Sincerely,



**Justin Barnett, RLA**

*Project Planner II*

**ESE Consultants, Inc.**

1140 Virginia Drive, Fort Washington, PA 19034

P: 215-293-5449

[jbarnett@esecconsultants.com](mailto:jbarnett@esecconsultants.com) [www.esecconsultants.com](http://www.esecconsultants.com)

**FISCAL & RECREATION IMPACT ANALYSIS**  
**Greenridge Development**  
**Upper Uwchlan Township, Chester County**

*Revised*  
*October 3, 2021*

Prepared for:  
Toll Mid-Atlantic L.P. Company, Inc.

Prepared by:  
David C. Babbitt, AICP  
David C. Babbitt & Associates, LLC  
P.O. Box 922  
Frazer, PA 19355-0922  
Phone 610-651-5717  
[www.babbittplanning.com](http://www.babbittplanning.com)  
[david@babbittplanning.com](mailto:david@babbittplanning.com)

# Fiscal Impact Analysis

Proposed Greenridge Development  
Upper Uwchlan Township, Chester County  
October 3, 2021

This report examines the annual fiscal impact to Upper Uwchlan Township and the Downingtown Area School District (DASD) of the Greenridge development proposed by Toll Mid-Atlantic L.P., Inc. The report examines the fiscal impact to the Township and School District during any given year after the completion of the proposed project and full occupancy, based on 2021 levels of revenue, expenditures, and taxation. It is an updated version of the report submitted August 9, 2021.

The Greenridge development proposal consists of 64 single family detached dwellings, with four bedrooms each, to be sold for an average price of \$871,495. At buildout, the proposed development will generate \$55,775,680 of market value and \$25,099,056 of assessed value, which is 2.4 percent of the total assessed value of all properties in the Township. At full occupancy, the proposed development will house 224 persons, including 65 school age children (ages 5-17), of whom 60 will attend public (DASD) schools.

The table below shows the annual net fiscal impact (revenue minus expenditures) to the Township and School District of the proposed development. Below the table are sections on assessments, demographics, Township expenditures and revenue, and School District expenditures and revenue. At the end of this report are the spreadsheets for the Township and School District impact, which show the major expenditure and revenue categories for each entity. All cell addresses in the text refer to these spreadsheets.

Proposed Dwelling Type	Number of Units	Annual Net Township Impact	Annual Net School District Impact	Annual Net Combined Impact	Annual Net Combined Impact per Unit
4 BR SFD	64	\$57,837	\$-47,309	<b>\$10,529</b>	\$165

The annual net fiscal impact of the proposed development is projected to be moderately favorable for the Township and moderately unfavorable for the School District, creating an overall annual net surplus. **The annual net combined fiscal impact for the proposed Greenridge development is projected to total positive (or surplus) \$10,529, or positive \$165 per unit.** The annual combined revenue is projected to exceed the annual combined expenditures by 0.9 percent.

In addition to the annual net impact figures shown in the table above, the proposed development will also generate one-time real estate transfer tax revenue from the initial sales of the units over the buildout period, projected to total \$278,878 to each of the Township and School District. Further, the proposed development will generate \$147,444 in traffic impact fees to the Township over the buildout period.

The most important reason for the annual net surplus to the Township is the relatively high value of the proposed homes. The median housing value in Upper Uwchlan Township in the 2019 American Community Survey (a function of the U.S. Census Bureau) was \$442,300. In comparison, the market value of the proposed homes is projected to be \$871,495, nearly twice as high. The higher housing value translates to higher revenue in the real estate tax, earned income tax, and real estate transfer tax categories, for both the Township and School District. For the School District, the higher revenue from the proposed homes does not offset the higher expenditures generated by the greater number of students, resulting in a small annual deficit to the District.

### Assessments

The average market value of the proposed units is projected to be \$871,495 (cell C6). The total market value is determined by multiplying the number of units (64, cell B6) by the market value per unit (\$871,495, cell C6). The market value at buildout is projected to total \$55,775,680 (cell D6).

The assessed value is determined by multiplying the market value (totaling \$55,775,680, cell D6) by the 2021 Chester County common level ratio of 45.0 percent, from the Pennsylvania State Tax Equalization Board (cell D18). The assessed value at buildout is projected to total \$25,099,056 (cell E6). This \$25,099,056 in projected assessed value represents 2.4 percent of the entire assessed value of all properties in Upper Uwchlan Township (\$1,058,654,325, from the Chester County Board of Assessment computer data base as of July 29, 2021), and 0.4 percent of the entire assessed value of all properties in the Downingtown Area School District (\$5,697,963,007, according to the DASD 2021-2022 budget). Please note that the Chester County Board of Assessment will determine the actual assessments only when the proposed development is constructed and inspected.

### Demographics

The number of persons per unit is projected to be 3.50 for the proposed four bedroom single family detached dwellings (cell F6). This demographic multiplier is from *Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing*, by Robert W. Burchell, David Listokin, and William Dolphin of the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR), published in June, 2006. This multiplier is based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Sample, and is specific to four bedroom SFD dwellings with higher values, built between 1990 and 2000, and specifically in Pennsylvania. The number of persons is determined by multiplying the number of units (64, cell B6) by the number of persons per unit (3.50, cell F6). The number of persons projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy totals 224 (cell G6).

The number of school age children per unit is projected to be 1.02 (cell F32 of the School District spreadsheet), from the same CUPR document on Pennsylvania residential demographic multipliers. The number of public school students is determined by multiplying the number of units (64, cell B32) by the number of school age children per unit (1.02, cell F32), and by 92.4 percent (cell D45), to account for those children who will attend private schools or be schooled at home. The figure of 92.4 percent is from the 2019 American Community Survey (the most recent available), a function of the U.S. Census, specifically for Upper Uwchlan Township, which reported 2,697 public school students out of 2,920 school age children. The number of DASD students projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy totals 60 (cell G32).

### Annual Upper Uwchlan Township Expenditures

The 2021 Upper Uwchlan Township budget includes the following seven funds totaling \$10,873,439 in expenditures, shown in the table below with their respective expenditure totals:

Fund	Budgeted Amount
General Fund	\$6,500,327
Capital Reserve Fund	\$2,357,462
Solid Waste Fund	\$1,045,522
Water Resource Protection Fund	\$243,400

Fund	Budgeted Amount
Liquid Fuels Fund	\$397,800
Act 209 Traffic Impact Fee Fund	\$0
Sewer Fund	\$328,928
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,873,439</b>

In order to find a more accurate measure of the average annual expenditures for the proposed development, this analysis focuses on the regular, annual ongoing operating expenditures of the Township. Such operations are quantified in the following four funds, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the 2021 budget.

Fund	Budgeted Amount
General Fund	\$6,500,327
Solid Waste Fund	\$1,045,522
Water Resource Protection Fund	\$243,400
Liquid Fuels Fund	\$397,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,187,049</b>

The four operating funds total \$8,187,049 in expenditures for 2021 (cell D19). These four funds cover nearly all Township expenditures, including general government, executive, audit, tax collection, legal, computer, engineering, Township properties, police, fire, ambulance, codes administration, planning and zoning, emergency operations, signs, signals, public works, park and recreation, historical commissions, solid waste collection and disposal, road maintenance, and water resource protection.

The Sewer Fund is excluded because it is a proprietary fund, where revenue from sewer fees and tapping fees is spent on the sewage collection and treatment system. The Capital Reserve Fund is excluded because it is a capital and not operating fund, where revenue from transfers from the General Fund and Sewer Fund, plus some grant revenue and fund balances from previous years, is spent on capital purchases such as the Township Building expansion, Park Road reconstruction, Upland Farms parkland development, Hickory Park lighting, and work at Fellowship Fields. Please note that though the capital expenditures from the Capital Reserve Fund are excluded from this analysis, the annual debt service of \$243,656 is considered an operating expenditure, and is therefore included in the 2021 Township expenditures. The Act 209 Traffic Impact Fee Fund has no budgeted expenditures for 2021.

In order to find a more accurate measure of the average annual operating expenditures for future residents of the proposed development, three categories of funds are subtracted from the total 2021 operating expenditures of \$8,187,049 (cell D19):

1. Pass-Through Funds. Pass-through funds are excluded because the proposed development will have no net impact on these funds, since revenue always equals expenditures. Pass-through funds that are excluded are as follows, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the Township's 2021 budget.

Source	Fund	Budgeted Amount
State Utility Tax (PURTA)	General	\$5,000
State Aid Police Pension	General	\$122,000
State Aid Non-Uniform Pension	General	\$80,000
Foreign Fire Insurance	General	\$95,000
Reimbursed Police Wages	General	\$3,000
Rental Property Income	General	\$24,000
Alcoholic Beverages Tax	General	\$600
Engineering Fees	General	\$50,000
Administrative Fees from Engineering	General	\$4,000
Administrative Fees from Legal	General	\$1,000
Legal Services Fees	General	\$6,000
Fees from Engineering CU	General	\$20,000
Fees from Advertising Reimbursements	General	\$500
Pavilion Rental	General	\$500
Field Program Revenue	General	\$30,000
Turf Field Fees	General	\$45,000
Community Events Donations	General	\$10,000
Municipal Authority Reimbursement	General	\$264,736
Hazardous Waste Event	Solid Waste	\$2,000
Leaf Bags Sold	Solid Waste	\$500
Scrap Metal Sold	Solid Waste	\$500
Solid Waste Performance Grant	Solid Waste	\$25,000
Snow Agreement	Liquid Fuels	\$600
Turnback Maintenance	Liquid Fuels	\$14,520
Motor Fuel Vehicle Taxes	Liquid Fuels	\$362,257
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,166,713</b>

The 2021 pass-through funds total \$1,166,713.

2. Development Related Funds. The other pass-through category is charges related to the processing and administration of proposed subdivisions and land developments in the Township, shown in the table below with their respective sums in the 2021 budget (all are in the General Fund):

Source	Budgeted Amount
Zoning/Subdivision/Land Development	\$6,000
Building Permits	\$425,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$431,000</b>

Source	Budgeted Amount
<b>90 Percent Subtracted</b>	<b>\$387,900</b>
<b>10 Percent as Miscellaneous Revenue</b>	<b>\$43,100</b>

Development related funds are excluded because they are in essence a one-time pass-through fund for specific functions normally associated with new development. The funds will be expended on inspections, the administration of permits, etc. while a development is under construction, not on other municipal functions associated with the time after a development is completed. Once a development is completed, the revenue and expenditures for such permits and application fees decrease significantly, but not completely. Ninety percent of the 2021 development related pass-through funds of \$431,000 (or \$387,900) is excluded from the total expenditures. Only 90 percent of the development related funds is excluded from the expenditure analysis, in acknowledgment that there will still be some expenditures on subdivisions and land developments once they are complete, for things like building renovations and inspections for violations. Please note that in the revenue analysis, below, only 10 percent of the revenue from development related funds (or \$43,100) is included in the category of miscellaneous revenue.

3. **Interfund Transfers.** Certain interfund transfers are excluded, for two reasons. Since the General Fund and Water Resources Protection Fund are both operating funds, the transfer of \$245,000 is excluded in order to avoid double counting the same expenditures in two included funds. The transfers from the General Fund and Solid Waste Fund to the Capital Fund are excluded in order to focus on operating – and not capital – expenditures. As noted above, the annual debt service of \$243,656 is considered an operating expenditure, and is therefore included in the 2021 Township expenditures.

Source	Budgeted Amount
General Fund to Capital Fund (minus debt service)	\$656,344
General Fund to Water Resources Protection Fund	\$245,000
Solid Waste Fund to Capital Fund	\$100,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,001,344</b>

The 2021 excluded pass-through funds, development related funds and interfund transfers total \$2,555,957 (cell D20). The 2021 net Township operating expenditures (minus the excluded pass-through funds, development related funds and interfund transfers) are \$5,631,092 (cell D21). Please note that just as the expenditures for the above funds are not included in the expenditure calculations of this section, the revenue from these sources is also not included in the revenue analysis, below.

Then, the Township expenditures associated with existing nonresidential development are subtracted from the net expenditures using the “proportional valuation method” of *The New Practitioner’s Guide to Fiscal Impact Analysis*, by Robert W. Burchell, David Listokin, and William R. Dolphin, Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research, 1985. First, a portion of the total Township expenditures is assigned to existing nonresidential development, based on the average value of property. According to the Chester County Board of Assessment Land Use Classification Report as of July 29, 2021, the total assessed value of the 4,474 properties in Upper Uwchlan Township was \$1,058,654,325, yielding an average assessed value of \$236,624. Of those properties, 275 were nonresidential (commercial, industrial, institutional, utility, etc., whether taxable or exempt), with a total assessed value of \$164,027,790 (representing 15.5 percent of the Township total), and an average assessed value of \$596,465.

The proportion of average nonresidential assessed value to average Township assessed value (residential

and nonresidential combined) is 2.52, which is then used to determine the refinement coefficient of 1.56 from a graph in *The New Practitioner's Guide*. The refinement coefficient is based on empirical research by the Rutgers University CUPR, and is necessary to adjust the costs of existing nonresidential development in communities without extensive nonresidential development of very high average assessed value, such as Upper Uwchlan Township. By comparison, in communities where the ratio between the average nonresidential assessment and the average overall assessment is above 6, an economy of scale reduces the nonresidential expenditures on a per square foot basis, and the refinement coefficient is below 1.00.

The proportion of Township assessed value in nonresidential uses (15.5 percent) is then multiplied by the refinement coefficient of 1.56, and by the 2021 net Township operating expenditures of \$5,631,092 (cell D21). The result of this calculation is that \$1,359,982 of the net Township operating expenditures (representing 24.2 percent) is attributable to existing nonresidential development (cell D22). This sum is subtracted from the 2021 net Township operating expenditures (\$5,631,092, cell D21), and the remainder (\$4,270,022 in expenditures attributable to existing residential development) is divided by the estimated number of Township residents in 2021, which is 12,275 (cell J18, from the recently released 2020 U.S. Census).

The per capita Township operating expenditures attributable to existing residential development are \$347.86 (cell D23), which are then applied to the number of persons projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy (totaling 224, cell G6) to find the total annual Township expenditures for the proposed development of \$77,921 (cell H6), or \$1,218 per unit (cell I6).

#### Annual Upper Uwchlan Township Revenue

The annual Township revenue is determined by adding the following sources:

- Real estate tax revenue, based on the 2021 Township General Fund tax rate of 1.034 mills (cell J19), applied to the projected assessed value of the proposed development (\$25,099,056, cell E6). Please note that the General Fund tax millage includes the 0.25 mills for ambulance, rescue and emergency services. The annual real estate tax revenue is projected to total \$25,952 (cell B11).
- Earned income tax revenue, based on the tax rate of 0.5 percent (for the General Fund) applied to the household income of residents, which is calculated by determining the monthly housing costs, including a combination of real estate taxes, insurance, homeowners association fees and mortgage costs, as shown in the table below.

Proposed Dwelling Type	Monthly RE Taxes	Monthly Insurance	Monthly HOA Fee	Monthly Mortgage	Minimum Annual Income
4BR SFD	\$1,089	\$90	\$127	\$3,309	\$197,768

The monthly real estate taxes are based on a combined Township plus School District plus County tax rate of 33.311 mills. Insurance costs are projected to be \$90 per month. HOA fees are projected to be \$127 per month. The mortgage costs are based on the conforming rate of 2.88 percent, according to the September 23, 2021 Primary Mortgage Market Survey by Freddie Mac (available on [www.freddiemac.com](http://www.freddiemac.com)). The mortgage costs also assume a 10 percent down payment, which is higher (and therefore more conservative) than the 6.1 percent down payment which is the national median in the first quarter of 2021 for home purchases (as opposed to refinances) according to ATTOM Data Solutions (see <https://www.attomdata.com/news/market-trends/mortgage-origination/attom-data-solutions-q1-2021-u-s-residential-property-mortgage-origination-report/>). The minimum annual household income is

determined by adding all the monthly housing costs, multiplying times twelve months, and dividing by 28 percent, according to Fannie Mae criteria that no more than 28 percent of annual household income be used for housing costs. The minimum annual household income necessary to afford the proposed homes and their associated housing costs is projected to be \$197,768 which is then multiplied by the number of units (64, cell B6) and by the Township General Fund tax rate of 0.5 percent. The annual earned income tax revenue is projected to total \$63,286 (cell C11). Please note that this revenue assumes the lowest level of household income needed to afford the mortgage, taxes, insurance and HOA fees. Most households will have significantly higher levels of income, which will result in additional annual revenue to the Township.

- Real estate transfer tax revenue, based on the market value of the units (\$871,495, cell C6) multiplied by the number of units (64, cell B6), multiplied by the projected annual housing turnover rate of 5.0 percent for single family detached dwellings (cell J20), and multiplied by the Township's tax rate of 0.5 percent of market value. The annual real estate transfer tax revenue is projected to total \$13,944 (cell D11). Please note that this annual revenue figure does not include the one-time real estate transfer tax revenue from the initial sales of the units over the buildout period, projected to total \$278,878 (cell A24).
- Trash and recycling fee revenue, based on the Township's annual trash and recycling fee of \$315 (cell J21) applied to the number of units in the proposed development (64, cell B6). The annual trash and recycling fee revenue is projected to total \$20,160 (cell E11).
- Franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue, based on the Township's budgeted revenue from these sources (totaling \$263,100 comprised of \$220,000 in franchise fee revenue and \$43,100 in development related revenue, representing 10 percent of the total revenue in this category associated with existing and not new development, which is \$431,000; see the expenditure analysis, above) divided by the 2021 estimated number of units in the Township (3,980, cell J22, also from the 2020 U.S. Census), and that per unit revenue of \$66.11 (cell J23) is applied to the number of units in the proposed development (64, cell B6). The annual franchise fee and miscellaneous revenue is projected to total \$4,231 (cell F11).
- Liquid Fuels revenue, based on PennDOT's 2021 per person revenue of \$17.8193 (cell J24) applied to the number of persons projected to reside in the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy (totaling 224, cell G6), plus the per mile revenue of \$3,096.7932 applied to the 0.93 linear miles of roadway to be offered for dedication to the Township. The per person revenue and per mile revenue are found in the current Department of Transportation Bureau of Municipal Services *Municipal Liquid Fuels Allocations Report* (dated February 5, 2021). The annual Liquid Fuels revenue is projected to be \$3,991.52 for the residential element and \$2,891.51 for the roadway element, for a total of \$6,883 (cell G11).
- Interest earnings, based on the projected assessed value of the proposed development (\$25,099,056, cell E6) divided by the Township's total taxable assessed value (\$1,012,628,285, according to the Chester County Board of Assessment computer data base), and multiplying by the Township's projected revenue from interest earnings in the 2021 budget, which totals \$52,600 and is shown in the table below.

Fund	Interest Earnings
General Fund	\$35,000
Solid Waste Fund	\$10,000
Water Resource Protection Fund	\$600
Liquid Fuels Fund	\$7,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$52,600</b>

The annual interest earnings are projected to total \$1,304 (cell H11).

The annual Township revenue from all sources is projected to total \$135,760 (cell I11), or \$2,121 per unit (cell J11). The annual net Township impact (revenue minus expenditures) is projected to total positive \$57,838 (cell B15), or positive \$904 per unit (cell C15). Annual revenue is projected to exceed annual expenditures by 74.2 percent (cell D15). Once again, please note that this annual net Township revenue figure does not include the real estate transfer tax revenue of \$278,878 from the initial sales of the units or the \$147,444 in traffic impact fees.

#### Annual Downingtown Area School District Expenditures

The number of units (64, cell B32 of the School District spreadsheet), average market value per unit (\$871,495, cell C32), total market value (\$55,775,680, cell D32), and total assessed value (\$25,099,056, cell E32) are the same as for the Township impact, above. As noted above, the proposed development is projected to generate 1.02 school age child per unit (cell F32) and 60 public school (DASD) students overall (cell G32).

The Downingtown Area School District General Fund budgeted expenditures total \$244,086,119 for the 2021-2022 year (cell D46). The following pass-through funds are subtracted from this total:

Pass-Through Fund	Budgeted Amount
Public Utility Realty Tax	\$161,900
Revenue from LEA Activities	\$1,640,000
Revenue from Intermediary Sources	\$2,284,636
Rentals	\$450,000
Tuition from Patrons	\$190,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,726,536</b>

The excluded pass-through funds total \$4,726,536. In addition, the budgetary reserve of \$3,645,000 is excluded, representing funds not projected to be expended during the school year. The pass-through funds and budgetary reserve total \$8,371,536 (cell D47), with the remaining School District net expenditures totaling \$235,714,583 (cell D48). This figure is then divided by the 2021-2022 District-wide projected enrollment of 13,351 students (cell D49, from the District's enrollment projections in the 2020-2021 budget book) to find the 2021-2022 DASD net expenditure of \$17,655 per student (cell I44). This per student expenditure is applied to the number of students projected to attend public schools from the proposed development at buildout and full occupancy (totaling 60, cell G32) to find the annual School District expenditures of \$1,064,513 (cell H32), or \$16,633 per unit (cell I32).

#### Annual Downingtown Area School District Revenue

The annual School District revenue is determined by adding the following sources:

- Real estate tax revenue, based on the School District's 2021-2022 tax rate of 27.7260 mills (cell I45) applied to the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling \$25,099,056, cell E32). Subtracted from this total is the proposed homestead exclusion at \$7,710 of assessed value per unit applied to the number of units (64, cell B32). The proposed homestead exclusion is projected to subtract \$214 per unit (cell I46) or \$13,681 from the total School District real estate tax revenue for the entire proposed development. The annual real estate tax revenue is projected to total \$682,215 (cell B37).

- Earned income tax revenue, determined using the same method as was used for the Township impact, above. The annual earned income tax revenue is projected to total \$63,286 (cell C37).
- Real estate transfer tax revenue, determined using the same method as was used for the Township impact, above. The annual real estate transfer tax revenue is projected to total \$13,944 (cell D37). As noted above, this annual revenue figure does not include the one-time real estate transfer tax revenue to the School District from the initial sales of the units over the buildout period, projected to total \$278,878 (cell A50).
- State and Federal revenue, based on the projected 2021-2022 DASD budgeted revenue from those sources totaling \$56,587,660 divided by the projected 2021-2022 DASD enrollment of 13,351 (cell D49), or \$4,238 per public school student (cell I48), applied to the projected number of students from the proposed development (totaling 60, cell G32). The annual state and federal revenue is projected to total \$255,556 (cell E37).
- Earnings on investments, based on the projected assessed value of the proposed development (totaling \$25,099,056, cell E32) divided by the School District's total taxable assessed value (\$5,697,963,007, according to the 2021-2022 DASD budget), and multiplying by the School District's 2021-2022 revenue from earnings on investments in the budget (\$500,000, cell I49). The annual earnings on investments are projected to total \$2,202 (cell F37).

The annual School District revenue from all sources is projected to total \$1,017,204 (cell G37), or \$15,894 per unit (cell H37). The annual net School District impact (revenue minus expenditures) is projected to total negative (or deficit) \$47,309 (cell B41), or negative \$739 per unit (cell C41). Annual expenditures are projected to exceed annual revenue by 4.4 percent (cell D41). The projected annual deficit is minimal, representing the DASD expenditures to educate only 2.68 students. Once again, please note that this annual net School District impact does not include the real estate transfer tax revenue of \$278,878 from the initial sales of the units.

**Recreation Impact Analysis**  
**Proposed Greenridge Development**  
**Upper Uwchlan Township, Chester County**  
October 3, 2021

This report examines the recreation impact to Upper Uwchlan Township of the proposed development on the 65.95 acre gross site on the northwest side of Greenridge Road. The proposed development consists of 64 new single family detached dwellings, with four bedrooms each, along with substantial open space. The recreation impact analysis follows the format of Section 162-9.H(3) of the Upper Uwchlan Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**A. Projected Age Breakdown of the Residents of the Proposed Development**

As noted in the fiscal impact analysis, above, the number of persons per unit and school age children per unit are derived from the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research data published in June, 2006 and based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Sample. The Rutgers CUPR examined housing built between 1990 and 2000 specifically in Pennsylvania, and determined the demographic multipliers for a variety of dwelling types (detached, attached, multifamily, etc.), size (in number of bedrooms), and value. The demographic multiplier of 3.50 used in this analysis is for four bedroom single family detached dwellings with very high values. The number of persons is projected to total 224. The age breakdown of the residents of the proposed development is shown below:

Age	Per Unit	Total 64 Units
Total Persons	3.50	224
0-4	0.35	22
5-13	0.79	51
14-17	0.23	15
18-24	0.12	8
25-44	1.20	77
45-64	0.74	47
65-74	0.05	3
75 and over	0.02	1

The demographic multiplier for number of school age children (ages 5-18) per unit is also from the Rutgers CUPR, and is 1.02 per unit. The breakdown of school age children by grade is shown below:

Grade	Per Unit	Total 64 Units
Total School Age Children	1.02	65
K-2	0.31	20

Grade	Per Unit	Total 64 Units
3-6	0.34	22
7-9	0.21	13
10-12	0.16	10

Of the total 65 school age children, only 92.4 percent are projected to attend public schools (see the fiscal impact analysis, above, for the source of this figure). Therefore, only 60 DASD students are projected from the proposed development.

### **B. Description of Proposed Recreational Facilities**

The proposed development site is 65.95 acres gross. Land within permanent rights-of-way, the Flood Hazard District, wetlands, and prohibitive slopes greater than 25 percent totals 6.87 acres, leaving the net tract area as 59.08 acres. The total open space is proposed to be 30.11 acres. The restricted open space on the site totals 29.19 acres (or approximately 44.3 percent of the gross tract area) and includes all areas not part of individual lots, streets, and lots proposed to be conveyed to the Municipal Authority for sanitary disposal. Of the 29.19 acres of open space, 21.0 acres are proposed usable open space, well in excess of the required 9.89 acres of usable open space. The active recreation land is proposed to be 3.29 acres. This area includes the variable width paved trail (0.74 acres), future Greenridge Road trail (0.58 acres), 8 foot wide nature trail (0.91 acres), and tot lot and upland area (1.06 acres).

The combination of the sidewalks along Roads A, B and C and the proposed trails will create several pedestrian loops through the entire site. A tot lot is proposed adjacent to Lot 19, in a central location in the proposed development. The tot lot is accessible from the intersection of Road B and Road C. The tot lot will include play equipment for the neighborhood children, along with benches for seating.

### **C. Ownership and Maintenance of Recreational Facilities**

The proposed open space and trails will be owned and maintained privately, by the homeowners association of the proposed development. There will be no burden of maintenance or expense borne by Upper Uwchlan Township.

### **D. Description of Existing Municipal Recreational Facilities, and Impact of Proposed Development**

According to the *Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan for Upper Uwchlan Township*, adopted October 19, 2009, as well as the Upper Uwchlan Township Comprehensive Plan, adopted April 21, 2014, the Township's primary active recreation facility is Hickory Park, located on Park Road just south of the Turnpike. The park is described variously as 42.3 acres in size on Page 50 of the *Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan*, and as 27 acres on Pages 8 and 20 of the *Plan*. It includes playing fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, play apparatus, paved and unpaved trails, covered picnic tables, bandstand, trash receptacles, restroom building, and parking area. The park is heavily used by organized sports and casual users throughout most of the year.

Uplands Farms is located on the west side of Pottstown Pike at Darrell Drive, north of the Village of Eagle. The park is 56 acres in size, and is a passive recreation facility with trails and a parking lot. This property also includes an historic farm house and barn, as well as lands for wastewater disposal. Larkins Field is located at Graphite Mine Road and Byers Road. This park is 7.2 acres in size, and contains playing fields and paved trails. Fellowship Fields is located on Fellowship Road east of Pottstown Pike. This park is 17.8 acres in size, and includes playing fields, paved trails, and a picnic pavilion.

Though not a Township facility, Marsh Creek State Park is also located predominantly within the borders of Upper Uwchlan Township. It is 1,705 acres in size, of which 1,372 acres are in the Township. The park includes a 535 acre lake with boating and fishing, as well as a large swimming pool, picnic areas, and hiking and equestrian trails. While much of the park is for passive recreation and natural feature preservation, the swimming and boating satisfy active recreation needs. The State Park is in the southern part of the Township, along Park Road.

Section 162-54 of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance recommends a minimum of 2.0 acres of playground and neighborhood park acreage for the first 25-50 families in a subdivision, plus 1.0 acre for each additional 50 families or fraction thereof. Therefore, this provision recommends 3.0 acres of playground and neighborhood park acreage for the proposed Greenridge Road development. This area should be suitable for active recreation uses, have only limited environmental constraints, be interconnected with adjacent open space and recreation areas, and be permanently preserved for open space and recreation.

As noted above, the proposed development has 30.11 acres of total open space, 21.0 acres of usable open space, and 3.29 acres of active recreation land, with internal trails along with internal sidewalks connecting to Greenridge Road. These open space areas constitute the neighborhood park for the proposed development, and should accommodate some of the active and passive recreation needs of the prospective residents. But because the on-site facilities do not include all recreation options (i.e., all court and field sports, etc.), the proposed development will likely result in a nominal increase in the use of the existing Township and State recreation facilities, particularly Hickory Park, Marsh Creek State Park, Larkins Field, Upland Farm and Fellowship Field.

The Upper Uwchlan Township *Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan* on page 61 includes the Chester County Park and Recreation Guidelines, which call for 0.25 acres of mini-park land per 1,000 population, 2.5 to 3.5 acres of neighborhood park land per 1,000 population, and 3.0 to 6.0 acres of community park land per 1,000 population. With the 224 persons projected to reside in the proposed development, that translates to 0.056 acres of mini-park land, 0.56 to 0.784 acres of neighborhood park land, and 0.672 to 1.344 acres of community park land. As noted above, the proposed development includes 3.29 acres of active recreation land, which includes a tot lot and walking trails, and 21.0 acres of usable passive recreation open space. These acreage figures appear to meet the Chester County Park and Recreation Guidelines for various types of park land.

The *Open Space, Recreation and Environmental Resources Plan* on page 62 also includes the suggested outdoor activity/facility needs (e.g., basketball courts, tennis courts, baseball fields, etc.), from Chester County *Linking Landscapes*. As noted above, the proposed development will include a tot lot and walking trails, but none of the other recreation facilities that appear on the table in the *Plan*. The prospective residents of the proposed development will use the existing Township and State recreation facilities, including Hickory Park, Marsh Creek State Park, Larkins Field, Upland Farm and Fellowship Field.

#### **E. Proposed Recreation Facilities to Compensate for any Anticipated Deficiencies in Township's Recreation Facilities**

As noted above, proposed open space areas and recreation facilities should accommodate some of the recreation needs of the prospective residents. The remaining recreation needs of the prospective residents will be met by the existing Township and State facilities, particularly Hickory Park, Larkins Field, Fellowship Field, Upland Farm and Marsh Creek State Park. The residents of the proposed development will provide funding to operate and maintain the Township recreation facilities (and all other municipal functions) through the projected annual \$135,760 revenue from the real estate tax, earned income tax, real estate transfer tax, trash and recycling fee, cable TV and miscellaneous revenue, liquid fuels revenue, and

interest income (see the fiscal impact analysis, above).

#### **F. Accessibility of Proposed Facilities to General Township Residents**

The proposed open space and nature trails will be privately owned and maintained, and will be available for the use of the residents and guests of the development. The public community trail and future Greenridge Road trail are to be open to the public and general Township residents.

#### **G. Contributions from Developer to Compensate for Expected Impacts**

Again, given the likelihood that the proposed open space and recreation facilities will accommodate some of the recreation needs of the prospective residents, the nominal increase in the use of existing Township and State facilities, and the significant annual revenue from the proposed development to cover recreation expenditures, no further contributions from the developer are proposed at this time.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	<b>ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL IMPACT TO UPPER UWCHLAN TOWNSHIP</b>									
2	<b>Of the Proposed Greenridge Development at Buildout</b>								October 3, 2021	
3										
4	Proposed	Number of	Average Market Value	Market	Total	Persons	Number of	<b>Annual Township</b>	Expenditures	
5	Dwelling Type	Units	per Unit	Value	Assessment	per Unit	Persons	<b>Expenditures</b>	per Unit	
6	4 BR SFD	64	\$871,495	\$55,775,680	\$25,099,056	3.50	224	<b>\$77,921</b>	\$1,218	
7										
8		<b>Annual Township Revenue</b>								
9	Proposed	Real Estate	Earned Income	Real Estate	Trash &	Cable TV &	Liquid Fuels	Interest	<b>Total</b>	Revenue
10	Dwelling Type	Tax	Tax	Transfer Tax **	Recycling Fee	Misc. Revenue	Revenue	Earnings	<b>Revenue</b>	per Unit
11	4 BR SFD	\$25,952	\$63,286	\$13,944	\$20,160	\$4,231	\$6,883	\$1,304	<b>\$135,760</b>	\$2,121
12										
13	Proposed	<b>Annual Net</b>	Annual Net Township	Revenue >						
14	Dwelling Type	<b>Township Revenue</b>	Revenue per Unit	Expenditures						
15	4 BR SFD	<b>\$57,838</b>	\$904	74.2%						
16										
17	<b>NOTES:</b>									
18	2021-2022 STEB Common Level Ratio for Chester County				45.0%		2021 Estimated Township Population			12,275
19	2021 Total Township Operating Fund Expenditures - 4 Funds				\$8,187,049		2021 Township Real Estate Tax Millage			1.034
20	Minus Pass-Through, Dev. Rel. & Cap. Exp's and Interfund Transfers				\$2,555,957		Annual Housing Turnover Rate - SFD			5.0%
21	2021 Net Township Operating Fund Expenditures - 4 Funds				\$5,631,092		2021 Township Annual Trash & Recycling Fee			\$315
22	Existing Township Nonresidential Expenditures		24.2%	\$1,361,070			2021 Estimated Township Housing Units			3,980
23	2021 Township per Capita Operating Fund Expenditure				\$347.86		2021 Twp. Cable TV & Misc. Revenue per Unit			\$66.11
24	** Does not include the real estate transfer tax revenue of \$278,878 from the initial sales of the units over the buildout period.						2021 Liquid Fuels Revenue per Person			\$17.8193

