

Appendix C

POPULATION, HOUSING, AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Introduction

East Goshen Township, Chester County, is located in southeastern Pennsylvania. It is a suburban community characterized by its historic rural landscape and is predominately residential in nature. The population in the year 2000 according to the United States Census Bureau was 16,824.

Population, housing, and economic profiles provide insight into characteristics and trends of the community and its residents. This information gives us the foundation on which sound planning strategies for land use, community facilities and services and transportation improvements are based. Comparisons between East Goshen Township and neighboring municipalities will give us the opportunity to analyze regional influences.

The following information is analyzed in this Chapter:

Population Profile:

- Historic Population Trends
- Population Projections
- Population by Race and Hispanic Origin
- Age Distribution

Housing Profile:

- Number of Housing Units
- Housing Projections
- Housing Types
- Building Permit Activity
- Persons Per Household
- Home Ownership
- Housing Costs
- Housing Affordability and Fair Share Obligations

Economic Profile:

- Income Levels
- Educational Attainment
- Unemployment
- Employment Characteristics
- Commuting Patterns

Population Profile

Historic Population Trends

The 1960's marked the beginning of a period of rapid expansion through development that was to occur in East Goshen. With 1,694 residents in 1960 the population has grown ten times to 16,824 in 2000 shown in Table C-1.

**Table C-1: Population Trends, 1950–2000
East Goshen Township**

Year	Population	Numeric Increase	Percent Increase
1950	1,039	---	---
1960	1,694	655	63.0%
1970	5,138	3,444	203.0%
1980	10,021	4,883	95.0%
1990	15,138	5,117	51.1%
2000	16,824	1,686	11.1%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1950-2000

The greatest percentage increase occurred in the 1960's when the population of the Township more than tripled with a 203% increase. In the 1970's population almost doubled again with a 95% increase. In terms of numeric increases, the most dramatic occurred in the 1980's with the addition of 5,100 new residents. The slowest growth rate of 11% in the Township took place in the 1990's which was slightly below the growth rate for Chester County as a whole at 15%. The County rate during this time period was greatly affected by the expansive growth experienced in the central and eastern areas resulting in a high Countywide growth rate for the decade. East Goshen is projected to grow at a rate of 10% until 2010 and the trend of lower growth rates will continue at 7% as projected through 2030.

As illustrated in Table C-2 the overall East Goshen population increase between 1970 and 2000 was over 227%, far ahead of Chester County's rate for the same time period.

**Table C-2: Population Growth, 1970–2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Population				Percent Change	
	1970	1980	1990	2000	1970-2000	1990-2000
East Goshen	5,138	10,021	15,138	16,824	227.4%	11.1%
West Goshen	12,838	16,164	18,082	20,495	59.6%	13.3%
Westtown	5,069	6,774	9,937	10,352	104.2%	4.2%
West Whiteland	7,149	9,584	12,403	16,499	130.8%	33.0%
East Whiteland	7,242	8,468	8,398	9,333	28.9%	11.1%
Willistown	9,128	8,284	9,380	10,011	9.7%	6.7%
Chester County	227,746	316,396	376,396	433,501	90.3%	15.2%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1970-2000

East Goshen was a highly desired quality location for residential living. During this time period suburban sprawl continued until the present time as the Township approaches build out. In the 1990's the growth rate slowed down considerably in East Goshen though not as slowly as other adjacent townships most notably Westtown at 4% and Willistown at 6.7%. The highest growth rate among the surrounding townships occurred in West Whiteland with a 33% increase in population during the decade. West Whiteland's vast commercial and retail growth is based to a significant degree on the locational factors of easy access to multiple modes of transportation, the availability of newer, larger housing models, and increased affluence of new residents during the 1990's.

Population Projections

Population projections assist in planning for future land use, providing local services, developing community facilities and improving the circulation system. Although projections serve only as general indicators since it can be difficult to accurately predict future population levels, they are necessary to plan for the future. Table C-3 shows the projected populations for East Goshen and its adjacent municipalities over the next 30 years incrementally divided in 10-year horizons.

**Table C-3: Population Projections, 2000–2030
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Population				Numeric Change	Percent Change
	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030	2000-2030
East Goshen	16,824	18,530	19,780	21,130	4,306	25.6%
West Goshen	20,495	22,500	24,060	25,490	4,995	24.4%
Westtown	10,352	10,560	10,760	11,450	1,098	10.6%
West Whiteland	16,499	19,100	20,460	21,560	5,061	30.7%
East Whiteland	9,333	10,030	10,560	11,180	1,847	19.8%
Willistown	10,011	10,460	10,370	10,350	339	3.4%
Chester County	433,501	483,500	528,000	571,800	138,299	31.9%

Source: 2000 data from U.S. Census Bureau. Projections: CCPC, 2002.

The County Planning Commission derived these projections based in part on past rates of growth applying adjustment factors for environmental factors, proposed development projects, infrastructure, highways, protected lands, zoning and municipal policies affecting development, Landscapes Policy, remaining developable land, and group quarters population. The projections indicate that East Goshen should expect to see the potential for more than 4,300 new residents by the year 2030, a total number exceeded only by West Goshen and West Whiteland. Whether or not this projection is achievable relative to availability of developable land and the potential for redevelopment will be addressed in more detail in the Developable Lands Analysis (see Appendix B, Existing Land Use Inventory) and the Land Use Plan (see Chapter 2).

Population by Race and Hispanic Origin

The composition of East Goshen’s and surrounding municipalities’ population by race and by Hispanic/Latino origin are provided in Tables C-4 and C-5. Because a person of Hispanic/Latino origin can be of any race this information is shown in separate tables.

**Table C-4: Population By Race, 2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	White		Black		Asian		Other*	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
East Goshen	15,880	94.4%	452	2.7%	331	2.0%	161	0.9%
West Goshen	18,549	90.5%	871	4.2%	775	3.8%	300	1.5%
Westtown	9,728	94.0%	268	2.6%	251	2.4%	105	1.0%
West Whiteland	14,742	89.4%	887	5.4%	598	3.6%	272	1.6%
East Whiteland	8,360	89.6%	306	3.3%	465	5.0%	202	2.2%
Willistown	9,596	95.9%	214	2.1%	127	1.3%	74	0.7%
Chester County	390,519	90.1%	29,221	6.7%	9,441	2.2%	11,248	1.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

* "Other" includes people claiming two or more races, American Indian, Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, or some other race.

In terms of racial composition, East Goshen is primarily white at 94%, in line with the composition of Chester County as a whole. Similar percentages, with some variations, can be seen in the surrounding municipalities. Though not equally distributed by race, West Whiteland is considered the most racially diverse of the six municipalities. The implication of not having diverse racial composition is the impact of public and private initiatives.

**Table C-5: Hispanic or Latino Population, 1980 – 2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change 1980 – 2000
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
East Goshen	70	0.7%	45	0.3%	197	1.2%	181%
West Goshen	210	1.3%	284	1.6%	410	2.0%	95%
Westtown	40	0.6%	84	0.8%	117	1.1%	193%
West Whiteland	65	0.7%	164	1.3%	330	2.0%	408%
East Whiteland	85	1.0%	139	1.7%	226	2.4%	166%
Willistown	79	1.0%	72	0.8%	81	0.8%	3%
Chester County	5,799	1.8%	8,565	2.3%	16,126	3.7%	178%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Hispanic/Latino residents represented 1.2% of East Goshen’s population in 2000, a 181% increase since 1980. The percentage of the Hispanic population is lower than that of Chester County and represents half the percentage of that found in East Whiteland though the overall number is similar. The area as a whole has a significantly smaller proportion of Hispanic/Latino residents in comparison to the County’s population composition of 3.7%, but this may be due in large part to the concentration of the mushroom industry in southern Chester County and the large concentration of Hispanic/Latino workers employed by that industry and therefore living in that part of the County. Between 1980 and 2000, West Whiteland experienced the largest increase (408%) in the number of Hispanic/Latino residents. Hispanic/Latino populations are an additional factor to racial composition, not only in terms of providing additional diversity but because they are an indicator of the growth of particular interests in a community, and of potential issues to address. Hispanic/Latino concentrations in the southern part of the County are typically first-generation and their orientation to society in the United States is still foreign.

While previously a large segment of the Hispanic/Latino population living in Chester County consisted of single males, current trends include more married men with families. Regionally, a need for affordable housing, bilingual services, school programs and assistance with assimilation into the local culture are some of the impacts resulting from increases in the Hispanic/Latino population. It should also be noted that accurate counts of immigrant groups can be difficult to obtain for reasons including tracking migration, non-traditional household composition, fear of government agencies and language barriers. Therefore, counts obtained through the U.S. Census are likely to be somewhat lower than the actual number.

Age Comparisons

To indicate the movement and distribution of age groups in East Goshen from 1980 to 2000, ages for this subsection are broken down into five groups. They are: under 5 pre-school age; 5-17 school age; 18-44 childbearing and first time home buyer age; 45-64 working and second-time home buyer age; and 65+ retirement age as shown in Table C-6.

**Table C-6: Age Group Composition, Female/Male Population, Median Age, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township**

Age Group	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change	Percent Change	Percent Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1980-1990	1990-2000	1980-2000
Under 5	621	6.2%	944	6.2%	899	5.3%	52.0%	(4.8)%	44.8%
5-17*	2,247	22.4%	2,528	16.7%	2,842	16.9%	12.5%	12.4%	26.5%
18-44*	4,794	47.9%	6,546	43.2%	5,626	33.4%	36.5%	(14.1)%	17.4%
45-64	1,804	18.0%	3,304	21.9%	4,377	26.0%	83.1%	32.5%	142.6%
65 and Over	555	5.5%	1,818	12.0%	3,080	18.3%	69.5%	69.4%	455.0%
Total	10,021	100.0%	15,140	100.0%	16,824	100.0%	51.1%	11.1%	67.9%
Female	5,103	50.9%	7,784	51.4%	8,810	52.4%	52.5%	13.2%	72.6%
Male	4,918	49.1%	7,354	48.6%	8,014	47.6%	49.5%	9.0%	63.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

* Due to a change in counting methods, the 2000 Census uses 5-19 and 20-44. Numbers were adjusted relative to full data pulled from the US Census website.

In 1980, the 65 and over age group was the smallest cluster as a percentage of the total population 5.5% and the 18-44 age group the highest percentage of the total population 47.9%. By the 1990 Census, the smallest cluster became the Under 5 age group 6.2% as the 65 and over age group more than tripled in size to 12% of the total population. The largest portion of East Goshen’s population in 1990 and 2000 continued to be the 18-44 age group, though the percentage of the total population is declining from 43.2% in 1990 to 33.4% in 2000. As a percentage increase from 1980 to 1990, the 65 and over group experienced the greatest cumulative growth of 455% for the period 1980 to 2000. In the years ahead, the effects of a continually growing retirement age population coupled with the movement of the working age population into retirement will create a larger percentage of citizenry living on fixed retirement level incomes. This trend has implications for the need for additional elderly housing and services with a declining revenue base. Types of housing demand may also change as an older population seeks smaller properties requiring less maintenance.

From 1990 to 2000 the Under 5 age group experienced a 4.8% decrease in population while the 18-44 age group declined in total population by 14.1%. This further indicates that the overall age of East Goshen’s population is increasing, and that the younger age groups are migrating away from the Township. This real

decline also has implications for the implementation of other effective means of generating municipal income since a decline in income-earners and the in-migration of a retired workforce can create difficulties when implementing any income-based taxation strategy.

Hershey’s Mill Village. An important consideration for the Township is the impact of the development of the large retirement community known as Hershey’s Mill Village. Originally approved in 1973, this community has been developed almost to full buildout. As shown in Table C-7, given the large proportion of the Township population leaning toward persons of retirement age, this comparison is beneficial in order to determine the non-retirement community distribution of the population.

**Table C-7: Age Group and Female/Male Composition, 2000
Hershey’s Mill Village and East Goshen Township**

Age Group	East Goshen Township 2000		Hershey’s Mill Village 2000		Total Township w/o Hershey’s Mill Village 2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent of Total Township	Number	Percent of Total (-) Village
Under 5	899	5.3%	4	0.5%	895	99.5%
5-17	2,842	16.9%	9	0.3%	2,833	99.7%
18-44	5,626	33.5%	76	1.4%	5,550	98.6%
45-64	4,377	26.0%	558	12.7%	3,819	87.3%
65 and Over	3,080	18.3%	1,683	54.6%	1,397	45.4%
Total	16,824	100.0%	2,330	13.8%	14,494	86.2%
Female	8,810	52.4%	1,372	58.9%	7,438	51.3%
Male	8,014	47.6%	958	41.1%	7,056	48.7%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000.

The Female/Male proportion of the population percentages fluctuated slightly over the past 20 years in favor of the female gender which is another indicator of the increasing age of the population in East Goshen. With the sizable tilt in the Hershey’s Mill Village population toward the female population, this also skews the overall Township population data, but to a lesser degree than for age group comparisons. Also noted is the number of persons in the population under age 18 (13 total). While Hershey’s Mill Village is designed for persons age 55 and older, the covenants only require that one resident of each household meet the age requirement, thus allowing for a minimal number of children within Hershey’s Mill Village. Another possibility is the limit of the Census question framework, which defines residents as “persons currently inhabiting the dwelling.” This could introduce small errors in the data.

When comparing the demographic profile of Hershey’s Mill Village versus the overall Township population, it becomes clear that a sizable skewing of the overall average age of the Township is a result of the overly large older population in Hershey’s Mill Village. This is indicated by the third column of data in Table C-7 and again in Table C-9 (see page C-7).

**Table C-8: Median Age, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Median Age (Years)			Percent Change 1980-2000
	1980	1990	2000	
East Goshen	29.4	35.7	41.5	41.2%
West Goshen	29.8	34.0	36.6	22.8%
Westtown	31.4	34.6	38.7	23.2%
West Whiteland	28.5	32.2	34.9	22.5%
East Whiteland	29.4	34.1	38.2	29.9%
Willistown	34.6	39.4	42.8	23.7%
Chester County	30.5	33.8	36.9	21.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Unlike the mean or average age, which can be affected by extreme values either high or low, the median age is significant in that it is the “middle age” of all the persons in the community. In 1980, East Goshen’s median age was 29 years as shown in Table C-8. By 1990, the median had increased to 35.7 years; and by 2000 the median age was up to 41.5 years. In comparison to the surrounding communities for 2000, East Goshen is second oldest to Willistown, which is at 42.8 years. However, Willistown has had the highest median age among East Goshen’s neighboring municipalities over the last 20 years and the increase has been only slightly ahead of the rate experienced by the County, 23.7% versus 21%. In fact, all of the neighboring townships have experienced increases in the median age at a rate higher than the County, though East Goshen’s median age has increased at a far faster rate. This is attributed to the large influx of residents to Hershey’s Mill retirement community, as shown in Table C-9.

**Table C-9: Median Age, 2000
East Goshen Township and Hershey’s Mill Village**

	Median Age (Years)
East Goshen Township (total)	41.5
Hershey’s Mill Village	67.9
East Goshen Township w/o Hershey’s Mill Village (estimated)	36.2
Chester County	36.9

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

The increasing median age in the United States, Chester County and East Goshen is indicative of the aging of the Baby Boom generation. Recent census age structure estimates indicate that the median age of the County population will continue its upward trend. As noted previously, the increasing median age and growing older age groups will have implications for the types of facilities and services needed by the residents of the region. Similarly, changes in the younger age categories will have implications for demands on school facilities.

Housing Profile

Number of Housing Units

Housing units in East Goshen increased at a rate of nearly 15%, the third lowest rate in comparison to the surrounding municipalities, see Table C-10. Between 1990 and 2000, new housing increased from a high of almost 38% (1,848 new units) in West Whiteland to a low of about 13% (901 units) in West Goshen. In comparison to Chester County 17.3%, all of the communities except West Whiteland had somewhat lower percentages of new housing units for 1990 to 2000.

**Table C-10: Actual and Projected Number of Housing Units, 1990-2020
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1990 (actual)	2000 (actual)	2010	2020	Actual Change 1990-2000		Projected Increase 2000-2020	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent
East Goshen	6,535	7,496	7,900	8,450	961	14.7%	954	12.7%
West Goshen	6,802	7,703	8,400	9,000	901	13.2%	1,297	16.8%
Westtown	3,279	3,795	3,800	3,900	516	15.7%	105	2.8%
West Whiteland	4,900	6,748	7,850	8,400	1,848	37.7%	1,652	24.5%
East Whiteland	3,001	3,460	3,900	4,100	459	15.3%	640	18.5%
Willistown	3,434	3,932	4,100	4,100	498	14.5%	168	4.3%
Chester County	139,597	163,773	182,500	199,250	24,176	17.3%	35,477	21.7%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1990-2000; Chester County Planning Commission Population Projections, 2002.

Housing projections for 2010 to 2020 are calculated by dividing the projected population for each community by the number of persons per household in 2000 (See Table C-13). Based on the relative accuracy of the County’s projections, the number of new housing units needed by the year 2020 is a useful target for planning future housing needs of the Township. Based on these housing projections, the Township should plan for an additional 954 units by the year 2020.

The Township has mapped the number of parcels and estimated acreage that it believes are available for development within the Township. As of 2003, the total buildable acreage, pending review for natural resource constraints, was 573 acres. Including the completion of the Wellington retirement complex, the Township estimates a total of 788 potential dwelling units. Confirmation of estimated total dwelling units is part of the Fair Share analysis. Please see Appendix H for additional details and analysis.

Housing Types

Understanding the diversity of housing in East Goshen is a prelude to knowing what types of housing are needed to satisfy “fair share” obligations (explained later in this section) and to understand the shift in development patterns in the Township. The number of housing units in East Goshen by type for 1980 to 2000 are shown in Table C-11.

**Table C-11: Number of Housing Units, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township**

Units in Structure	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change 1980-2000
	Number of Units	Percent	Number of Units	Percent	Number of Units	Percent	
Single-Detached	1,774	44.9%	2,889	44.2%	3,268	43.6%	84.2%
Single-Attached	668	16.9%	1,691	25.9%	2,017	26.9%	202.0%
2-4 Units	70	1.8%	115	1.7%	178	2.4%	154.0%
5-9 Units	326	8.3%	378	5.8%	600	8.0%	84.0%
10 or More Units	1,107	28.1%	1,462	22.4%	1,433	19.1%	29.4%
Total Units	3,945	100.0%	6,535	100.0%	7,496	100.0%	90.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Single-family detached dwellings have been the predominant housing style built in the community. In 1980, 45% of all the housing in the Township was single-family detached. This continued into the 1990's though the number decreased to 42.8% of the total number of housing units. In comparison, in 1990, 61% of all housing in Chester County was single-family detached. By the year 2000, the percentage of housing as single-family detached increased to 43.6% of all housing in the Township.

Single-family attached (townhouses and twins) comprised 16.9 % of the Township's housing stock in 1980 and increase to 25.9% in 1990 and to 26.9% in 2000. Multi-family units (more than 4 units) make up the majority of the remaining housing with 27.1% in 2000 though this reflects a decline in the percentage of East Goshen's total housing from 1980, when the percentage was at 36.4%.

While the overall percentage of single-family detached dwellings has declined, this is in large part due to the vast increase of single-family attached dwellings, which are predominantly the result of the long-term development of Hershey's Mill Village. With this large development approaching final buildout, and the remaining developable lands located in the R-2 Low Density Residential District (dominated by single-family detached subdivisions), the likelihood is that further residential development in the Township will be of additional single-family detached units.

Building Activity

Residential building permits issued for 1996 through 1999 and the number of structures built in 2000 in East Goshen Township and surrounding municipalities are shown in Table C-12.¹

¹ Prior to 2000, data were based on the number of building permits issued in each year. In 2000, the building permit data were replaced by the number of structures actually built that year according to Chester County Assessment records.

**Table C-12: Residential Building Permits, 1996-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
East Goshen	144	143	123	152	85	647
West Goshen	88	106	144	143	120	601
Westtown	31	292	23	78	92	516
West Whiteland	123	327	339	191	234	1,214
East Whiteland	15	16	6	24	6	67
Willistown	10	59	94	54	65	282
Chester County	2,253	3,114	3,832	3,778	3,345	16,322

Source: Chester County Planning Commission, *Residential Building Permits, 1996-1999*, Structures Built, Chester County Office of Assessment, 2000.

The number of permits does not indicate the number of housing units constructed in that year it is the number of permits issued for applications submitted. The numbers in 2000 represent the actual number of structures built. In 1996, East Goshen had 144 permits issued and maintained that amount the following year. The year 1998 saw a decline in activity to 123 permits followed by an increase in 1999 to 152 permits. East Goshen had a total of 647 permits or structures from 1996 to 2000. The decline in permit activity is due to a general decline in the amount of development in East Goshen as the Township approaches buildout. West Whiteland had the most permit activity over the five-year period with 1,214 permits or structures, which almost doubled the number in East Goshen having the next highest number. The data suggests that the focus of development pressure in this region of the County has shifted toward the western end of the Main Line corridor, and to a certain degree away from the West Chester Region.

Persons per Household

Average household sizes are shown in Table C-13 for East Goshen and the surrounding municipalities.

**Table C-13: Persons per Household, 1980-2000*
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Average Household Size		
	1980	1990	2000
East Goshen Township	2.68	2.47	2.35
West Goshen	2.92	2.74	2.68
Westtown	3.41	3.07	2.78
West Whiteland	3.01	2.64	2.44
East Whiteland	2.94	2.64	2.59
Willistown	3.08	2.73	2.55
Chester County	2.90	2.73	2.65

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

* Note: the persons per household does not include persons living in institutions or group quarters.

During the 1980's and 1990's, East Goshen and the surrounding communities experienced a decreasing number of persons per household reflecting both a County and National trend. In 1990, East Goshen had the lowest average household size at 2.47 persons while the highest average household size was in Westtown at 3.07 persons per household. This continued in 2000 with East Goshen having the lowest

average household size with 2.35 and Westtown with the highest at 2.78 persons. It is interesting to note that of East Goshen’s neighboring municipalities, West Goshen’s household size over the last 20 years most closely mirrors the average household size for the County as a whole.

Factors contributing to the smaller households include couples having fewer children, young adults postponing marriage, divorced or separated couples living on their own and increasing numbers of older people living alone. Large retirement communities, particularly Hershey’s Mill Village, also contribute to the smaller household sizes in East Goshen. Results from the 2000 Census indicate that the average household size for Hershey’s Mill Village was 1.67 persons per household, which represents approximately 19% of all households in the Township. After accounting for this population, the average household size in the rest of the Township is 2.38, which is still lower than the surrounding municipalities and the County.

The smaller number of persons living in a household has significant planning implications because it takes a greater number of housing units, infrastructure and land to accommodate the same population. The decreasing number of persons per household also may indicate a change in housing needs in terms of cost, size, and maintenance of housing units. This is also due to large projects such as Hershey’s Mill that contribute new residents living in smaller households.

Home Ownership

The percentage of residents who either own or rent their homes generally corresponds to the types of housing available in a particular community. It is impacted by the construction projects selected by the housing construction industry and is dominated by single family residential development. The higher the number of single-family homes, the higher the percentage of homeowners versus renters. In East Goshen, 64% of the housing stock was “owned” in 1980, corresponding closely with the total number of single-family housing units at 62%, combining both attached and detached units. In 1990, these figures increased to 68.7% total single-family units and 72.6% owner occupancy. Table C-14 shows East Goshen and the surrounding municipalities with respect to their occupied housing unit status by either owner or renter from 1980 to 2000. East Goshen has experienced an increase in the number of owner occupied units in each of the last two decades. There is a similar pattern in West Goshen, East Whiteland and Willistown. Westtown and West Whiteland have both experienced a decline in owner-occupied housing.

**Table C-14: Housing Tenure, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1980		1990		2000	
	Percent Owner	Percent Renter	Percent Owner	Percent Renter	Percent Owner	Percent Renter
East Goshen	64.1%	35.9%	72.6%	27.4%	73.6%	26.4%
West Goshen	67.8%	32.2%	71.2%	28.8%	74.7%	25.3%
Westtown	89.4%	10.6%	90.2%	9.8%	82.6%	17.4%
West Whiteland	74.2%	25.8%	70.6%	29.4%	68.5%	31.5%
East Whiteland	68.5%	31.5%	70.6%	29.4%	71.3%	28.7%
Willistown	87.4%	12.6%	88.7%	11.3%	89.1%	10.9%
Chester County	70.7%	29.3%	74.5%	25.5%	76.3%	23.7%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Corresponding to the increase in owner occupied units in East Goshen Township is a steady decrease in the percentage of renter occupied units for the same time period, from 35.9% in 1980 to 26.4% in 2000. This decrease in rental units mirrors the same trend in Chester County. By 2000, Willistown and

Westtown had the lowest percentage of renter occupied housing with 10.9% and 17.4% respectively. East Goshen had the highest percentage of renter occupied units in 1980, but the decline in overall percentage since 1980 has positioned East Goshen’s owner/renter percentages close to those of the County while West Whiteland now has the highest percentage of renter occupancy at 31.5% in 2000.

Age of Housing

The age of housing indicates the relative trends of building and indicates potential problems a municipality may face in the future. These include fire protection in older homes or more repair needed which may place a financial burden on municipal residents.

Table C-15 displays the age of housing for East Goshen and its surrounding municipalities.

**Table C-15: Age of Housing Units, 2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1939 and earlier	1940-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	1980-1989	1990-2000*
East Goshen	2.7%	5.1%	13.2%	28.0%	33.5%	17.5%
West Goshen	4.1%	20.8%	23.1%	22.5%	14.7%	14.8%
Westtown	6.2%	12.5%	17.3%	18.9%	27.1%	18.0%
West Whiteland	2.1%	11.4%	13.0%	16.2%	21.0%	36.3%
East Whiteland	5.1%	22.8%	19.8%	20.3%	17.7%	14.3%
Willistown	11.8%	29.3%	14.0%	8.1%	22.7%	14.1%
Chester County	16.4%	14.8%	12.8%	17.5%	19.1%	19.4%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000 * Data through March 2000.

East Goshen clearly experienced a housing boom in the 1970’s and 1980’s which mirrors the higher growth rates in the population. For comparison, West Goshen’s housing growth has been less explosive and the primary growth occurred in the 1940’s to 1970’s. West Whiteland is clearly in a housing boom with more than 36% of that township’s housing being built during the 1990’s. Other municipalities are more difficult to assess. Willistown, for example, has had what appear to be two relatively high growth periods, during the 1940’s and 1950’s, and then later in the 1980’s.

Housing Costs

Housing cost is a key component in analyzing the relative affordability of housing for the median household income in East Goshen. When the cost of housing increases faster than increases in income, then housing becomes less affordable. Generally, owner-occupied housing is considered affordable if the monthly housing ownership costs do not exceed 28% of a household’s gross monthly income. Renter-occupied housing is considered affordable if the monthly rental costs do not exceed 30% of the household’s gross monthly income. It should be noted that the Census data includes utility and fuel costs as well as other costs that are not normally included in a specific housing affordability analysis. Therefore, the figures presented above represent an approximate measure of housing ownership affordability.

Table C-16 shows median housing cost and rent for East Goshen and surrounding municipalities and the County.

**Table C-16: Median Housing Value and Rent, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Median Value (\$)			Median Rent Per Month (\$)			1980-2000 Percent Increase	
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	Value	Rent
East Goshen	\$91,000	\$218,500	\$241,600	\$280	\$564	\$846	166%	202%
West Goshen	\$69,600	\$171,200	\$191,700	\$269	\$550	\$801	175%	198%
Westtown	\$86,900	\$211,500	\$223,000	\$283	\$600	\$1,195	157%	322%
West Whiteland	\$65,700	\$152,500	\$168,100	\$283	\$585	\$976	156%	245%
East Whiteland	\$70,400	\$160,700	\$184,400	\$291	\$605	\$917	162%	215%
Willistown	\$76,400	\$186,800	\$211,800	\$274	\$744	\$1,152	177%	320%
Chester County	\$63,000	\$155,900	\$182,500	\$237	\$496	\$754	190%	218%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980 and 1990, and Chester County Planning Commission, *Housing Costs Profile*, 2000

Median housing costs spiked upward during the 1980's, but have increased at a much lower rate since 1990. In 2000, the median housing value in East Goshen was \$241,600 which was an increase of 10.6% from 1990. In comparison, the median price of a home in Chester County was \$182,500, a 17% increase from 1990. However, it should be noted that East Goshen median housing value has maintained a higher value relative to surrounding municipalities and the County. This indicates that higher median household incomes are necessary in order to live within the Township.

Table C-16 illustrates that rental costs have increased at a faster rate than housing value. In general, the rental market in Chester County has become tighter and vacancy rates have continually decreased over the past 20 years. Rents have increased rapidly and affordable units particularly for families needing larger two to three bedroom apartments are more difficult to obtain. Higher and continually increasing rents pose particular problems for the elderly. They tend to be on fixed incomes and for those living below the poverty level, may pay over 75% of their incomes towards rental housing costs. It should be noted that the median rent in East Goshen is the second most affordable in comparison with surrounding municipalities and is about 12% higher than the median rent for the County as a whole. While it is more expensive to own a home in East Goshen the rent is far less expensive compared with surrounding municipalities.

Market values of home ownership for East Goshen and the surrounding municipalities between 1995 and 2000 are shown in Table C-17. These numbers are based on actual sales and reflect the market prices of homes sold during each year not the assessed value of the entire municipal housing stock.

**Table C-17: Median Sales Prices per Year, 1995-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Median Sales Prices per Year					
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
East Goshen	\$185,000	\$205,000	\$218,632	\$218,000	\$228,809	\$255,000
West Goshen	\$170,500	\$179,900	\$177,500	\$185,000	\$188,405	\$230,000
Westtown	\$178,500	\$185,000	\$212,500	\$205,250	\$209,000	\$199,900
West Whiteland	\$140,000	\$145,388	\$145,000	\$148,500	\$168,750	\$173,450
East Whiteland	\$171,500	\$169,349	\$175,000	\$179,000	\$160,000	\$195,000
Willistown	\$173,250	\$160,000	\$169,000	\$195,500	\$210,000	\$205,000
Chester County	\$155,000	\$156,250	\$169,000	\$170,000	\$179,900	\$188,000

Source: Chester County Planning Commission, *Housing Costs Profile*, 1995-2000, Chester County Assessment Office.

As seen in Table C-17, East Goshen Township sales prices have maintained a relatively constant increase in each year since 1995 with the exception of a slight dip in 1998 and a fairly significant increase between 1999 and 2000. Every year the median value in East Goshen Township has been significantly higher than that of Chester County. Except for West Whiteland, the median sales prices in the surrounding municipalities were higher in comparison to the County.

Housing Affordability and Fair Share Housing Obligations

To evaluate the affordability of housing in Chester County, the Chester County Planning Commission prepares an affordability index based on the index developed by the National Association of Realtors. The index assesses the relationship between income and housing costs using median household income, median sales prices, average mortgage rates, tax millage, insurance costs and closing costs. The monthly housing cost includes the mortgage payment, taxes, and insurance. The index assumes a 10% down payment and 28% (the industry standard) as the maximum amount of income that should be devoted to housing. An affordability index of 100 or higher indicates that affordable housing is available to the household with the median adjusted 1996 household income for Chester County.

**Table C-18: Housing Affordability – 1996
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Median Sale Price	Monthly Hsg. Cost	Closing Costs	Affordability Index ¹
East Goshen	\$205,000	\$1,574	\$34,235	85.9
West Goshen	\$179,900	\$1,397	\$30,043	96.8
Westtown	\$185,000	\$1,432	\$30,895	94.5
West Whiteland	\$145,388	\$1,156	\$24,280	117.0
East Whiteland	\$169,349	\$1,339	\$28,281	101.0
Willistown	\$160,000	\$1,243	\$26,270	108.8
Chester County	\$156,250	\$1,277	\$26,094	105.9

Source: Chester County Planning Commission, 1998.

¹ An affordability index of 100 or greater is considered affordable to a household with the 1996 median household income for Chester County.

The affordability index numbers for East Goshen, surrounding municipalities and Chester County are shown in Table C-18. As of 1996, housing in Chester County as a whole was affordable to a household

with the median County income. Over the past several years, housing has become more affordable in the County primarily due to low interest rates and a leveling off in the rate of rapidly increasing housing costs experienced in the 1980's.

East Goshen, West Goshen and Westtown have housing prices considerably higher than what is considered affordable to the average Chester County household. On the other hand, East Whiteland, Willistown and particularly West Whiteland are considered to be affordable. The availability of some smaller homes, older housing stock and alternatives to single-family homes on larger lots account for the lower median sales prices in these municipalities. Of the townships in Table C-18, East Goshen had the lowest affordability index (i.e. relatively least affordable).

On a larger scale, East Goshen and the surrounding townships are considerably less affordable than many townships in the County. By comparison, Valley Township, with a rating of 157 is considered the most affordable township in the County. At the other end of the scale, Birmingham, with a rating of 56, is currently considered the least affordable township in Chester County. Recent updates to the Affordability Index for the County indicate that the index dropped from 105.7 in 1996 to 98.5 in 1999, which indicates a drop in affordability as a factor for the majority of the County population. Reasons for the higher housing costs in East Goshen, the surrounding municipalities, and the County overall include the relatively larger lots required, newer and larger homes being built and a willingness on the part of homebuyers to pay a premium for the quality of life available in this area.

The lack of affordable housing has many planning implications. The most important being that employees with moderate incomes including teachers, public safety personnel, and service employees may not be able to secure suitable housing. This translates into long commutes and traffic congestion which takes a toll on the quality of life for everyone in the region. Employers may also have difficulty filling lower paying positions. Limited housing choices often force younger families out of the area which reduces residential continuity and community diversity. There are many barriers to the development of affordable housing and understanding these barriers can lead to solutions.

The barriers to affordable housing are the circumstances existing in a municipality that limit the construction, financing, or purchase of affordable units. The barriers can vary by municipality or region with some types of barriers more or less evident depending on location and local politics. They tend to fall into one of three categories: social, financial and regulatory. Social barriers include a community's attitude toward affordable housing. Financial barriers include such factors as the cost of land and financing while regulatory barriers refer to local ordinance requirement that might indirectly increase housing costs. Market conditions are another important consideration in affordable housing. These barriers and other issues relating to affordable housing are discussed in detail in Chapter Three, Housing Plan.

Economic Profile

Income Levels

Table C-19 provides the median household and per capita incomes for East Goshen and surrounding municipalities based on Census data from 1980, 1990, and 2000, as compared with similar data for the County.

**Table C-19 Median Household and Per Capita Income, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change 1980-2000	
	Household	Per Capita	Household	Per Capita	Household	Per Capita	Household	Per Capita
East Goshen	\$25,356	\$10,631	\$51,830	\$25,260	\$64,777	\$37,775	155.5%	255.3%
West Goshen	\$24,310	\$8,829	\$51,265	\$20,589	\$71,055	\$32,487	192.3%	267.9%
Westtown	\$30,635	\$10,349	\$65,046	\$23,547	\$85,049	\$36,894	177.6%	256.5%
West Whiteland	\$25,733	\$8,690	\$50,598	\$21,387	\$71,545	\$35,031	178.0%	303.1%
East Whiteland	\$25,591	\$8,894	\$49,021	\$21,099	\$69,500	\$30,258	171.6%	240.2%
Willistown	\$30,057	\$11,825	\$59,451	\$31,270	\$77,555	\$45,010	158.0%	280.6%
Chester County	\$22,209	\$8,764	\$45,642	\$20,601	\$65,295	\$31,627	194.0%	260.9%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Overall, in 1980 and 1990, all of the municipalities had a higher median income than that of Chester County which has the highest median household income of any county in the State. In terms of per capita income only West Whiteland in 1980, and West Goshen in 1990, had marginally lower per capita incomes. However in 2000, household income for East Goshen was slightly lower than the county average. East Goshen ranked the lowest among the six townships shown in Table C-17 for household income. However, East Goshen's per capita income in 2000 was the second highest compared to surrounding municipalities trailing only Willistown. These differences reflect the smaller overall household size and the increase in residents on fixed incomes.

Poverty Levels

Poverty is defined by the Census Bureau using a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is poor. If a family's total income is less than that family's threshold, then that family, and every individual in it, is considered poor. The poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition counts money income before taxes and does not include capital gains and noncash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps). Poverty is not defined for people in military barracks, institutional group quarters, or for unrelated individuals under age 15 (such as foster children). As an example, the poverty threshold for a family of four (two parents, two children) in 2002 was \$17,463. For more information on the definition and standards for poverty thresholds, see <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty.html>.

Table C-20 shows the percentage of residents with incomes below the poverty level for East Goshen and surrounding municipalities.

**Table C-20: Percent of Persons Below Poverty Level, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	1980	1990	2000	Percent Change 1980-2000
East Goshen	1.4%	1.5%	3.5%	2.1%
West Goshen	3.6%	2.0%	3.4%	(0.2%)
Westtown	2.1%	1.7%	3.0%	0.9%
West Whiteland	1.8%	1.5%	2.8%	1.0%
East Whiteland	1.4%	5.0%	4.7%	3.3%
Willistown	3.7%	3.0%	4.0%	0.3%
Chester County	6.4%	4.7%	5.2%	(1.2%)

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Changes in poverty levels in East Goshen and the surrounding municipalities show an interesting trend. In 1980, East Goshen had the lowest rate 1.4% (shared with East Whiteland) while West Goshen had the highest rate 3.6%, though the levels of the surrounding municipalities fell well below the rate of the County 6.4%. By 1990, East Goshen had maintained the lowest percentage of the communities 1.5%, (shared with West Whiteland), while East Whiteland’s poverty level jumped to 5%. This mirrors a decline in population in East Whiteland in the same period and placed East Whiteland as the only municipality in the area ahead of the County’s poverty level. In 2000, East Goshen’s poverty level jumped up to 3.5%, which is still in the middle of the pack among the surrounding townships, whose levels varied from 2.8% in West Whiteland to 4.7% in East Whiteland. Poverty levels among the six townships fell below those for the County.

The increase in poverty level from 1990 to 2000 can be due to a variety of factors, including the type of income households include in the Census data forms, whether or not retirement income is counted toward overall income in a given year, the presence (or absence) of Section 8 programs for housing assistance within the Township, and other factors that the Census Bureau does not track.

It should be noted that these poverty levels fall well below those of Chester County’s boroughs. Somewhat higher poverty levels and lower median incomes in urban areas in comparison to rural or suburban areas are typical in Chester County and in many other areas in the State. Typical poverty levels for the boroughs in 2000 include Parkesburg 7.5%, Atglen 16.8%, Avondale 14.7%, Oxford 11.3%, and West Chester 17.5%. The highest poverty levels in the County are found in the City of Coatesville 22.1% and Modena 23.1%.

Educational Attainment

**Table C-21: Highest Educational Attainment by Percent, 2000
East Goshen Township and Surrounding Municipalities**

Municipality	Less Than High School	High School	Some College or Associate Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree
East Goshen	4.8%	19.1%	22.5%	35.2%	18.3%
West Goshen	5.8%	23.8%	22.8%	31.7%	15.9%
Westtown	3.6%	17.3%	19.6%	36.0%	23.5%
West Whiteland	5.2%	19.0%	26.2%	32.6%	17.1%
East Whiteland	9.3%	20.7%	18.5%	33.4%	18.0%
Willistown	4.8%	17.8%	20.9%	33.8%	22.8%
Chester County	10.7%	26.0%	20.9%	26.6%	15.9%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

As seen in Table C-21, the level of educational attainment in East Goshen and surrounding municipalities is higher than that for the County, which ranks among the highest in the Commonwealth. Levels of education generally correlate with income levels and available housing options discussed earlier. In 2000, East Goshen, East Whiteland and Willistown townships had more than half their population attaining at least a Bachelor’s degree. The lowest level of college-level educational attainment was 47.5% of West Goshen’s residents having attained at least a Bachelor’s degree. This compares to 42.5% for Chester County. On the other end, East Whiteland has the highest percentage of residents lacking a high school diploma, but this level 9.3% is lower than that of the County 10.7%.

Unemployment

**Table C-22: Percent Unemployment, 1980-2000
East Goshen Township, Chester County, and Pennsylvania**

Municipality	1980	1990	2000
East Goshen	2.5%	2.5%	2.3%
Chester County	4.6%	3.0%	3.8%
Pennsylvania	7.4%	6.0%	5.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

The unemployment rates in Chester County and the Commonwealth dropped between 1980 and 1990 while the low rate of unemployment for East Goshen held steady at 2.5%. Chester County continues to enjoy one of the lowest unemployment rates in Pennsylvania and the Township’s unemployment rate is even lower than that of the County. While low unemployment rates are generally desirable, when they drop too low the lack of available employees can become a deterrent for new businesses seeking to locate in an area and for existing businesses seeking to expand. However, these factors have a greater impact on a regional or countywide basis than they do on a single township.

Employment Characteristics - Occupation and Industry

Employment characteristics provide an overview of the types of businesses in which the residents are employed and the type of work they do for that business. Changes in these characteristics show trends in the overall economy of an area and changes in the types of employment available.

Employment of Township Residents by Industry

Table C-23 shows the levels of employment by industry categories for East Goshen Township residents for 1990 and 2000.

**Table C-23: Employment of Residents by Industry, 1990-2000
East Goshen Township**

Industry	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	136	1.6%	35	0.4%
Construction	426	4.9%	363	4.3%
Manufacturing	1,321	15.3%	1,024	12.3%
Transportation	452	5.2%	170*	2.0%
Communications/Public Utilities	236	2.7%	303*	3.6%
Wholesale Trade	422	4.9%	234	2.8%
Retail Trade	1,297	15.1%	1,089	13.1%
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	1,051	12.2%	994	11.9%
Personal and Recreational Services	253	3.0%	455	5.5%
Health Services	780	9.1%	1,765*	21.2%
Educational Services	737	8.6%	*	
Other Professional Services	1,342	15.6%	1,588*	19.0%
Public Administration	157	1.8%	326	3.9%
Total Employment	8,610	100.0%	8,346	100.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1990-2000

* Several categories were reorganized for the 2000 Census, so that Transportation is merged with Utilities, while Health, Educational, and Professional Services are realigned into two major categories.

Industry is defined as the type of business conducted by the person’s employing organization. In 1990, the largest employment sector in East Goshen was in the area of “Other Professional Services” with 16% of the population, followed by “Manufacturing” 15.8% and “Retail Trade” 15.5%, (see Table C-23). In 2000, “Health and Education Services” as a combined component accounted for 21.1% of the population while “Other Professional Services” grew to 19% of the total employed persons in the Township. “Manufacturing” saw a loss of 297 employees in the 1990’s, mirroring the trend across the country, as well as the County, whose level of employment in “Manufacturing” accounted for 15% of employed persons in the County.

Employment of Township Residents by Occupation

Occupation, shown in Table C-24, is the type of work a person does on the job, regardless of the industry in which they are employed.

**Table C-24: Employment of Residents by Occupation, 1990-2000
East Goshen Township**

Occupation	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Managerial/Professional Specialty	3,659	43.7%	4,449	53.3%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	3,044	36.4%	2,410	28.9%
Service	634	7.6%	729	8.7%
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing	52	0.6%	25	0.3%
Precision Production, Craft, and Repair	524	6.3%	418*	5.0%
Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors	230	2.7%	*	
Transportation and Material Moving	71	0.8%	*	
Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers	160	1.9%	315	3.8%
Total Employment	8,374	100.0%	8,346	100.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1990-2000

* These three categories were combined in the 2000 Census results into a large category of Production, Transportation, and Maintenance.

In East Goshen in 2000, “Managerial/Professional Specialty” 53.3%, “Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support” 28.9% make up over 82% of all occupations which is slightly higher than the total percentage in 1990 about 79%. The third highest percentage of workers 8.7% were employed in the “Service” category. This was consistent with the increased need for service occupations in the evolution of the national economy over the last two decades.

Decreases in manufacturing jobs and increases in service and administrative jobs have been a national trend over the past several decades. One impact of the downturn in manufacturing is the reduction of good paying jobs available to residents without higher education levels. In addition, many of the service sector jobs that are available are lower paying in comparison to manufacturing jobs that have disappeared.

Commuter Patterns

Residents’ destination to their place of work is shown in Table C-25.

**Table C-25: Place of Work, 1990–2000
East Goshen Township Residents**

Location	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Workers Over 16	8,258	100.0%	8,382	100.0%
Worked in Township	598	7.2%	982	11.7%
Worked Outside Township	7,660	92.8%	7,400	88.3%
Worked in Chester County	4,921	59.6%	4,678	55.8%
Worked Outside Chester County	3,337	40.4%	3,704	44.2%
Worked in Pennsylvania	7,614	92.2%	7,792	93.0%
Worked Outside Pennsylvania	644	7.8%	590	7.0%
Worked at Home	231	2.8%	424	5.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990-2000.

In 1990, 7.2% of all workers living in East Goshen worked in East Goshen, while 92.8% worked outside of the Township. By 2000, these percentages had changed so that 11.7% worked within the Township, while 88.3% worked outside the Township. Part of the increase in Township-based employment of

residents is the increase in the percentage of residents working from home (2.8% in 1990 versus 5.1% in 2000). However, the continuation of this commuting pattern indicates that the Township remains primarily a bedroom community, with many more residents working outside of the Township than within it.

A further breakdown of the commuting data of residents indicates where they work more specifically. Table C-26 indicates locations where Townships residents worked as provided by the 2000 Census. This table includes data for those residents who worked outside East Goshen Township.

Table C-26: Commuting to Work Outside East Goshen, 2000

Regional and Subregional Location		Number	Percent
In Chester County	Surrounding Townships	2,365	31.9%
	West Goshen Township	756	10.2%
	East Whiteland Township	520	7.0%
	West Chester Borough	379	5.1%
	West Whiteland Township	317	4.3%
	Willistown Township	237	3.2%
	Westtown Township	156	2.1%
	Other Municipalities	1,331	18.0%
In PA	Delaware Valley	2,942	39.8%
	Delaware County	1,318	17.8%
	Montgomery County	937	12.7%
	Philadelphia County	643	8.7%
	Berks County	44	0.6%
	Other Counties	172	2.3%
Outside PA*		590	8.0%
Total Outside East Goshen Township		7,400	100.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

* States included: CA, CT, DE, FL, IL, MD, NJ, NY, OH.

When factoring out residents working within East Goshen, those residents working within Chester County slightly outnumbered those residents working outside the County but in Pennsylvania (by a percentage of 49.9% to 42.1%). Note that there were 9 states listed as locations where work was conducted, which does not factor out those trips taken as short-term business trips to states outside of the Mid-Atlantic Region or adjacent states (New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland).

The Township's commuting pattern has implications for transportation planning which will be discussed in more detail in Appendix G, Transportation and Circulation Systems Inventory.

(this page intentionally left blank)