



TREDYFFRIN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Tredyffrin Township Municipal Building ♦ Keene Hall

Thursday – September 17th, 2026– 7:00 pm

Minutes

Call to Order: 7:15 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, Martin Bond, John Caruolo, and Robert Rose. Also in attendance were Hans Von Mol, Board of Supervisors Liaison; William Martin, Township Manager; Erin McPherson, Director of Planning and Zoning; Robert Emmanuel, Planner I; Theo Speedy, Township Solicitor from Gawthrop Greenwood, PC; Andrew Pockl, P.E., Municipal Engineer from Remington and Vernick Engineering; and Sean Walsh, Engineer from Princeton Hydro.

The meeting dates for the year were advertised in the 11/20/2025 issue of Daily Local and the 11/27/2025 issue of the Main Line Suburban. The meetings dates for the year were published on the Township website by 12/31/2025 and were printed in the Township's newsletter 1/31/2026. The agenda was posted on the Township website 09/10/2026 and at the main entrance to the Township Building 09/16/2026. Copies of the agenda were made available for the public in attendance at the meeting.

Consideration of Meeting Minutes: August 20th, 2026

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

There are none

Mr. Growney requested a motion to approve the minutes...

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

Mr. Growney introduces the first item on the agenda:

LD-03-2025 602 Old Eagle School Road (1010 Wayne LLC) The Applicant proposes to subdivide an existing 6.3-acre lot and an adjacent 2.0-acre lot into a total of six (6) lots. A residential dwelling currently exists at 602 Old Eagle School Road. The existing dwelling will remain on one of the lots. Single-family dwellings are proposed for the five (5) remaining lots. The applicant proposes to construct a new cul-de-sac road from Harwick Road, and all lots will each take access from the newly created cul-de-sac road. The existing paved driveway from Old Eagle School Rd. is proposed to be abandoned. Also included in the project are grading, utilities, landscaping, lighting, stormwater management and erosion and sediment control. One (1) waiver is proposed from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Potential 2-Acre Deed Restriction

Mr. Growney announced at the beginning of the meeting that the Planning Commission had held an executive session beforehand to discuss matters related to the application with its counsel. After the session, he updated the public on the ongoing discussion about a possible deed restriction affecting the parcel at 602 Old Eagle School Road and explained the guidance the Commission had received from counsel.

Mr. Growney stated that some evidence suggests the property may be subject to a two-acre deed restriction based on a note in an old plan set. However, other evidence suggests otherwise, including a court order declaring all deed restrictions on the property null and void.

The Township's counsel, Theo Speedy, explained that the Township may impose conditions on land-development approvals, including restrictions on future subdivision. The Township may enforce those conditions through an equity action, such as an injunction or declaratory action. Property owners affected by a violation of a subdivision-approval condition may also challenge the violation in court, independently of any action brought by the Township.

In this case, it is unclear whether the two-acre minimum-lot requirement was a condition of approval for the 1976 plan. The prior deed restrictions requiring two-acre lots also have a complicated legal history. As a result, it is uncertain which party would prevail in a legal challenge.

Nevertheless, if a later subdivision application does not comply with conditions from a previously approved plan, the application cannot be denied on that basis alone. Under the Municipalities Planning Code, a denial must identify the statutory or ordinance provisions supporting the rejection. Conditions from a prior subdivision approval do not constitute statutes or ordinances. Therefore, it alone does not justify denying the application. Accordingly, the Planning Commission will evaluate this application based on its compliance with the current zoning code.

Tree Removal

Audience members and Planning Commission members asked whether the Township arborist had reviewed the entire site and requested a spreadsheet identifying each tree slated for removal and its diameter at breast height (DBH).

Mr. Pockl stated that his professional review confirmed the applicant's calculations and that the proposed compensatory trees complied with the Township's ordinance. The Township's third-party arborist also reviewed the applicant's assessment of dead and nonviable trees and found it accurate.

Ms. McPherson explained that the Township arborist did not inspect all 600-plus trees. Instead, they reviewed a representative sample and determined, within an acceptable margin of error, that the applicant's calculations were reliable. She added that any alternative presentation of the data would need to be prepared by the applicant.

Ms. Murphy of the Township's Environmental Advisory Council stated that she had reviewed the applicant's entire plan set and found the calculations and compensatory replanting proposal

compliant with the woodland ordinance. However, she expressed concern about trees just beyond the limit of disturbance that were marked for removal and asked the applicant to make reasonable efforts to preserve them. Ms. Murphy did request information on specific trees slated to be removed.

The Planning Commission also questioned the removal of specific tree species. The Township explained that the woodland conservation ordinance does not regulate tree type; trees may be removed if the applicant provides sufficient replacement trees based on the DBH of those removed.

The applicant stated that avoiding unnecessary tree removal is standard practice because removal increases costs and replacement requirements. Although no specific trees were guaranteed to remain, the applicant committed to removing only those necessary for construction. They declined to provide the Township with a spreadsheet identifying the trees scheduled for removal and did not respond to Ms. Murphy's request for information regarding specific trees. Instead, they cited the applicable code and relied on the Township's professionals, who reviewed and ultimately concurred with their arborist's assessments.

The Planning Commission expressed disappointment that the ordinance does not provide greater protection for individual trees but acknowledged the overlap between its goals and those of the applicant. Members agreed that the applicant's proposal complied with the code and that they would minimize tree removal where feasible. Ultimately, the Planning Commission accepted the proposal based on the Township consultant's professional review.

Stormwater, Site Design, and Building Renderings

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to go over the changes to the application since their last appearance before the planning commission.

Mr. Daily, the engineer for the applicant, highlighted the larger changes to the application. The biggest change is the reduction in the number of lots. The applicant had originally proposed a 7th lot that would take access from a shared driveway at the end of the proposed cul-de-sac. A regional stormwater basin was also proposed to the north of said lot. The Planning Commission, as well as Township staff had concerns over this lot, specifically the shared driveway and maintenance access to the regional stormwater basin. Moreover, this lot and basin necessitated the removal of more trees, which made it difficult to comply with the Township's woodland conservation ordinance.

In response, the applicant explained that they removed the 7th lot, resulting in a 6th lot subdivision (5 new, one existing). They also removed the regional basin and replaced it with a subsurface basin beneath the proposed cul-de-sac. The result is a plan that now complies with the woodland conservation ordinance and should result in less stormwater runoff that would need to be managed.

The Township's engineer, Stephen Burgo, was not present at the meeting, but did confirm prior that there were no outstanding engineering comments in the Princeton Hydro review letter. Concerns over maintenance, access and effectiveness of the regional basin have been addressed in the latest version of the plan.

Members of the public requested that the applicant show renderings of the proposed homes. Ms. Bernstein presented a slide that showed a rendering of what the homes could look like. She did stress that these were only renderings at this time but were representative of the types of homes designed by the applicant's preferred builder.

Requested Waivers

The Planning Commission requested that the applicant explain the one requested waiver as part of this application.

Ms. Bernstein stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 181-44F: Excessively irregular lots shall not be permitted. The ratio of the depth of a lot to its width shall be not less than 1 to 1 nor greater than 3 to 1.

She explained that the purpose of this waiver was due to the irregular conditions located on Lot 4. The current parcel gains access from a driveway atop an access strip that connects to Old Eagle School Road. This strip is not an easement, but rather a part of the parcel. Since the strip must be incorporated into one of the 5 newly created lots, it necessitates a waiver from the Section 181-44F of the Township's SaLDO.

The Planning Commission acknowledges Ms. Bernstein's explanation and states that they believe this to be a de minimis waiver request.

Township staff, on behalf of Township Engineer, Stephen Burgo, state that they would support a waiver request to not construct sidewalks along the new cul-de-sac. They state that this waiver would be supported because the proposed cul-de-sac does not connect to any road with sidewalks. Moreover, the roads in the vicinity are not on the Township's Green Routes Network, a plan outlining streets where sidewalk should be constructed. Lastly, they state that the removal of sidewalk would reduce the amount of impervious surface, and in turn reduce the amount of stormwater runoff that the stormwater system would need to manage.

The applicant stated that, although they would be willing to request a waiver, they had not prepared the request as of the meeting. Given the limited timeframe and their willingness to construct the sidewalk, they do not intend to pursue the waiver.

Public Comment

Mr. Growney opens the meeting to comments from the public

The public is concerned about the following:

- Exacerbated traffic on surrounding streets caused by this application
- Concerns over the tree removal and landscaping plan. Many residents would like the data presented in the form of a spreadsheet rather than on the plan set as the applicant submitted

- Stormwater runoff caused by the removal of trees. Specifically, the negative externalities caused in the time between when the trees are removed and the stormwater system is built.
- The validity of the proposal, given the possibility of a two-acre deed restriction
- Lighting concerns.
- The smaller-lot subdivisions are not keeping in character with the adjacent two-acre sized properties.

Final Comments from the Planning Commission

The Planning Commission stated that it considers this version of the application a notable improvement over the applicant's earlier submissions. The Commission noted that reducing the number of lots, revising the stormwater management system, and limiting tree removal resulted in a plan that better fits the surrounding context.

Several members expressed support for the renderings of the proposed homes and indicated that the development could positively affect property values in the immediate area. However, they continued to express concerns about the potential removal of specimen trees and urged the applicant to preserve trees wherever possible. They also recommended that Township staff review the woodland conservation ordinance to determine whether additional protections should be incorporated in the future.

Finally, the Commission acknowledged that the two-acre deed restriction remains unresolved and encourages any party with standing to pursue available legal options, if desired.

Mr. Growney opens the meeting to comments from staff.

There were no comments from staff.

Mr. Growney Requested a motion from the Planning Commission.

Action: Mr. Thomas makes a motion seconded by Mr. Bond, and passed unanimously (5-0) to grant preliminary approval to the subdivision/land development plan, **LD-03-2025 602 Old Eagle School Road (1010 Wayne LLC)**, subject to the following waiver:

1. Section 181-44.F. to have a lot depth to width ratio greater than 3:1.

Action: Mr. Bond makes a motion seconded by Mr. Rose and passed unanimously (5-0) to adjourn the meeting.

Unanimous approval for the adjournment of the meeting.

Adjournment: 9:17pm

~Next Meeting ~

October 15, 2026