



## TREDYFFRIN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Tredyffrin Township Municipal Building ♦ Keene Hall

Thursday – September 18th, 2025– 7:00 pm

### Minutes

#### **Call to Order:** 7:01 PM

A Regular Meeting of the Tredyffrin Township Planning Commission was held on the above date at the Township Administration Building. Commission members present (5) included Scott Growney, Chair; Dave Thomas, Vice Chair, William Rountree, Martin Bond, and Robert Rose. Also in attendance were William Martin., Township Manager, Erin McPherson, Director of Planning & Zoning; and Robert Emmanuel, Planner I.

The meeting dates for the year were advertised in the 12/27/2024 issue of Daily Local and the 1/5/2025 issue of the Main Line Suburban. The meetings dates for the year were published on the Township website by 12/31/2024 and were printed in the Township's newsletter 1/31/2025. The agenda was posted on the Township website 8/14/2025 and at the main entrance to the Township Building 8/20/2025. Copies of the agenda were made available for the public in attendance at the meeting.

#### **Consideration of Meeting Minutes:** August 21st, 2025

*Mr. Growney requested any comments and/or corrections to the minutes...*

*Mr. Rose states that there is an error with who adjourned the meeting. The minutes read Mr. Growney; however, the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Thomas*

*Mr. Growney requested a motion to approve the minutes with the correction proposed by Mr. Rose...*

**Action:** Motion made by Ms. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Rose, and passed unanimously (5-0) to approve the minutes as drafted.

Mr. Growney makes a point of inquiry, asking if the application for 602 Old Eagle School Road would be on the agenda.

Mr. Emmanuel states that 602 Old Eagle School Road has withdrawn their application and are no longer seeking subdivision approval. He goes onto state that the Township is unaware of any other proposals or plans for the site. If the applicant was to resubmit the plan, it would be considered a new application subject to the same notification requirements.

#### **New Business:**

Mr. Growney states that the next agenda item is an application that was introduced at the last Planning Commission Meeting. Since he was not present at that meeting, he differed to the Vice Chair, Dave Thomas, to lead the discussion on the application.

Mr. Thomas introduces the application

**ZA-03-25 – 675 E SWEDESFORD RD (Rockwell Swedesford, LLC)** A Petition requesting that the Tredyffrin Township Board of Supervisors adopt an ordinance to amend chapter 208 of the Code of the Township of Tredyffrin to permit age-qualified single-family semidetached dwellings (twin) and single-family attached dwellings (townhouse) in the O: Office zoning district, subject to various requirements.

The applicant has also submitted an associated illustration of the potential development of 46 age-qualified units on the property located at 675 E Swedesford Road in Wayne, PA 19087.

Mr. Broseman introduces the applicants and recaps the highlights of the proposed text amendment. He states that they received good feedback from the Planning Commission regarding this application, However, there were some comments that they have addressed. Since then, they have received comments from the Chester County Planning Commission. The County recommended the applicant explore applying this text amendment to the O: Office District, rather than the Trout Creek Overlay District. Mr. Broseman believes that despite this recommendation, the concept was supported by the County. Furthermore, the Township's Comprehensive Plan recommends adding a diversity of housing options to zoning districts which do not traditionally include housing. Mr. Broseman goes on to state that the applicant has met with Township staff to discuss the plan and identify potential issues. One of the recommendations that came out of those meetings was to produce a map showing the other properties in the Township that would potentially be affected by this text amendment. Township staff created this map, which is included in the packet. The qualifying parameters that would make a property eligible for this amendment are as follows:

- Parcel must be zoned O: Office District
- Parcel must be a minimum of five (5) acres
- Parcel must be adjacent to, or across the street from a lot that is zoned residential and currently used for residential purposes

Mr. Lingo introduces himself as the equitable owner of the parcel. He states that there have been multiple meetings with the Township to work on their proposal. He believes that the current iteration is the most acceptable to the Township. Mr. Lingo shows the map that highlights the other properties in the Township that would be affected by this text amendment. There is a total of 9 other properties that would potentially apply.

Mr. Rose asks about two properties along Lee Road. He would like to know their specific location in relation to Wilson Farm Park.

Mr. Martin states that they are adjacent to the park, on its western end.

Mr. Broseman clarifies that the addresses of those parcels are 601 and 701 Lee Road. They are adjacent to the park, and back up along the Cheswold Court apartments.

Mr. Growney clarifies if the purpose of the map is to show what parcels in the Township qualify under this text amendment.

Mr. Lingo states that it is correct. He goes onto show the commission, a previously approved plan for the site. A large office building with associated parking garage.

Mr. Growney asks if the applicant is aware of the date that previous plan was approved.

Mr. Lingo states that the previous plan was approved in 2019. He states that the office market is in a slump, and the previous plan is no longer financially viable. He then goes onto show the current proposal. A 45-unit, age restricted community of attached townhouses. The plan was brought down to 45 units from discussions with the Township's Development Subcommittee. The units facing Old Eagle School will be situated facing the street to enhance the curb appeal of the community. The community will also include a clubhouse to be shared with the Wayne Glen Homeowners Association just north of the parcel. They have also been in discussions with Wayne Glen to establish a shared homeowners association between the two

developments. Mr. Lingo goes onto show an image of the proposed houses. His company developed a similar product in Newtown Square that has been very successful. They intend to replicate that success in Tredyffrin on the parcel in question. He then shows excerpts from the Township's comprehensive plan that supports the concept being proposed by the applicant. These excerpts include expanding housing choice, increasing housing opportunities for older populations, creating new pedestrian connections, and increasing opportunities for stormwater management projects. He states that this plan hits every one of these points, stressing the stormwater management benefits of this project, which is in a flood-prone part of the Township. He then goes on to speak about the density of the development, and how it compares to similar developments within the Township. He states that they are proposing a density of 5 units per acre. This compares to 13.5 units per acre at Cheswold Court, 15.7 at Mountain View, 9.7 at Newport, 12.3 at Park View 14.1 at Le Forge, and 9.5 at Picket post (note that these are all townhome communities within Chesterbrook). They feel that the 5 units per acre proposed by this development fits in with other townhome communities in the Township while activating a property that has been sitting idle.

Mr. Rose asks the applicant if there has been any notification of this plan to the other property owners that would be affected by this text amendment.

Mr. Lingo states that they have not notified any of the property owners.

Mr. Bond asks about the uses of the other properties.

Ms. McPherson states that the other properties are all existing office buildings.

Mr. Broseman states that this zoning amendment adds a potentially desirable use to those other properties, he does not believe the property owners would object to it.

Mr. Rose states that he prefers the proposed layout to the one shown to the Planning Commission at previous meetings.

Mr. Rountree states that he would prefer to refrain from commenting on the site plan until the applicant submits a formal land development application. He goes onto ask the applicant what the specific changes are from the last presentation before the Planning Commission to tonight's meeting.

Mr. Broseman states that the biggest change is the mechanism by which the text amendment would allow for this development. Rather than affecting the Trout Creek Overlay District, it would now apply to the Office District.

Mr. Rountree understands the broad changes, rather he requested the applicant to elaborate on any smaller changes that have occurred between the two meetings.

Mr. Broseman states that there are relatively few changes, apart from several qualifiers. The parcel now needs to be at least 5-acres in size, and it must be adjacent to or across the street from a residentially zoned parcel that is currently improved with a residential use.

Mr. Rountree asks about the second qualifier. He would like to know if the parcel needs to be zoned residential and improved with a residential use at the time of the adoption of the ordinance, or if it can apply at any point in the future.

Mr. Broseman states that the text amendment did not add a date to that qualifier. However, he believes the requirement that the property must be zoned residential will accomplish the same goal. Regardless if an adjacent, Office zoned parcel, is developed as residential, the underlying zoning would still be office, and

therefore it would be excluded from the ordinance. Therefore, he believes that the number of applicable properties would remain stagnant.

Mr. Growney asks the applicant about the rationale behind the chosen qualifiers. He believes it sounds a little arbitrary

Mr. Broseman states that the rationale behind the amendment is two-fold. The first is that expanding housing choice is a goal of the Township's comprehensive plan. The second is that there is a significant depression within the office market. As for the chosen criteria, the applicant views the text amendment as a good transitional use between existing low-density residential neighborhoods and existing office buildings. The criteria successfully restrict this use to parcels where that transition is appropriate. Conversely, some of the other permitted uses offer a starker transition between low-density residential and office use. Uses such as a gas station, or a shipping warehouse.

Mr. Growney offered a general comment on the proposed text amendment. Considering the current state of the office market and the growing demand for housing of all types, he questioned whether this use is preferable to allowing a failing office building to remain and whether it should be promoted on a broader scale than what the amendment currently proposes. He recommended conducting a more in-depth study to address this question.

Mr. Rose asks Mr. Growney if he thinks the amendment is too restrictive.

Mr. Growney confirms that it is his comment. He acknowledges that there is a real problem with the office market and reaffirms the need to construct vital stormwater management projects. He sees this amendment as a potential answer to some of those concerns. He is unsure on the specifics of how it should look, perhaps it should focus on conversion rather than redevelopment. However, he sees the benefits that a similar text amendment to what is being proposed could do for the Township.

Mr. Rountree expressed concerns about developer-initiated text amendments, noting the potential for negative externalities and unintended consequences when amendments are overly broad. He supports the inclusion of a 5-acre minimum and the requirement for adjacency to residential properties as safeguards against these impacts. He added that if the amendment proves successful, these restrictions could be relaxed in the future.

Mr. Thomas states that he is more in-line with Mr. Rountree's comments. He states that other considerations, such as impact on local services, should be observed before the text amendment is broadened to affect other properties.

Ms. McPherson states that Township staff has worked with the applicant on the language of the text amendment. There is still some potential for changes, specifically related to density.

Mr. Bond asks Ms. McPherson if she has any comments on the acreage requirements

Ms. McPherson noted that the Township is aware of challenges within the Office District and that there have been broad discussions about potential changes. She indicated that a staff-led text amendment may be considered in the future, informed by an updated Comprehensive Plan. However, she emphasized that the current amendment is more narrowly focused than what staff anticipate proposing. Consequently, staff have not developed specific comments and have chosen to differ to the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Mr. Growney asks the applicant about the specific recommendations given to them from the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Broseman stated that they have not received specific guidance from the Board but have considered feedback from community members who spoke at the meeting. He addressed the density concerns mentioned by Ms. McPherson, emphasizing that the proposed density aligns with other townhome communities in the Township. He expressed his view that the proposal is not excessively dense.

Mr. Thomas opens the meeting to comments from the public

*The public is concerned about the following:*

- The overgrown lot has become an eyesore and needs to be addressed
- While some like the lot to be natural, most accept that this is an attractive parcel with high development potential
- Other proposals, such as a gas station and strip mall, are not preferred by the community. A residential use of some kind is preferable to this development
- Generally supportive of the proposed site layout. Specifically, the orientation of the homes towards Old Eagle School and Swedesford Roads.
- The additional traffic at the intersection of Old Eagle School and Swedesford Roads
- Stormwater runoff concerns
- The future costs of maintaining the regional stormwater basin at Wayne Glen and the potential to share that cost with the new development.
- Development of a natural site
- The high cost of the proposed houses
- The proposed exit onto Swedesford road and its proximity to Old Eagle School Road
- Overwhelming the Wayne Glen regional stormwater basin
- Appreciating the inclusion of more housing choice in Tredyffrin

Mr. Rountree states that his opinion has not changed on the application since the last time it came before the Planning Commission. He states that he is generally in favor of the application and appreciates the qualifiers that the applicant has added.

Mr. Thomas states that he is also generally in favor of recommending this application

Mr. Rose states that he is not in favor of this lot being developed, however, he understands the reality of development pressures. Overall, he finds this proposal to be relatively inoffensive and one of the better solutions for the site. As a result, he is supportive of the application

Mr. Bond states that the text amendment offers good use of the land. However, he does not appreciate the way this change to the office district has come about. He believes that any change to the Office district should come at a global level and not rely on complicated qualifiers to achieve results. He acknowledges that this is an imperfect, but not bad solution to the issue and is generally in favor of the application. However, he would like to see a more comprehensive solution to the office district proposed by staff at some point in the future.

Mr. Growney agrees with the comments made by the other Planning Commission members. He believes the negative externalities have been reduced to an acceptable level and appreciates the applicant's collaboration with the Wayne Glen homeowner's association. He also emphasizes the township's ongoing need for stormwater management projects. While he would like any development on this site to exceed the minimum code requirements, he will withhold further comments until a formal land development plan

is submitted. He would support a recommendation for approval from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Thomas asks staff if they require any formal action on this application

Mr. Emmanuel explains that the Planning Commission is not required to take formal action. Instead, the Commission's comments will be included in the meeting minutes and shared with the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, Ms. McPherson, who attends Board meetings, will provide a summary of the Commission's comments to the Board. However, the Planning Commission may choose to issue a formal recommendation to the Board if it wishes.

Mr. Thomas states that with that information, he believes the comments are sufficient to express the Commission's opinion to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Growney and Mr. Bond agree with Mr. Thomas.

**Action:**

*There was no action taken on ZA-02-25 at this meeting*

**Action:**

Mr. Thomas makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Unanimous approval for the adjournment of the meeting.

**Adjournment:** 9:09pm

~Next Meeting ~  
October 16, 2025