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RESOLUTION of the Board of Commissioners of Aston Township, Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

WHEREAS, the Township of Aston agreed with Upper Chichester Township and Lower Chichester Township to prepare a Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, a Task Force was formed comprising representatives of the three (3) municipalities; and

WHEREAS, after a more than two (2) year process of development said Task Force prepared and recommended for adoption said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, representatives from the Commissioners of the three (3) Townships at a joint Public Meeting held at the Upper Chichester Township Municipal Building on January 25, 2005, recommended adoption of said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, representatives from the Commissioners of the three (3) Townships at a joint public hearing held at the Aston Township Community Center on May 24, 2005, likewise recommended adoption of said Plan; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the adjacent municipalities, the School District and the County of Delaware were given forty-five (45) days to review and, if desired, commend on said proposed Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of Aston Township recognizes that said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan will be a valuable tool in aiding decision making in Aston Township as the Township continues to develop and change.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, this Sixteenth (16th) Day of November, 2005 that the Board of Commissioners of the Township of Aston hereby adopt and approve the Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan for Upper Chichester, Lower Chichester Township and Aston Township.

TOWNSHIP OF ASTON
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

BY:
Joseph P. Possenri Jr., President
Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

Richard D. Lehr
Township Secretary/Manager
TOWNSHIP OF LOWER CHICHESTER
DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
RESOLUTION NO: 2005-12

BE IT RESOLVED, this 19th day of December 2005, that
the Board of Commissioners of Lower Chichester Township,
Delaware County, Pennsylvania does adopt and approve the
Aston Township-Lower Chichester Township and Upper
Chichester Township Multi-Municipality Comprehensive Plan.

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER CHICHESTER

ROCCO GASPARI
President of the Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

JACQUELINE WALLACE
Township Secretary
UPPER CHICHESTER TOWNSHIP

RESOLUTION – NO. 05-37

WHEREAS, Upper Chichester Township agreed with Aston Township and Lower Chichester Township to prepare a Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, a Task Force was formed comprising representatives of the three (3) municipalities; and

WHEREAS, after a more than two (2) year process of development said Task Force prepared and recommended for adoption said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commissions of the respective Townships at a joint public meeting held at the Upper Chichester Township Municipal Building on January 25, 2005, recommended adoption of said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, representatives from the Commissioners of the three (3) Townships at a joint public hearing held at the Aston Township Community Center on May 24, 2005, likewise recommended adoption of said Plan; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the adjacent municipalities, the School District, and the County of Delaware were given forty-five (45) days to review and, if desired, comment on said proposed Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of Upper Chichester Township recognizes that said Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan will be a valuable tool in aiding decision making in Upper Chichester Township as the Township continues to develop and change.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, this 13th day of October 13, 2005 that the Board of Commissioners of Upper Chichester Township hereby adopts and approves the Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan for Aston Township, Lower Chichester Township and Upper Chichester Township.

Duly adopted this 13th day of October, 2005.

ATTEST:

Dora A. Coleman, Township Secretary

UPPER CHICHESTER TOWNSHIP

By: Thomas E. Parro, President
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A comprehensive plan is a long-range planning tool used to guide the future physical growth and development of a community. It expresses a community’s vision and goals for the future and recommends policies and strategies to achieve them. A multi-municipal comprehensive plan is a plan for two or more localities that considers their futures from a joint perspective while still respecting the individual character of each municipality. Comprehensive plans are officially adopted by the governing bodies of the participating municipalities and are implemented to a large extent by zoning, subdivision, and land development ordinances. Today, the typical timeframe of a comprehensive plan is about ten years. This document is a multi-municipal comprehensive plan for the Townships of Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester in Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN PENNSYLVANIA

The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), Act 247, regulates comprehensive planning in Pennsylvania. Act 247, as amended, requires plans to include a statement of the community’s development goals and objectives, plans for land use, transportation, the environment, housing, community facilities, and historic preservation. Comprehensive plans in Pennsylvania are also required to include a statement about the interrelationships among the various plan components and a discussion of short- and long-range plan implementation strategies. In addition to these required plan elements, this plan contains chapters and sections on the three Townships’ regional history, demographic characteristics, and characteristics of livability, as well as a two-year action agenda.

In June 2000, Pennsylvania adopted its own “smart growth” legislation uniquely tailored to the traditions, laws, and politics of Pennsylvania. Act 67 (House Bill 14) and Act 68 (Senate Bill 300) both amended the MPC. These reforms were designed to encourage and enable counties and municipalities to plan together for future development, and to implement such plans through cooperative agreements, consistent ordinances, and actions. The amendments enable the following:

Allow cost sharing of the significant costs of a sound land use plan, and the use of the technical assistance and expertise of county planning departments, regional agencies, and state agencies.

Provide funding incentives by authorizing state agencies to provide funding priority for multi-municipal planning and implementation.
Require incorporation of local plans in decision-making by requiring state agencies to consider and/or rely upon the multi-municipal plan in making funding and permitting decisions.

Address regional issues by enabling municipalities to cooperatively identify and address issues that are regional in nature, such as sewer and water provision, emergency services, transportation issues, and developments of regional scope. Planning for these issues together can eliminate the duplication of efforts, encourage communication among municipalities, and create opportunities for more efficient use of resources.

Protect against curative amendment lawsuits by no longer requiring that each municipality within a multi-municipal planning area provide for every possible use. In the context of a zoning challenge, the law now directs the court to look at the availability of uses under the zoning ordinances of all municipalities participating in a multi-municipal comprehensive plan, and not to limit its consideration to the municipality whose zoning ordinance is being challenged.

Preserve local autonomy by allowing municipalities to retain control over local issues so long as implementation is consistent with the framework of the multi-municipal comprehensive plan.¹

THE PLANNING PROCESS IN THE THREE TOWNSHIPS

The process of preparing a new multi-municipal comprehensive plan for Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester began in the fall of 2003. Individual comprehensive plans for the Townships were previously adopted in 1990 (Upper Chichester), 1987 (Aston), and 1978 (Lower Chichester). The Comprehensive Plan Task Force (CPTF), comprising officials representing each of the three Townships, provided general guidance throughout the planning process. The CPTF provided input including general policy guidance, review and refinement of plan drafts, and ideas for receiving public input.

Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) staff performed much of the research and drafted the text in coordination with the CPTF. The CPTF and DCPD staff met regularly to exchange information and review the work performed by DCPD.

This document contains significant data describing conditions in the Townships as they existed in 2003-2004. Much of the information was obtained from an analysis of U.S. Census data, Zoning Hearing Board records, and County documents such as subdivision reviews, parcel records, and maps. Information concerning existing development was obtained from land use surveys conducted by DCPD staff in 2003.

¹Planning Beyond Boundaries, 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, 2002
VISION STATEMENT

Visioning is a relatively new and commonly used tool in developing a comprehensive plan’s goals, objectives, and policies. A vision statement describes in general terms the residents’ overall opinion of and commitment to their ideal community. Therefore, it identifies the community’s ultimate long-range goal.

The vision of the Townships is to create a community that values its heritage; fosters socially and economically healthy environments; encourages safe human-scale development; and efficiently uses land, infrastructure, and public facilities and services.

While this statement provides the broad concept of the Townships’ long-term vision, some elaboration is necessary to provide a clearer picture of this ideal community. The statements below are designed to portray this long-term vision.

The Townships are striving toward a community that:

1. Maintains and encourages stable, blight-free neighborhoods where homeowners and residents can invest with reasonable assurance that their investment is secure;

2. Preserves Townships’ layouts, thus ensuring compatible, neatly spaced residences along pedestrian-oriented streets that discourage high volumes speeds and vehicular traffic volume;

3. Encourages diversity in land uses, economic development, housing opportunities, and social and cultural activities;

4. Encourages and supports businesses, government, and citizens to work together to attain common goals and fully capitalize on the community’s resources;

5. Capitalizes on its unique cultural characteristics to develop new retail and service opportunities;

6. Supports planned and designed public spaces and facilities that promote the maximum opportunity for social interaction and engagement;

7. Promotes the conservation of open spaces and the provision of parks, public recreational facilities, and programs designed for all members of the community, regardless of age, interest, or physical ability;

8. Encourages outdoor recreational activities, festivals, and events;
10. Provides and supports pedestrian-oriented, human-scaled streetscapes and urban design that foster a sense of place and accessibility for all members of the community;

11. Provides a setting that encourages people to choose to locate, remain, or return to the Townships because they offer a healthy, safe, and enriching environment in which to raise a family;

12. Preserves its cultural resources by supporting the protection and/or rehabilitation of historically or architecturally significant structures and sites;

13. Provides an integrated network of lighted multi-use paths/trails utilizing public rights-of-way and stream valleys;

14. Provides and maintains attractively landscaped entranceways and streetscapes containing shade trees along clean, well-maintained streets.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The term goal, as used in this plan, is an expression of the generalized end-points or ultimate purposes that the Townships strive to achieve. Objectives are the measurable actions necessary to move towards these goals. In most cases, several objectives must be achieved or nearly achieved before the goal is reached.

Recommendations are the specific actions that must be taken and/or directions to be carried out so that a given objective is attained. Frequently, an objective can be reached only by carrying out several recommendations.

The goals, objectives, and recommendations identified in comprehensive plans typically contain highly interrelated statements. For example, goals and objectives stated in terms of land use issues are frequently linked with those framed as transportation issues. Whenever this occurs, it is important to ensure that these statements are reasonably consistent with one another.

One of the most critical aspects of well-crafted goals and objectives is that they reflect the needs and desires of the community. Accordingly, it has been necessary to elicit the views and opinions of local officials and residents to prepare useful statements of goals and objectives.

Goals, objectives, and recommendations are included in individual chapters, as applicable.
FUNDING SOURCES

On behalf of the Townships, DCPD secured a Pennsylvania Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP) grant in the amount of $37,000 and a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) in the amount of $29,600. The Townships provided the remaining 10% of the total project cost ($7,400). The LUPTAP grant was obtained through the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED), the CDBG grant was obtained through the Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD), and the local match was divided among the three participating Townships.

PLAN ORGANIZATION

This plan is organized into twelve chapters that are bound together in a three-ring binder. This provides the Townships with the maximum convenience in making future plan revisions as conditions warrant. The Townships may incrementally update the plan one section at a time.

Each chapter has been carefully prepared to support and enhance the others, but is not dependent on them. This allows the chapters to act independently as well as cooperatively with one another to meet the overall vision of the region. The chapters that constitute the plan are:

- **Chapter 1 – Introduction**: provides an overview of the comprehensive plan and includes the *Vision Statement*.

- **Chapter 2 – Community Profile**: presents a brief history of the Townships and analyzes their demographic characteristics.

- **Chapter 3 – Historic Preservation**: provides a detailed history of the area and a plan for the preservation of the Townships’ cultural and historic resources.

- **Chapter 4 – Environment**: describes the area’s natural features and explores the region’s environmental issues.

- **Chapter 5 – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space**: discusses existing conditions of parks and open space areas, and presents recommendations for additional recreational areas, facilities, and programs.

- **Chapter 6 – Housing**: presents housing conditions and strategies to improve them.

- **Chapter 7 – Community Facilities and Services**: describes the level and adequacy of community facilities and services such as police protection, fire protection, library service, utilities, and Township administration.
• **Chapter 8 – Transportation:** discusses methods to enhance the local and regional transportation systems, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities and public transit.

• **Chapter 9 – Land Use:** presents an inventory of present land uses, a discussion of principal problem areas, and a plan for future land uses in the Townships.

• **Chapter 10 – Livability of the Townships:** discusses what features make a community “livable,” and highlights those components of a livable community that the three Townships possess.

• **Chapter 11 – Two-Year Action Agenda:** lists the priority actions that the Townships should take within the first two years after adoption of this plan.

• **Chapter 12 – Implementation:** describes the steps and tools for implementing this plan’s recommendations and preparing the Implementation Agreement.

• **Chapter 13 – Funding Programs and Technical Assistance:** lists the funding agencies and programs as well as sources of technical information needed to pay for and properly implement plan recommendations.

**HOW TO USE THIS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

This plan has been written in a consistent and straightforward manner, and is intended to be read either from cover to cover or consulted as needed for reference. The reader can flip to any chapter, read the existing conditions for the topic discussed, and continue to the recommendations designed to alleviate any deficiencies or shortcomings. Where applicable, a funding program and/or technical assistance source follows the recommendations. Chapter 13 – Funding Programs and Technical Assistance, provides a description of the applicable funding programs, sources of technical assistance, and specific contact information. Funding programs are listed alphabetically in Chapter 13.

Members of each Board of Commissioners should always turn to this plan when considering policy matters. They should consult this report to see the basic direction the plan sets forth and the more specific objectives outlined therein for areas such as land use, transportation, housing, etc.

Similarly, when Commissioners or other local boards or officials are considering specific matters, they are advised to consult the chapter that addresses the topic in question, as it will likely provide direction through its goals, objectives, and recommendations. These goals, objectives, and recommendations are based on combined input from local residents, staff, and elected and appointed officials, as well as that of DCPD. In many cases, municipalities ignore their own comprehensive plans, which contain valuable information on how to approach and make decisions on the very topics with which they are having difficulty. Therefore, the plan should be used as a reference that provides guidance on a wide variety of issues, problems, and challenges facing the Townships.
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COMMUNITY PROFILE

This chapter describes the three-Township area in the context of past, present, and future generations and its place in the region. It identifies the historical events that shaped the Townships and the region as a whole and analyzes each community’s demographics. Knowledge of the Townships’ past will assist in charting a course for their future.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL SETTING

The three-Township area comprises Aston Township, Upper Chichester Township, and Lower Chichester Township. It is located in the southwestern portion of Delaware County between Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Wilmington, Delaware. The area is bordered by Middletown Township, Brookhaven Borough, Chester Township, and the City of Chester to the east; Trainer Borough, Marcus Hook Borough, and the State of Delaware to the south; and Chester Heights Borough, Bethel Township, and Concord Township to the west. Map 2-1 highlights the location of the Townships in relation to the remainder of Delaware County and its bordering counties.

The area consists of 13.6 square miles and is approximately fifteen miles from Center City, Philadelphia; nine miles from Philadelphia International Airport; and nine miles from Wilmington, Delaware. The Commodore Barry Bridge, which spans the Delaware River and provides access to southern New Jersey, is located less than five miles from the area.

Interstate 95 (I-95) traverses a portion of the study area, passing through the southern portion of Upper Chichester Township and the northern part of Lower Chichester Township. The interstate highway provides easy access to Philadelphia, Wilmington, Philadelphia International Airport, and the Commodore Barry Bridge. I-95 also connects with Route 476 (Blue Route), a major north-south expressway that provides access to the Pennsylvania Turnpike, Route 202, and other major roads in the metropolitan area.

The area’s major arterials are Route 452 (Pennell Road and Market Street) and Route 322 (Conchester Road). Route 452 is a north-south arterial that traverses each Township in the study area and connects with Route 1 to the north. It also intersects I-95 and provides access to Marcus Hook and the Delaware River to the south. Route 322 is an east-west roadway that also intersects I-95 and provides access to the Townships of Bethel, Concord, and Chadds Ford to the west and the City of Chester and Trainer Borough to the southeast.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Europeans settled the three Townships in the 1670s and 1680s. Upper and Lower Chichester Townships were originally part of Chichester Township. They officially became separate municipalities in 1759. Aston was formed in 1682 and included what is now Chester Heights Borough until 1945. Prior to European settlement, the Lenni Lenape Indians occupied the land comprising the three Townships. This nomadic tribe traversed the area in their travels to the Delaware River in the spring and summer, and back to higher elevations in the western part of Delaware County in the winter.

There was limited industrial development in the Townships during the mid- to late-18th century and the first half of the 19th century. The area remained primarily agricultural through the first decade of the 20th century. In Aston, textile mills and villages were constructed along Chester Creek and the West Branch of Chester Creek early in the 19th century. The population doubled during that period. In Lower Chichester, gristmills were established along Naamans Creek in the late-18th century. Coupled with the 1838 development of the rail line between Philadelphia and Baltimore, Maryland (which passed through the Township), this precipitated the growth of the Village of Linwood. A gristmill and two sawmills were established in Upper Chichester by the mid-19th century.

After World War I, population size, industry, and commercial growth began to increase. Upper Chichester began to feel the effects of transportation improvements brought on by the automobile and industrial growth along the Delaware River. As workers were able to live farther away from their jobs, new subdivisions were built to accommodate their increased mobility. Aston also experienced increased suburbanization and the development of many new subdivisions. This growth continued in Aston and Upper Chichester during the post-World War II period.

Lower Chichester also experienced an increase in population as well as some spillover growth from the oil and chemical industries in Marcus Hook Borough and Trainer Borough. After World War II, suburbanization continued in Aston and Upper Chichester, with both Townships experiencing rapid population growth as well as the establishment of new industrial and commercial enterprises. In contrast, although Lower Chichester experienced some new housing development, its population started declining after 1960.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Population

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) provides population trends and forecasts for the Philadelphia region. Table 2-1 shows the population trends and forecasts for the three-Township area and Delaware County from 1900 to 2025.

The population of the tri-Township area has steadily increased over the past century, with the exception of 1910, when the area lost 13.1% of its total population. DVRPC forecasts that the population of the area will continue to increase through the year 2025.
This increasing trend followed that of Delaware County until 1970, when the overall County population started to decrease. Population forecasts for Delaware County show that from 2000 to 2025, the total population will decline slightly or stable.

### TABLE 2-1

**POPULATION TRENDS AND FORECASTS, 1900-2025**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Three Township Total</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Delaware County</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>117,906</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>173,069</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>9,875</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>280,264</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>11,504</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>310,756</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15,511</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>414,234</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>24,737</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>553,154</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>29,127</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>603,461</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>32,691</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>555,007</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>33,744</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>547,323</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36,636</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>551,974</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>38,190</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>551,530</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>39,480</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>550,970</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>40,520</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>546,570</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41,720</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>546,972</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>42,820</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>547,784</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Age Distribution**

Table 2-2 shows the age distribution for the three Townships and Delaware County between the 1990 and 2000 censuses. Since 1990, the 0-4 age group decreased by 2.5%, attributed to the fact that the childbearing age group (25-34) decreased by 15.6%. In the tri-Township area, these two age groups are the only ones that experienced decreases. This could be the effect of the 25-34 age group relocating in pursuit of jobs or conditions more suitable for child-rearing (e.g., better schools, less crime, etc). Comparing the same groups to County’s population statistics overall, there was a 10.1% decrease in the 0-4 age group and a 25.3% decrease in the 25-34 age group. The County also experienced a decrease in the 55-64 (-13.6%) and 65-74 (-16.8%) age groups, possibly due to retirees moving out of the area, whereas the tri-Township area gained 2.6% in the 55-64 age group and 5.8% in the 65-74 age group.
Racial Composition

Table 2-3 compares the racial composition of the three Townships and Delaware County in 1990 and 2000. Between the years 1990 and 2000, the racial composition of the three Townships and Delaware County changed dramatically. Aston Township and Upper Chichester Township experienced an increase in the White population of only 4.8% and 5.9%, respectively. The White population in Lower Chichester and Delaware County decreased by 3.2% and 6.6%, respectively. The Black and Other populations in the three-Township area have increased over the past 10 years. Aston had a substantial increase of 342.6% in the Black population, and a 297.4% increase in the Other population. (The term “Other” includes Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, and multiracial persons.) Lower Chichester experienced a 1.4% increase in the Black population, and a 314.3% increase in the Other population. Upper Chichester’s Black population increased by 46.2%, and its Other population increased by 341.7%. Consistent with Delaware County’s decrease of 6.6% in the White population and increases of 30.3% in the Black population and 127.2% in the Other population, the three-Township area has become more multiracial over the past decade.

### TABLE 2-2
AGE DISTRIBUTION, 1990 AND 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Three-Township Total</th>
<th>Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>4,857</td>
<td>4,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>4,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>6,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>5,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>2,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 2-3
RACIAL COMPOSITION, 1990 AND 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Lower Chichester</th>
<th>Upper Chichester</th>
<th>Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>15,662</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>342.6%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>297.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income

Median family income in the three-Township area has increased since 1990, consistent with the trend in Delaware County overall. As Table 2-4 indicates, between 1990 and 2000 Aston’s median family income increased by 38.7%, Lower Chichester’s increased by 23.5%, and Upper Chichester’s increased by 40.4%. Delaware County’s median family income increased from $44,323 to $61,590, a 39% increase.

Despite this increase in median family income, the percentage of individuals in poverty also increased. Aston’s number of individuals in poverty increased from 3.1% to 4.7%, Lower Chichester’s increased from 6.9% to 10.2%, and Upper Chichester’s increased from 4.1% to 5.5%. Delaware County’s percentage of individuals below the poverty level also increased between 1990 and 2000, rising from 6.8% to 8.0%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>$46,833</td>
<td>$64,938</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>$34,861</td>
<td>$43,066</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>$44,949</td>
<td>$63,125</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>$44,323</td>
<td>$61,590</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Housing Occupancy

Table 2-5 shows the number of owner-occupied, renter-occupied, and vacant units in the three-Township area for 1990 and 2000, and the percentage change between the two decades. There were 14,039 housing units in the area in 2000, 97% of which were occupied. Between 1990 and 2000, the total number of housing units increased by nearly 14%. This indicates that the area is experiencing new housing development. Nearly all of this development has occurred in Aston and Upper Chichester, where there is more developable land. In contrast, Lower Chichester is almost fully developed and there is little or no land available for new residential development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Occupancy</th>
<th>Three-Township Total 1990</th>
<th>Three-Township Total 2000</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Delaware County 1990</th>
<th>Delaware County 2000</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>12,346</td>
<td>14,039</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>211,024</td>
<td>216,978</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-26.6%</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>10,658</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
<td>11,770</td>
<td>13,616</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>201,374</td>
<td>206,320</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>9,428</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>146,281</td>
<td>148,384</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>55,093</td>
<td>57,936</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The pasts of the three municipalities, Aston, Lower Chichester and Upper Chichester, are evident in their contemporary identities. Visual reminders such as farmsteads, street patterns, landscapes, homes, and buildings evoke the area’s proud heritage. The significant historic places in each municipality are community assets. Planning for their protection is an important consideration in comprehensive planning, and it is the focus of this chapter. Many older communities across the county recognize that if they are to thrive in the future, they must embrace and build upon their history rather than ignoring it.

A community’s built environment evolves over time; likewise, preservation of historic resources is an ongoing process. Preservation consists of three steps: identification, evaluation, and protection. First, a community must identify those buildings, areas, or landscapes that exhibit historical characteristics and significance. Once a general listing has been created, each record must be carefully evaluated by collecting and documenting historical and physical data. This will enable the community to determine the degree of integrity the resource has retained and where it fits in with the history of the community, region, or nation. Finally, the community establishes appropriate and secure methods of protection so that these resources will be preserved for future generations.

A municipality that values its roots can foster a strong sense of community identity. Aston, Lower Chichester and Upper Chichester Townships still exhibit much of their history through the built environment, and these unique characteristics should be protected. The three Townships should actively pursue historic preservation through the steps described above and throughout this chapter.

HISTORIC COMMUNITY CHARACTER

GOAL: To identify and evaluate noteworthy historic development patterns, individual places, and character-defining features, and to protect and maintain these historic resources to strengthen community identity, generate economic vitality, and sustain them for the future.

Objective 3-1: To identify elements contributing to the area’s unique historic community character, including development patterns, and to design strategies for retaining and preserving those most valued.

The community character of the plan area (Aston, Lower Chichester and Upper Chichester Townships) displays historic development patterns that predominate in all the municipalities. Because the physical growth of a community provides the built environment that residents and visitors use in shaping their vision of that place’s identity, it is essential to examine these elements.
Historic Development Patterns

Like many Delaware County municipalities, all three Townships began as agricultural communities. Each evolved uniquely in response to increasing populations, national trends, and changes in technology. The historical growth patterns coincide with modern-day neighborhoods and municipal boundaries, providing illustrations of their evolution. The patterns discussed in this section contribute to the contemporary identity of the area, and provide the basis for guiding new development as well as preservation and revitalization.

Early Agricultural Farmstead Development – Some of the roads in the three Townships began as paths of the Lenni Lenape Tribes. The European settlers converted these paths into roads. These early transit corridors connected extensive agricultural lands to local village and large markets along the Delaware River. Much of this farmland was eventually subdivided and developed. Though land uses have changed, scattered late-18th and early-19th century farmhouses, carriage houses, barns, and outbuildings still exist. Because of the early settlement by the Quakers, their meetinghouses are the earliest religious and civic structures in the area. Chichester Meeting was the focal point for the future settlement of McCaysville, or Boothwyn, in Upper Chichester. These early farmsteads, supportive institutions, and remaining landscapes help define modern-day Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester. The early roadways have provided a path for development, particularly commercial development, and include some of today’s principal highways such as “Old Concord Road” (now Chichester Avenue), “Old Chichester and Bethel Road” (now Larkin Road), and Ridge Road.

Crossroads Village Development – Crossroads, or intersections of major roads, became commercial and social gathering places for scattered agricultural farmsteads. Village Green in Aston was one such gathering place. A post office, school, hotel, church, blacksmith shop, and residences were clustered around the intersection of the historic Pennell and Concord Roads. At the intersection of Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road, McCaysville (now Boothwyn) served the civic, social and commercial needs of local residents with a store and blacksmith shop. The McCay-Pierce House at the southwest corner of the Boothwyn crossroads was used as school, post office, and church, all while the McCay family resided there!

Lower Chichester served as a market town and transit hub until Marcus Hook and Trainer separated from the municipality in 1892 and 1919, respectively. In fact, Lower Chichester was a major trade center for cherries, dairy, and other foodstuffs produced in the western portions of Delaware County. Beginning in the 17th century, many Indian trails were developed and new roads were built to expand the pre-industrial trade network that led into Lower Chichester. This farm-to-market transportation system linked the crossroads villages in Upper Chichester and Aston with the larger river markets in Lower Chichester.
All three Townships had early commercial centers based on crossroads villages. The villages contained establishments for the surrounding agricultural uses, and eventually grew to include more and more residential facilities.

**Mill Villages** – In the early-19th century, the agrarian-based economy of Aston and Lower Chichester began to change. An early manufacturing industry developed along the Chester, Marcus Hook and West Branch Creeks. Especially in Aston, these water-dependent mills triggered the construction of fairly concentrated mill worker housing and supporting commercial uses. Generally, workers lived close to the mills, while management and owners lived on higher ground above the mill. Religious institutions also developed around the growing waterfront industry. In Aston, Mount Hope Methodist Church (1807) and Calvary Episcopal Church (1836) were erected. Many of these mill village industrial, residential, commercial, and religious buildings are still in use today.

Linwood, in Lower Chichester, was another early product of the mill industry, but its growth correlated more with the development of the railroad than with that of the waterways. Upper Chichester, on the other hand, maintained agricultural-related mills used to process locally grown grain. Unlike Aston or Lower Chichester, it did not develop manufacturing facilities or dense villages. These early mills, whether related to inner-county creeks, roads, or rail, diversified and expanded the pre-Industrial Revolution economies of each municipality.

Late-19th and early-20th century industrial expansion would have the greatest influence on the physical layout of the Townships today, especially in Lower and Upper Chichester. Large land parcels were purchased for industrial use, such as the National Analine & Chemical Company in Lower Chichester. The industrial uses replaced large agricultural areas and created demand for more worker housing (e.g., Analine Village) in the surrounding areas of all three Townships. As with the earlier mill villages, these new industries supported residential construction and the establishment of religious, social, and civic institutions such as the Holy Savior Roman Catholic Church (1914); Lawncroft Cemetery (1904); Independent Order of Odd Fellows Hall; and Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Building (1914) (all located in Lower Chichester). Schools such as Village Green (1867) and Rockdale Grammar (1853) (both located in Aston) were also established.

**Early Suburban Development (Turn-of-the-Century to World War II)** – Industrialization in the second half of the 19th century helped increase mobility by rail and eventually by car. As the automobile gained popularity, people were able to travel greater distances more quickly and to live within commuting distance of their place of employment. The result was the emergence of the suburb, as is apparent in the development patterns of Upper Chichester, Lower Chichester, and Aston.

The most explosive growth during the first half of the 20th century occurred in Upper Chichester as Twin Oaks Farms, Twin Oaks Manor, Boothwyn Farms, Boothwyn Acres, Naaman’s Heights, and Pleasant View (to name just a few) were being platted and
developed. The population in Upper Chichester grew from 601 in 1900 to 5,280 in 1940, an increase of over eight times in just forty years. As exemplified by Lenni Heights, another early subdivision in Aston, new housing during this period was generally platted and built on a grid. It tended to be less dense than neighborhoods in Chester City or Philadelphia, though it maintained several urban characteristics such as easy walks to general stores, religious institutions, and schools.

**Later Suburban Development (1947 to 1970)** – The grid-based pattern of early suburban development continued into the early 1950s. However, the post-World War II era brought rapid change to America. Industrial Revolution technologies had been perfected and new discoveries were constantly being made. Each municipality’s residential, commercial, industrial, civic, and social heritage was firmly established, yet continually evolving. Many of the early residences were added to during the early Post-WWII period, as new tract-type housing was built on adjacent lots. With its outstanding architecture, the Convent of the Sisters of St. Francis evolved into Neumann University. The incredible proliferation of the automobile during this period substantially impacted the major patterns of development. Car-based transportation dominated, rapidly outpacing pedestrian-, animal-, and water-based travel. Strip commercial centers, housing, municipal institutions, and schools, among other places, were now centered on the automobile. This form of development still dominates today.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

3-1 Identify significant resources that are examples of both early and later development patterns. In the areas of clustered developments of early crossroads or later suburban areas, develop design criteria for each neighborhood for elements including set back, bulk, height, rooflines, architectural styles, building types, and streetscape features such as well-designed sidewalks, curbs, and street trees.

Funding Programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Elm Street Program

Technical Assistance: Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)

3-2 Develop voluntary design guidelines using the design criteria established for each type of resource. The guidelines may specify preferred rehabilitation and maintenance alternatives. They should be made available to residents and developers as they apply for construction permits, in order to preserve the historic nature of the housing stock. They may also include incentives for the retention of historic resources such as the granting of conditional use permits for the reuse of historic properties. The process and results provide awareness and alternatives to residents.
Funding Programs: CDBG Program
PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
Elm Street Program
Technical Assistance: DCPD

3-3 Target historic business centers and established villages that offer opportunities for revitalization and continued retail use; consider using the “Main Street” approach.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
National Trust Main Street Program
Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) Main Street Program
Technical Assistance: DCPD

3-4 Identify vacant and/or underutilized commercial or industrial sites for adaptive reuse, and consider creating redevelopment plans that take advantage of the historic character of these places.

Funding Programs: DCED Community Revitalization Program
Historic Tax Credits
Technical Assistance: DCPD

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Objective 3-2: To prepare Township-wide inventories that represent a full range of significant historic resources, and to provide the necessary records for evaluation, documentation, and preservation.

Historic preservation is the act of safeguarding significant places from the past. Historic resources can include any portion of a community’s built environment that is 50 years or older, and that is important to the community, region, or nation. Similarly, they may encompass all of a community’s key features, including elements such as parks, open space, and archaeological resources. Some of these older resources are significant and should be protected and preserved. Others may meet the age criterion but have little historic significance, and therefore do not warrant protection.

Historic resource surveys were done in the 1980s for both Upper Chichester and Lower Chichester Townships, but the criteria for including resources was very limited. Today, the community character and historical development should first be identified to provide the background for the selection of resources to be preserved. The resources should reflect the uniqueness of the municipality and those common elements that are important to the Townships. The architectural styles, street patterns, and other features can identify neighborhoods, commercial areas, individual buildings, or farmsteads. Together, they generate and reflect community identity. The following section highlights each
Township’s character as a means for identifying, interpreting, and preserving significant sites and areas.

**Municipal Snapshots**

**Aston Township** is defined by the topographical elements that created its unique historical characteristics. The swiftly running streams of Chester Creek and West Branch supplied ideal sites for many milling establishments early in Aston’s history. These complexes evolved into unique clusters of industrial, commercial, and residential use. The mill villages were accessible via the twisting, hilly roads that are still present today. Some of these villages have more linear patterns of development with common setbacks, alley access, and architectural styles such as the Second Empire style that was common in the late-19th century. Stonewall fencing, stone walkways, and alley accessory buildings are prevalent in these villages. The crossroads village of Village Green, which is now highly commercial, was the impetus for development of the surrounding roads. As the mills declined, suburbanization began with residential tracts of lower densities that were built to house the workers from the Riverfront industrial boom of World Wars I and II.

**Lower Chichester Township**’s development was closely allied with that of the Riverfront municipality of Marcus Hook. The road pattern is very rectangular due to the area’s relatively flat topography. The main roadway, Ridge Road, runs parallel to the River and the railroad tracks. Market Street served to move goods and people from the interior of the County to the Riverfront. The railroad provided the major impetus for the township’s characteristics; Linwood station (a connecting station for the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Wilmington railroads) was a major transportation center for both commuters and agricultural goods. The resulting development is a mix of commercial and residential with common elements in the denser areas of Linwood. The more remote areas are less dense, which is consistent with the area’s rural past. A considerable portion of Lower Chichester appears to be open because of the spacious Lawncroft Cemetery.

**Upper Chichester Township** reflects its rural past with some amount of open space still existing. The clustering of residential housing around the Village of Boothwyn (formerly McCaysville) represents the growth period of the late-19th and early-20th century with closely built houses, slight setbacks, and narrow side streets. Some of the more recent housing developments retain the original architecture of a significant number of buildings. Commercial establishments, built to serve the growing population, tend to be concentrated on the major roads such as Chichester Avenue and Market Street.

**Architectural Styles and Building Types**

Although the three Townships are separate communities, they share some of the architectural styles that are prevalent throughout Delaware County. Many styles of buildings can be found in the Townships, but the following images represent some of the most common. For a more detailed and complete guide to the architectural styles of Delaware County, please contact DCPD.
These late-19th and early-20th century houses are common throughout Lower and Upper Chichester Townships. Many have been adapted to accommodate the needs of the 21st century family, yet the overall character of the neighborhood (with sidewalks, on-street parking, shallow front yards, and deeper back yards) has been preserved.

Analine Village is a planned community built in the early 1920s to accommodate workers from the National Analine & Chemical Company. The neighborhood includes a school and community center in addition to housing.
Windshield Surveys

The inventories created for this comprehensive plan are intended to summarize each township’s historic built environment. These preliminary lists, created by way of windshield surveys, are a crucial first step for preservation planning. These inventories are separated by Township, as subsequent preservation planning is typically done on a municipal level. The inventories combine individual historic resources and representative examples of groups of resources that share a common development pattern or style. Some references may not seem historic, as they are from the more “recent past”; however, they may qualify as legitimate entries in a township inventory if they add to a strong neighborhood character. It is also important to note that while the resources listed on the windshield surveys are significant to each township’s history, they may not be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

These windshield surveys (Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3) were created through research and site visits during the spring of 2004. They are not complete listings of every resource within the Townships. They should be considered the groundwork for a more comprehensive and detailed survey that each community should complete to initiate the process of local preservation. Maps 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3, which follow the windshield surveys, show the location of the historic resources within each Township.

National Register of Historic Places Designation

Significant community treasures, both architectural and archaeological, can be deemed worthy of receiving national distinction. These historic resources are placed on the National Register of Historic Places. To receive listing on the National Register, a resource must:

- Be noteworthy on the grounds of displaying distinctive characteristics of a particular period
- Have the potential to yield important historic or prehistoric information
- Be associated with events in history or with the lives of significant persons

Although this designation shows a high level of historic merit, it does not offer ultimate protection to the resource in question, with the exception of a review requirement when federal funding is involved.

Currently, Aston has one resource that has been officially declared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places: the Village Green School House. However, this does not mean that there are no other significant buildings or potential National Register resources in the Townships. Our Lady of Angels Convent complex and its scattered historic buildings is a strong candidate as well as. The mill villages are especially unique and could be candidates for National Register of Historic Districts.

Lower Chichester has one resource that has been declared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. When a project receives federal funding, a mandated process
identifies historic resources within the area. The Market Street Bridge project identified the Philadelphia Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad as eligible for the National Register. In addition, the former home of Chauncy Olcott (now the Lawncroft Interstate Cemetery offices) is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register.

Village Green School House, Aston Township, c. 1865

The Lawncroft Interstate Cemetery Administration Building was built in 1876 as a summer home for Chauncey Olcott, a nationally known actor, tenor, and silent movie star. In 1904, the home and surrounding property were incorporated into the Lawncroft Interstate Cemetery.
The McCay-Pierce House is the last remaining building at McCaysville crossroads (located at the intersection of Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road), an important agricultural trade village from the 18th to early-20th centuries. The McCay family was instrumental in the political and economic development of Delaware County. They were also integral in establishing the public school system in Upper Chichester Township.

The Chichester Meetinghouse in Upper Chichester has been on the National Register of Historic Places since 1973. The Dutton Property on Market Street has been deemed eligible, and the McCay-Pierce House is also potentially eligible for the National Register.

**Archaeology**

In an effort to encourage the protection of below-ground historic resources for long term planning and review procedures, a County-wide archaeological survey was produced in 1991. *The Delaware County Archaeological Resource Inventory and Management Plan* provides information that is organized by municipality. The publication consists of maps indicating areas with the potential of both native and early settler archaeology, previous archaeological testing, and a computerized database.
Aston Township has areas of high archaeological potential for industrial artifacts in the mill districts of Rockdale, Lenni, Crozerville, Knowlton, Bridgewater, Aston/Llewellyn and West Branch. The undisturbed areas of Village Green are also considered to have a high sensitivity for archaeological artifacts associated with the 17th and 18th century crossroads village. The institutional complex of Our Lady of Angels Convent and Neumann University are also indicated as high potential areas.

In Lower Chichester Township, the 18th century portion of Linwood predates the railroad and consequently has a high sensitivity to archaeological remains.

The Village of Boothwyn is judged to have a high sensitivity for artifacts in those areas not disturbed by modern development.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

3-5 Create a more complete and official survey of historic resources from the initial inventory provided in this plan, on which further preservation planning could be based. This comprehensive plan should be amended to include this survey upon its completion.

Funding Program: PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
Technical Assistance: DCPD

3-6 Consider nominating significant historic resources and districts to the National Register of Historic Places.

Funding Program: PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
Technical Assistance: DCPD

3-7 Consider applying for joint municipal grants for the creation and distribution of maintenance manuals for the key architectural styles shared by the three Townships.

Funding Program: PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
Technical Assistance: DCPD
### TABLE 3-1

**ASTON HISTORIC RESOURCE WINDSHIELD SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Willow Hill, 614 Convent Road</td>
<td>c. 1790 stone residence with early-1900 addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Village Green Schoolhouse, Old Pennell Road &amp; Manor Drive</td>
<td>c. 1865 restored one-room school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northleigh, 11/13 W. Knowlton Road</td>
<td>c. 1870 Second Empire former residence and commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17/19 Knowlton Road</td>
<td>c. 1860 Gothic Revival twin residence and commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5531 Concord Road</td>
<td>18th century Colonial vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Walnut Grove Farm, 4500 Concord Road</td>
<td>Stone and stucco residence, c. 1720-1750. Also Twin Pines Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>816 Tryens Road</td>
<td>1684 Thimble House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tryens House, 710 Tryens Road</td>
<td>c. 1870 Second Empire residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Barn, 4001 Convent Road</td>
<td>19th century barn for the Fisher residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hall/Fisher Residence, 600 Convent Road</td>
<td>c. 1829 stucco over fieldstone Federal vernacular residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Samuel Rhodes House, 601 Convent Road</td>
<td>Mid-19th century mill owner home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Encampment of British Troops, 1777</td>
<td>Largest troop encampment from Revolutionary War, extending from Mt. Hope to Duttons Mill and Concord Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mt. Hope Methodist Church, 4020 Concord Road</td>
<td>Gothic Revival church built in 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mt. Hope Parsonage, 4010 Concord Road</td>
<td>Victorian vernacular, early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>887 Red Hill Road</td>
<td>Early-19th century stucco over stone residence associated with the Forstberg estate (later Red Gables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>609 Red Hill Road</td>
<td>Early-19th century stucco over stone farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 Red Hill Road</td>
<td>c. 1850 mill owner home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5 Red Hill Road</td>
<td>c. 1830 stucco over stone residence built as schoolhouse by John Crozer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thatcher House, 885 Concord Road</td>
<td>c. 1750 banked farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Weir/Carter House, 34 Williams Road</td>
<td>1682 stone and brick house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hoopes House, 400 Legion Road</td>
<td>1749 Robert and Mary Dutton stone residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>108 Old Pennell Road</td>
<td>c. 18th century vernacular stucco over stone residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Knowlton Manor, 449 Knowlton Road</td>
<td>c. 1800 manor house for Knowlton Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Red Gables, 4000 Concord Road</td>
<td>c. Late-19th century Gargener’s home remaining on the Forstberg estate (later Red Gables estate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>133 Crozerville Road</td>
<td>c. 1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>700 Birney Highway</td>
<td>1865 residence built by Bodley family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>268 Duttons Mill Road</td>
<td>Worker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5600 Pennell Road</td>
<td>Kings Mill, 19th century stone mill building from Pennell Hill Mills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3-1
ASTON HISTORIC RESOURCE WINDSHIELD SURVEY
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>247 Moria Place</td>
<td>c. 1900 stone apple warehouse converted to townhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>105 Old Pennell Road</td>
<td>c. 1900 stone residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>O’Flagherty’s Restaurant, 5501 Pennell Road</td>
<td>c. 1850 stone cider mill associated with Hillwood Farm of A. E. Ford, specializing in orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5561 Pennell Road</td>
<td>Early-1800s stucco over stone main residence for Hillwood Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5511 Pennell Road</td>
<td>Early-1800s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Our Lady of Angels Convent</td>
<td>Convent established in 1870’s; possible local historical district if expanded to entire property of Sisters of St. Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rockdale/Crozerville Historic District</td>
<td>19th century mill district incorporating over 100 contributing resources such as school, church, mill worker housing, store, and public buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>West Branch Historic District</td>
<td>19th century mill district incorporating several contributing resources such as mill buildings, worker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Aston Mills Historic District</td>
<td>Late-18th and 19th century mill district with mill worker housing and mill buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3-2
UPPER CHICHESTER HISTORIC RESOURCE WINDSHIELD SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5446 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 1700s, with additions in the 1800s and 1930s; farmhouse formerly part of the Van Epps farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4800 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built c.1810; stucco over stone, Georgian vernacular farmhouse constructed by prominent Quaker Pastor Salkeld Larkin; later owned by Arthur Hanby; property also contains several early- to late-20th century outbuildings; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1569 Larkin Road</td>
<td>Built in mid-19th century; Federal style, fieldstone residence with subsequent late-20th century additions; most likely associated with the Larkin saw mill complex, which operated from the 1840s-1880s, as evidenced by traces of a mill race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1727 Larkin Road</td>
<td>Built in 1824; stone and stucco Georgian vernacular farmhouse with late-mid-19th century Gothic Revival addition; built by Joseph and Mary Pennell as part of a dairy farm; builder's grandson, also named Joseph Pennell, was a significant American artist during the late-19th - early 20th century; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4533 Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Built in late-1700s; stone and stucco Georgian vernacular with 19th century addition; purchased by Samuel Goodley in 1863 from Robert and Martha Booth; purchased by Wesley and Mary Clayton in 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map#</td>
<td>Name/Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4000-4004 Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Built in late-18th century; stucco over stone Georgian vernacular farmhouse associated with the John C. Ogden family, who were among the first four English settlers in the area to have purchased and occupied land in 1685; the property remained in the Ogden family until the late-19th century; fieldstone and frame servants quarters built in the mid- to-late-19th century are also located on the former dairy farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2552 Central Avenue</td>
<td>Built in mid-19th century; Carpenter Gothic Style frame farmhouse and frame carriage barn attributed to the C.W. Hance and W.T. Galbreath families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3143 Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Built in late-19th century; vernacular Queen Anne with a stone foundation and frame structure; owned by W.H. Talley in 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3110 Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Built in 1919; stone foundation and brick structure, traditional one-room schoolhouse; built by Willard T. Galbreath, the school operated from 1919 to 1970 and originally held seven grades; now a senior center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2247 Mill Road</td>
<td>Built in before 1825; stucco over stone Georgian residence; French Second Empire-style mansard roof added in the mid-19th century; originally part of the William McCay, Sr. 350-acre farm estate; subdivided c. 1900 for the Boothwyn Farms subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2230 Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1806; Georgian vernacular stone farmhouse built by James Pennell and later purchased by William and Jane McCay; sold in 1829 with 80 acres to the John Broomall family; sold to George Helms in 1902; sold again to a developer who built the Ogden Park subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2131 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in 1812; fieldstone and stucco Georgian vernacular farmhouse built by John Broomall; small one-room addition built in the 1950s; owned by Congressman Broomall's family until 1902, when it was purchased by John Boudwin, who named the estate “Cherry Ridge” after his largest crop; the site was also known for its semi-precious feldspar veins, which where mined in the 1910s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2036 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in during the late-18th century; vernacular stucco over stone residence built by cabinetmaker &quot;Little&quot; John Talbot; the property also contains a small stone springhouse; later purchased by the McCay and then Mason families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1834 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1810; Georgian vernacular, coursed fieldstone residence built by William McCay; John B. McCay, William's son, added a frame kitchen c. 1860; the house and land were purchased by the Bergdoll family in 1903; they were sold to the developers of the Boothwyn Farms subdivision in 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4260 Bethel Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1840; stucco over stone, Federal vernacular style residence attributed to the Halsey family; known as the William Richardson farm from 1855-1900, the house also served as a summer resort; purchased by Dr. George F. Bair in 1912; now apartments; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map#</td>
<td>Name/Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3826 Bethel Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1790; stucco over stone, Georgian vernacular residence built by the Huston family; appears without pre-1843 addition in the 1789 Direct Tax records; sold to William Richardson in 1855 and to the Halsey family in 1900; Dr. George K. Bair purchased the 73 acre farm in 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1861 Mill Road</td>
<td>Built in the late-18th century; stucco over stone residence associated with the Talbot Grist Mill complex, which operated from 1767 to 1884; the worker housing is the last remaining building of the Talbot Mill complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3116 Bethel Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1870; frame vernacular Queen Anne/French Second Empire associated with the George W. Sharpe family; excellent example of late-19th century Revival styles architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1346-1350 Plum Street</td>
<td>Built in the early-19th century; stucco and fieldstone Georgian vernacular residence; part of the J.B. Okie farm in 1875; in 1913 the 36.75 acre tract belonged to Edward L. Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3631 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 1807; Georgian Vernacular, stucco over brick residence built by the Kerlin family; later owned by John M. Broomall, donor of the Memorial United Presbyterian Church; now a 3-unit apartment building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3213 &amp; 3215 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 1885; brick Gothic church and Queen Anne-style parsonage built with money from farmer Andrew Armstrong in memory of his son, William Samuel Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1008 Galbreath Avenue</td>
<td>Built c. mid-19th century; stucco over stone residence built as part of a 50-acre farmstead owned by prominent Democratic leader Andrew Osbourne; in 1917 the property was subdivided by Willard T. Galbreath and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2410 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 18th century; Penn plan, fieldstone residence and part of the William McCay, Sr. farm estate; last remaining building of McCaysville crossroads village, a major agricultural trade center from the late-18th to early-20th century; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2323 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in early-18th century; Georgian Vernacular fieldstone farmhouse built by John Dutton; in the mid-19th century the property (then owned by John Stevenson) contained wheelwrighting, cabinet-making, and undertaking businesses; in the late-19th-century the farmhouse was owned by Mrs. Rachel C. Smith, the first postmistress in Boothwyn; addition to the east side of the house was built in the late-20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>670 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in mid-18th century; stucco over stone Georgian vernacular farmhouse attributed to the Brown Family; reputedly housed wounded Americans after the Battle of Brandywine; the Brown family donated part of the 150-plus acre tract for the Chichester Friends Meetinghouse across the street; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map#</td>
<td>Name/Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>611 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in 1768-9; fieldstone; traditional Quaker meetinghouse, burial ground, stone privy, barn, wagon shed, and caretaker's house; though this is the second meetinghouse to occupy this site, it remains one of the first Quaker Meetinghouses in Pennsylvania; shelter for wounded American soldiers during the Revolution; caretakers' house built in 1703 and various outbuildings from the late-18th and 19th centuries; listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1712 &amp; 1714 Market Street</td>
<td>Built c. 1820; vernacular federal-style, clapboard clad twin; home was part of a 25-acre tract owned by C. Palmer in 1875 and a 15-acre tract belonging to James B. Taylor in 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1313 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1910; frame vernacular house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>217 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in 1760-1768; clapboard and stone Georgian vernacular farmhouse owned by the Stephenson family from 1770-1870; stone well and frame barn on the property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>337 Ruth Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-18th century; stucco-over-stone Georgian vernacular farmhouse built by John Valentine; occupied by the Chance, Psotta, and Lewis H. Dutton families; originally part of one of the largest farm estates in the area, maintaining 105+ acres until the 1940s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>709 Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-18th century; stone springhouse, expanded into a residence c. 1920; mostly likely part of the Dutton homestead and dairy farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3655 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1878; brick and frame, French Second Empire, tri-part residence constructed by Frank Dutton, a prominent butcher in the area during the late-19th and early-20th-centuries; remained as part of the Dutton family farms until after 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4021 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in before 1826; Brick and stone Georgian vernacular farmhouse built by the Kingsman Dutton family; small frame horse barn on premises; last remaining building from the Dutton family mill complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4309 Bethel Road</td>
<td>Built in 1840-1860; frame Carpenter Gothic farmhouse; part of Nathan Pennell's 85 acres in 1875; subdivided by 1913, with only 2 acre per house lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2103 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in early-19th century; stucco over stone Georgian Vernacular farmhouse; part of the 60-acre P. Birnbaum farm estate in 1875; owned by George Laughead in 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4498 Bethel Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1870; frame Victorian vernacular farmhouse; once part of the 43-acre J. Newlin Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2610 Larkin Road</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; stone and frame vernacular residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1800 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; vernacular frame house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2302 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in early-20th century; frame vernacular Four Square-type residence; in 1913 Ms. Alice B. Smith occupied the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4111 Greenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; vernacular frame farmhouse with stone foundation; part of the 85-acre North Pennell Estate in 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3638 Market Street</td>
<td>Built c. 1910; vernacular frame craftsman bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>704 Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; vernacular frame building; possibly a former schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map#</td>
<td>Name/Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1702 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-19th/early-20th century; stucco-over-stone former residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1706 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; stucco-over-stone vernacular residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1807-1811 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 20th century; vernacular brick commercial and residential buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1801 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 20th century; vernacular brick commercial and residential buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1821-1825 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in early-20th century; twin, detached Prairie-esque style residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2108-2110 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-19th century; stucco, detached twin houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2807 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-19th century; vernacular stucco house; possibly built as a commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5423 Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built in late-18th to early-20th centuries; stone, Georgian vernacular farmhouse; part of the A. Armstrong estate in 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue, Chichester Avenue, Naaman's Creek, Meetinghouse Road, Larkin Road, Bethel Road, and Mill Road</td>
<td>Historic farm-to-market road network; Blueball and Chichester Avenues constructed 1688; Naaman's Creek Road constructed 1686; each road was key to the development of the municipalities they traverse; important locally for their role in moving goods and people to and from the Delaware River and the interior of the county; important nationally for their role in early “westward expansion”; important troop movement routes during the American Revolution; potentially eligible for multi-jurisdictional listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Near Meetinghouse Road over Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Built in late-19th to early 20th century; granite over brick, double arch Baltimore and Ohio Railroad bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>727 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in 19th century; frame vernacular Victorian residence; part of the 18-acre D. Boyd Estate in 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>925 Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Built in early-20th century; frame vernacular Four Square-type residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Roughly bounded by Market Street, Belvue Terrace, Howard Avenue, and Hartzell Avenue</td>
<td>Twin Oaks Subdivision; African-American neighborhood marked with frame worker housing from the Industrial Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Intersection of Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Boothwyn, an early crossroads village; served as the township’s central economic area until the early-20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Roughly bounded by Blueball, Chichester Makay, 5th, 6th, Okiola, and Graham Avenues</td>
<td>Boothwyn Farms Subdivision; various early-20th century frame homes; subdivided from the McCay Family Estate in 1901 by a Philadelphia developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Running Northeast-Southwest, slightly north of Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; important in the movement of goods to and from Wilmington and Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Off Woodstream Road, near the East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Former saw mill site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Near Euclid Street</td>
<td>Former feldspar quarry; associated with major economic activity in the Township during the 19th century; once part of the 140-acre G. Broomall estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Off Mill Road, near the East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Former mill site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map#</td>
<td>Name/Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2333 Orchard Lane</td>
<td>Built c.1720; stone and frame, Colonial vernacular house; residence belonged to Nathan Pennell, Samuel Hickman, and Delaware Larkin (among others); these men also operated a grist mill near the house (now demolished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Naaman's Creek Road, near I-95 underpass, along Naaman's Creek</td>
<td>Site of mill complex ruins; saw and grist mills first established c.1800 by Nathan Pennell; in the mid-19th century, Samuel Hickman purchased the mills and built a higher-volume flour factory known as Diamond Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W. Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built in 1876; fieldstone, Carpenter Gothic-style house and carriage barn now part of Lawncroft Cemetery; built as a summer home for Chauncy Olcott, a nationally known actor, tenor, and silent movie star; in 1904, E.F. White incorporated the property into the Lawncroft Cemetery grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>Built in 1903; iron bridge over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1700 Block of Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Built c. 1915; five Shingle-style residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue &amp; Palmer Drive</td>
<td>Built in 1914; former granite institutional building (possibly the first Chapel of the Holy Savior); historically significant due to its use as the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1311 Green Street</td>
<td>Built c. 1920; frame Victorian Vernacular residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1313 Green Street</td>
<td>Built in 1917; frame Victorian Vernacular residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1321 Green Street</td>
<td>Built in 1893 with an addition in 1926; frame Victorian vernacular religious complex; built by the Mt. Hebron African Methodist Episcopal Congregation, which first organized in Upper Chichester in 1837; it remains an active congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1519 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in mid-19th century; frame, vernacular Carpenter Gothic residence; owned and possibly built by S.D. Pierce in 1875; became part of a 22-acre parcel owned by Frank D. Marshall in 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1509 Market Street</td>
<td>Built c. 1910; frame vernacular Queen Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1459 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in late-19th century; frame vernacular Queen Anne; part of the 10-acre M. Emmanuel estate in 1875; by 1913 the property was part of &quot;Maple Heights,&quot; a 5-acre property owned by Mrs. Rachael D. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1410 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1849; stucco-over-stone civic building originally known as the Farmers and Mechanics Lodge, No. 185 of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows; the group served as a members-only secret society that engaged in numerous charitable activities until turning the building over to the Township in the late 20th-century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1322-1324 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1892; brick Victorian Vernacular twin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1340 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1917; brick and frame twin with double second story bay windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1344 Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1910; frame, vernacular, Carpenter Gothic-style residence; now has a commercial use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3-3
**LOWER CHICHESTER HISTORIC RESOURCE WINDSHIELD SURVEY**
*(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>N. Market Street</td>
<td>Built in 1869; vernacular stucco-over-stone school (currently the Lower Chichester municipal building); originally built as the Rock Hill Public School, the building served the educational needs of the community until 1921, when a new school was built; the building was a private residence and clubhouse until 1939, when it was purchased by the Township for $1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built in 1871; frame, vernacular Queen Anne residence; built as the rectory for St. Martin's Episcopal Church; the congregation was established between 1700-1702 by Reverend Evan Evans of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, a missionary branch of the Church of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24 Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1900; frame vernacular Victorian with French Second Empire roof; most likely built as a summer home for an upper-level industrial employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30-32 Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1900; brick Victorian vernacular twin residence; possibly the most architecturally grand example of twin housing in the Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1900-1910; vernacular Victorian stone residence built by Albert H. Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15 &amp; 17 Morton Street</td>
<td>Built in between 1875-1910; brick vernacular row residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24 Morton Street</td>
<td>Built in between 1875-1910; frame vernacular row residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28 Morton Street</td>
<td>Built in between 1875-1910; frame vernacular row residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2-4 Ormond Street</td>
<td>Built c.1910; brick vernacular twin; served as housing for the adjacent United Roofing and Manufacturing Company in 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Market &amp; Ormond Streets</td>
<td>Built c.1920-1930; brick and stone, chamfered corner building known as Marcus Hook Baptist Church; the congregation was originally organized in on May 3, 1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built in 1917; granite Mission Revival-style building, known as the Holy Savior Roman Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Slightly southwest of and parallel to Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built in 1838; Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad; important for the line's role in moving goods and people northeast-southwest between Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington, D.C.; rail line helped expand commerce in the area before, during, and after the Industrial Revolution; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>244 W. Ridge Road</td>
<td>Built c. 1900; stone residence once known as the Joseph Malatesta Mansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Market Street, over Conrail rail line, between Marcus Hook and Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Built in 1927; concrete and steel bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Market Street, over Conrail rail line, between Marcus Hook and Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Built in 1927; concrete and steel bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3-3
LOWER CHICHESTER HISTORIC RESOURCE WINDSHIELD SURVEY
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bounded by Ridge Road, Naaman's Creek Road (Delaware State), National Avenue, and the Lawncroft Interst Cemetery</td>
<td>Built c.1920; planned workers’ community including stone and brick, vernacular Tudor Revival-style rowhomes, community garage, school, and community center; built as Analine Village by the National Analine and Chemical Company; potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bounded by Ridge Road, Hewes Avenue, Edwards Street, and Huddle Avenue</td>
<td>Subdivided c. 1913; brick rowhomes; subdivision known as Linwood Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue, Chichester Avenue/Market Street, Naaman's Creek, and Ridge Roads</td>
<td>Historic farm-to-market road network; Blueball and Chichester Avenues constructed 1688; Naaman's Creek Road constructed 1686; Ridge Road constructed 1687; each road was key to the development of the municipalities they traverse; important locally for their role in moving goods and people to and from the Delaware River and the interior of the County; important nationally for their role in early &quot;westward expansion&quot;; also important troop movement routes during the American Revolution; potentially eligible for multi-jurisdictional listing on the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bounded by Ridge Road, Morton Street, Market Street, and Green Street</td>
<td>18th and early-19th century village; below-ground historic resources may be present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESERVATION PLANNING IN THE TOWNSHIPS

Objective 3-3: To assess preservation efforts in the Townships to date, and to determine which techniques and level of local participation are most appropriate for protecting historic resources.

Historic preservation can be encouraged, promoted, and even mandated at various levels of government. No longer relegated to a few historically-minded community members, preservation activities entered the realm of federal governmental actions with the enactment of the National Preservation Act of 1966. While nationally recognized designations may promote awareness of historic resources, preservation is most effective at the local level, since municipalities are the governmental bodies with the legal authority to create and mandate preservation regulations. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) Act 247 specifically enables local government to plan for and regulate cultural resources. However, simply having the MPC as a guide for local municipalities does not ensure protection. It is the responsibility of each Township to become an active participant in preservation. Not taking full advantage of these legal opportunities may result in the loss of valuable historic fabric and community character.
Municipal Commissions and Task Forces

A Historical Commission or task force is the most common type of group that can be appointed by the municipality to formally oversee preservation efforts. Though not mandated by law, its members are appointed by municipal officials and should include both Borough residents and officials. Typical activities may include:

- Recording historical data
- Identifying significant community resources in survey format
- Acting as a review board for historic overlays and districts as well as subdivision and land development plans
- Advising residents and officials on potential historical activities
- Recommending incentives and methods for preservation

Another way to create a formally recognized advisory body is to establish a task force or subcommittee of the local Board of Commissioners or Planning Commission. The Historical Commission is granted its legal right to exist via the same portion of the MPC that allows for the Planning Commission. To date, none of the Townships have formed Historical Commissions.

Municipal Historic Ordinances

Local governments have the authority to protect historic resources through establishing ordinances. Many communities are wary of historic ordinances, however, because of the perception that these ordinances may limit a homeowner’s personal control over his/her property. This is simply not the case. Historic ordinances directly reflect the characteristics the community values most, and can be as rigid or as flexible as the individual Township deems appropriate. An ordinance can influence rehabilitation, demolition, new development, and financial incentives. The ultimate goal of such an ordinance is to maintain the shared character of the community. There are two major types of ordinances that are used to protect historic resources.

Local Historic District (Act 167 District)

Act 167 (1961 P.L. 282) authorizes the local government to delineate an historic district within the municipality. Adoption of a certified Local Historic District through an Act 167 historic district ordinance is an important tool for the protection of clusters of historic resources in a municipality. Once certified by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), this ordinance provides for local review of changes in the district by establishing an Historical and Architectural Review Board (HARB) that serves in an advisory capacity to the municipal governing officials. The Local Historic District acts as another layer of regulation upon the base zoning of the area, be it residential, commercial, or industrial. Design guidelines regulate physical changes within the district and are specifically tailored to the individual municipality. The local historic district does not need to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
The guidelines should reflect community values relative to the local historic district and can be as strict or lenient as desired. In some cases, they may only affect new construction or any additions (not alterations) to existing housing. Examples of elements that can be regulated by design guidelines include height, bulk, roofline, proportions, façade openings, building materials, color, fences, walls, exterior lighting, and compatibility with other architectural details. It is strongly advised that residents of the proposed local historic district be included in the planning process from the outset in order to maximize their cooperation. Steps for establishing an historic district ordinance and examples of model historic district ordinances prepared by PHMC are available at the Delaware County Planning Department.

Zoning Overlay District

Another useful tool for municipal level preservation is the zoning overlay, which is adopted into the community’s local zoning ordinance. In addition to regulations in the base zoning districts, the zoning overlay applies additional regulations and incentives to those resources identified in the municipal historic resource survey. These regulations may address such factors as historic impact studies as a part of the existing land development process, demolition, design guidelines, buffering, visual protection, and more.

The review body for activities within an historic overlay district is generally an historical commission, with members appointed by the municipality. Like the HARB, the historical commission can review proposed plans for appropriate treatment in the overlay zones. It may also become the “keeper” of the history of the municipality and be in charge of updating the historic resource survey, distributing information to citizens, and nominating resources to the National Register of Historic Places.

Incentives such as additional use opportunities can be given to the property owners of identified resources. A developer of a property that contains an identified historic building can be offered incentives to retain and reuse the structure. Incentives could include an expansion in uses, increased density, and parking bonuses. For instance, an historic home in the overlay zone could be used as a small shop or office, even though it is in a residential zone on the community’s base-zoning map. These incentives are offered via either special exception permits authorized by the zoning hearing board or conditional use permits authorized by the governing body.

Historic overlay zoning has advantages similar to the Act 167 local historic district. It has the flexibility to meet the needs of the community and advisory review body. Perhaps in the case of Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships, incentives for reuse of historic buildings hold the greatest potential benefit. However, it is necessary for Upper Chichester and Lower Chichester to update their official historic resources surveys (last performed in 1983 and 1981 respectively) before they would be able to establish the zoning overlays. Aston should also take a thorough inventory of historic resources; fortunately preliminary steps have been taken in that direction.
Protection of historic resources at the local level can be achieved through any number of ordinances and zoning activities to best meet the needs of the community. The Act 167 district and HARB approach, as well as municipal zoning through overlay districts, local landmark designations, and demolition ordinances are all viable legislative tools for preservation. To date, only Upper Chichester has an historic ordinance in place. This ordinance is directed toward the demolition of historic resources and extends a delay of demolition, but does not deny demolition (see Appendix A – Preservation Toolbox for more detailed information regarding these preservation tools).

**Citizen Involvement**

Citizen involvement is an integral part of the preservation process. The three Townships have an historically interested constituency. Aston Township has had an historical society for many years. Aston Township and the Aston Historical Society have a compatible relationship. The Township recognizes the value of the Historical Society collections and donates use of a room in the community center for display of historic photographs and artifacts. The Township also owns the Village Green School House, which is overseen and used by the Historical Society for their events.

Because of their similar histories, Upper Chichester and Lower Chichester Townships have a joint and newly revived historical society, the Chichester Historical Society. Because of recent demolitions of historic buildings and the threat of future demolitions, citizens have become more aware of their valuable historical resources.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

3-8 Consider creating an official joint historic preservation advisory body such as an Historical Commission.

- **Funding Program:** PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
- **Technical Assistance:** DCPD

3-9 Consider establishing Act 167 local historic districts and form accompanying Historic Architectural Review Boards (HARBs) to maintain the character of these districts. This is especially applicable to areas such as Aston’s Mill Districts.

- **Funding Program:** PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
- **Technical Assistance:** DCPD

3-10 Consider establishing historic preservation ordinances or historic zoning overlay districts and amending preservation language into the Townships’ zoning ordinances (see Appendix A – Preservation Toolbox for specific examples).

- **Funding Program:** PHMC Historic Preservation Grants
- **Technical Assistance:** DCPD
CHAPTER 4
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CHAPTER 4

ENVIRONMENT

The natural environment is an important consideration in the comprehensive planning process since it can directly affect the type, location, and intensity of land use. For this reason, this chapter focuses on soils, topography, wetlands, floodplains, stormwater, and water quality issues affecting the three-Township area. Although portions of the area have been heavily developed over recent decades, areas of open, undeveloped space still exist, and should receive consideration as an integral part of the comprehensive planning process.

GOAL: To preserve and enhance the quality of life in the three-Township area by encouraging sustainable development and redevelopment practices that protect and maximize the existing natural resources and unique

NATURAL FEATURES

Objective 4-1: To manage natural features such as soils, floodplains, and wetlands in a manner that preserves their productivity and function, protects the public, and provides for the continued viability of the resources.

Soils and Topography

According to the Soil Survey of Chester and Delaware Counties, Pennsylvania (May 1963), a large portion of the soils within the study area consist of a soil group known as Made Land (Ma). This term refers to a type of soil mixture present after grading and earthmoving during construction. The amount of Made Land actually present within the study area is greater than the Soil Survey indicates, due to development that has occurred during recent decades.

Agricultural and woodland soils, which are also present within the study area (particularly along the western borders and stream valleys) are discussed in more detail in the next section. Soils within the stream valleys are predominantly hydric soils or soils with hydric inclusions, indicating that they hold water. Map 4-1 shows the distribution of soil classifications for the three Townships.

Topography is analyzed by examining the nature and severity of slopes in a given area. According to the Soil Survey, the three Townships are generally flat. However, the northern portion of Aston has areas of steep slopes along the Chester Creek stream corridor. Additionally, moderately steep slopes can be found sporadically in the western half of Upper Chichester Township, particularly along Naamans Creek. A section of moderately steep slopes can also be found along Naamans Creek in Lower Chichester.
Agriculture and Woodlands

The three-Township area is generally urbanized with pockets of green space helping to maintain neighborhoods and areas with rural character. As mentioned in the previous section, a large portion of the soils in the study area is classified as Made Land. The majority of the remaining soils in the study area fall within the general categories of prime farmland and woodland. Large portions of these soils are listed as Class I and II, indicating that they are well-drained soils of the highest quality for the purpose of agriculture or forestry uses. While agriculture and forestry may not currently be common practices in the area, consideration should be given to areas with these soil types when preserving future open space.

The western sections of Upper Chichester and the southern section of Aston have a large concentration of significant agricultural and woodland soils. The only portion of Lower Chichester with woodland and agricultural soils is the area of Lawn Croft Cemetery.

Section 603(f) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) states that municipal zoning may not unreasonably restrict forestry activities. It further states that a zoning ordinance must be designed to “preserve prime agriculture and farmland considering topography, soil type and classification, and present use.” Since one of the main themes of the MPC is the requirement that zoning ordinances be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan, it is important that this plan does not designate future development in areas that could be considered for forestry activities. Township officials need to be mindful of this when considering proposed revisions to zoning ordinances.

It should be noted that the study area has a limited number of shade trees. Shade trees can greatly enhance the visual quality of the area and would, therefore, be important assets to the community. While Upper Chichester has a Shade Tree Commission currently developing plans to install and maintain street trees, neither Aston nor Lower Chichester currently has such a group.

Wetlands

Wetlands play a crucial role in the function of natural systems, including stabilizing the water regime, improving water quality, and providing habitats for plants and animals. In addition, because of their aesthetic value and species diversity, wetlands offer opportunities for passive recreation and education. There are several wetland areas, as identified in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI, 1991), within the study area, mostly on low-lying lands adjacent to exposed streams. Map 4-2 indicates the location of wetlands and other water features in the three Townships.

Floodplains

When rainstorms or snowmelt generate more runoff than watercourses can accommodate, streams overflow their banks and drain to adjacent low-lying areas. This condition is
known as flooding. When this process occurs repeatedly over time, it creates a natural overflow area called a floodplain. Floodplains play an important role in maintaining water quality and supply. They act as overflow areas for floodwaters, serve as wildlife habitat areas, and support vegetation. Any alteration of the floodplain (such as damming, stream diversion, or development) will disrupt natural flow and drainage patterns. This, in turn, is likely to increase the level of flooding, thus threatening the health and safety of residents.

Floodplains are the most common natural feature regulated by municipalities. In 1968, Congress passed the *National Flood Insurance Act*, providing federally subsidized flood insurance for structures within floodplains. The Pennsylvania General Assembly enacted Act 166 in 1978. It requires flood-prone communities to regulate uses and activities in the floodplain through local ordinances meant to prevent loss of life and property.

Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) defines the following flood-related terms (see Figure 4-1):

**FIGURE 4-1**
**FLOODPLAIN SCHEMATIC**

- 100-year Floodplain: The floodway and the maximum area of land that is likely to be flooded by the 100-year flood as shown on the floodplain maps provided to municipalities by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
• Floodway: The portion of the 100-year floodplain, including the watercourse itself and any adjacent land area, that must be kept open in order to carry the water of a 100-year flood.

• Flood-fringe: The portion of the 100-year floodplain outside of the floodway.

Floodplain areas within the Townships fall along the stream corridors of three major watersheds: Chester Creek, Naamans Creek, and Marcus Hook Creek. Additionally, some portions of Lower Chichester drain directly to the Delaware River. In addition to these larger creeks, the Townships also have a series of small, often unnamed streams that flow into the larger streams and have the potential to flood.

Floodplain development in each Township is regulated by individual municipal ordinances. All three Townships have floodplain management provisions in their zoning ordinances. While Upper Chichester’s ordinance complies with the federal and state floodplain management requirements, Aston’s and Lower Chichester’s ordinances are not in compliance. They should be revised and updated. Local floodplain ordinances must meet federal and state requirements in order for municipalities to qualify for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). NFIP allows property owners in the floodplain to purchase federally backed flood insurance. Obtaining this status will greatly benefit affected property owners within Aston and Lower Chichester. Map 4-2 indicates the locations of floodplains in the three Townships.

Fortunately, most of the floodplains in the Townships are relatively undeveloped except as parkland or open space. Surveys completed for the purpose of the Chester Creek Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan indicate a limited number of flooding problem areas in Aston Township. These areas are detailed in the Stormwater Management section in this chapter.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Many of the natural features discussed in this section not only provide important natural functions, but also serve as valuable amenities. In urbanized areas such as the three Townships, it is important to protect limited natural resources to the greatest extent possible, for both the function and the visual relief that they provide. When improperly managed through the introduction of inappropriate development, areas such as wetlands and floodplains can no longer function properly, often resulting in harm to the community (e.g., flooding). When properly managed through stream buffers, limitations on intense development, preservation of wooded areas, and introduction of street trees, these resources serve as valuable assets to the community. Such amenities help to attract and keep residents and businesses in the community and help to promote its distinctive character.

The Townships should:

4-1 Preserve the integrity of the existing woodlands through minimal disturbance practices. Not only will this help to prevent additional stormwater runoff from
reaching local streams, it could also provide passive recreational opportunities, such as potential nature trails.

**Funding Programs:** Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program  
Community Conservation Partnerships Program (C2P2)  
Growing Greener Watershed Program  

**Technical Assistance:** Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)  
Delaware County Conservation District

Aston and Lower Chichester should:

4-2 Consider creating a Shade Tree Commission for the installation and protection of street trees. Upper Chichester should continue with plans to install and preserve shade trees along its streets.

**Funding Program:** Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council  
**Technical Assistance:** Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council

4-3 Revise and/or adopt zoning ordinances that require protective measures such as buffers to protect stream corridors and wetland areas from paving, channelization, or fill, and provide strong enforcement of these ordinances.

**Technical Assistance:** DCPD

4-4 Regulate development in floodplains through strict enforcement of local floodplain ordinances, including prohibition of structures such as sheds or storage of loose or floatable items, and enact any amendments necessary as new Flood Insurance Rate Maps become available or regulations change.

**Funding Program:** Floodplain Land Use Assistance Program  
**Technical Assistance:** DCPD  
Delaware County Conservation District  
Floodplain Land Use Assistance Program

4-5 Consider adopting new floodplain ordinances that comply with the NFIP requirements. All three Townships should consider adopting consistent floodplain ordinances with slightly more stringent management standards that prohibit certain types of development in the flood-fringe and floodway areas.

**Funding Program:** Floodplain Land Use Assistance Program  
**Technical Assistance:** DCPD  
Delaware County Conservation District  
Floodplain Land Use Assistance Program

4-6 Establish regular maintenance/clean-out programs for all streams, particularly in channelized areas, to remove debris and other potential obstructions that could create
blockages during storm events. Such programs could be conducted jointly to maximize manpower and resources.

Technical Assistance: Delaware County Conservation District
Chester-Ridley-Crum (CRC) Watersheds Association

4-7 Protect the riparian buffers and floodplain areas along Chester, Marcus Hook, and Naamans Creeks as well as all of their tributaries and other unnamed streams in the area. Such protection could be accomplished through stream restoration projects. Ideally, initiatives for Chester Creek should be coordinated with the Chester Creek Rivers Conservation Plan. Also, adopt a “no-mow” ordinance requiring residents to maintain a vegetated buffer along the rear of any properties adjacent to the stream.

Funding Programs:
- CDBG Program
- Delaware County Conservation District
- Growing Greener Watershed Program

Technical Assistance:
- Delaware County Conservation District
- Growing Greener Watershed Program
- CRC Watersheds Association
- Community Service Program

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Objective 4-2: To properly manage local resources in compliance with federal and state requirements and local ordinances in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of area residents.

Water Quality

Water quality is important for maintaining the health of humans, flora, and fauna and contributing to a healthy quality of life. Sources of water pollution are usually described as either “point” or “nonpoint.” Point sources are identifiable and confined, such as discharges into waterways from factories and municipal sewage treatment plants. Nonpoint sources are diffuse and unconfined, resulting when rain washes oil, litter, fertilizers, or animal wastes into streams and rivers from streets, parking lots, lawns, and farmlands.

Under Chapter 93 of the Clean Streams Law, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) assesses the aquatic life of each stream in Pennsylvania to determine whether that stream is attaining its designated use. The four designations employed by DEP are cold water fishery, warm water fishery, migratory fishery, and trout stocked fishery. Stream sections that are not attaining their use are placed on the State’s 303(d) Water Quality Assessment List of impaired waters. According to DEP’s 2004 303(d) list, Marcus Hook Creek and its tributaries are impaired relative to their warm water fishery designation. Suspected sources of pollution include urban runoff/storm sewers, siltation, and land disposal practices. The DEP will develop plans to improve water quality to
ensure that Marcus Hook Creek meets its water use designation. There are no identified point source discharges to Marcus Hook Creek or its tributaries. Since storm sewer outlets are known sources of discharge for nonpoint source pollution from stormwater, it is important to consider that the stream’s water quality is most greatly impacted by land use activities and associated nonpoint pollution within the watershed.

A small section of Chester Creek at the northwestern corner of the Aston Township boundary has also been designated as impaired relative to its trout stocked and migratory fishery designation because of municipal point sources of pollution.

Streams can be aesthetically pleasing and can serve as valuable community assets if they are kept clean and properly maintained. The most effective way of managing water quality is a watershed-based approach. Since the activities of one municipality will affect the water quality of others downstream, it is imperative that all municipalities in a watershed work together to ensure the health of their streams.

**Stormwater Management**

**Stormwater Management Act (Act 167)**

Stormwater, as defined by the *Storm Water Management Act* of 1978 (PA Act 167), is “drainage runoff from the surface of the land resulting from precipitation, including snow or ice melt.” Although stormwater runoff occurs naturally, the quality, quantity, and velocity of stormwater can be influenced by construction and other development activity. Typically, the more impervious a surface within a watershed is, the less precipitation is able to percolate
into the ground, resulting in stormwater runoff flowing directly into streams. This stormwater, which picks up oil and gasoline deposits from parking lots and driveways, road salts, and other chemicals from streets and lawns, is believed to be a primary nonpoint pollution source in waterways.

A major objective of Act 167 is to ensure that the maximum rate of stormwater runoff is no greater after development than before. The Act also seeks to manage the quantity, velocity, and direction of stormwater runoff in a manner that protects health and property. Additionally, recent guidance from DEP requires stormwater management plans to address the following issues:

- Quantity control of runoff generated from new development and redevelopment
- Infiltration of runoff (groundwater recharge)
- Stream bank erosion
- Water quality controls through the use of best management practices (BMPs)
- Overbank flooding
- Extreme event management

The Act requires Pennsylvania’s counties to prepare stormwater management plans for each state-designated watershed within their boundaries. In turn, municipalities in these watersheds are required to adopt stormwater management regulations consistent with the watershed plan. To date, Delaware County has adopted Act 167 watershed management plans for Ridley, Chester, and Darby Creeks. A plan for the Crum Creek watershed is currently underway. Because portions of Aston and Upper Chichester lie within the Chester Creek watershed, an ordinance consistent with the Chester Creek plan was adopted. Lower Chichester does not fall within a state-designated watershed and is therefore not required to comply with the requirements of Act 167. However, it is advisable that the Township develop and adopt such an ordinance to protect the health and vitality of its watercourses and prevent stormwater-related flooding problems. Additionally, the adoption of a stormwater ordinance is a requirement of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program discussed in the next section.

**Stormwater Problem Areas**

The Aston Township Engineer completed an Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan survey in 1999. The survey identifies numerous stormwater management problems, many of which are attributable to frequent flooding and stream erosion along the Township’s streams.

1. Crozerville Road experiences street and private property flooding more than once a year due to inadequate drainage patterns.
2. Mt. Alverno Road (at the intersection with Pennell Road) experiences channel/stream flooding, street intersection flooding, parking lot flooding, private property flooding, erosion, and sedimentation. Problems occur more than once a year due to increased runoff from new development in the area.
3. A tributary of Baldwin Run in an industrial park area of Aston undergoes channel/stream flooding, erosion, and sedimentation more than once a year due to a lack of stream drainage facilities.

4. Bridgewater Road near the bridge over Chester Creek experiences street and intersection flooding more than once a year due to a lack of storm drain facilities and the number and spacing of existing storm sewer inlets.

5. Eagle Field, a neighborhood park along the West Branch of Chester Creek consisting of wooded open space, open fields, and a playground area, experiences channel/stream flooding, erosion, and sedimentation. Occurring more than once a year, these problems are due to increased runoff from new development and excessive stream velocities along that stretch of the creek.

6. The area of Team, New, and Mount Roads (consisting of a mix of residential and commercial uses) experiences street flooding, intersection flooding, and erosion with every significant rainfall. These problems are due to excessive stream velocities and a lack of stream drainage facilities.

7. Weir Park, a neighborhood park containing four Little League fields and playground equipment, experiences stormwater issues with a tributary of Marcus Hook Creek that flows through the park. Channel/stream flooding and erosion occur about once a year due to inadequate drainage patterns.

Other locations of flooding problems in the Townships include:

1. Low-lying areas along the West Branch of Chester Creek in the general vicinity of the Aston Beechwood firehouse, and along Lenni Road in Aston near the border with Chester Heights Borough and Middletown Township, experience stormwater flooding.

2. The following streets and neighborhoods within Upper Chichester experience periodic street and property flooding:
   - Naamanwood Drive in the area of Winding Way, Keanon Avenue, and Bridge Road
   - Gardendale in the area of Greenwood Avenue, Peach Street, Laurel Avenue, Plum Street, Apple Street, and Cherry Street
   - Cherry Tree Knoll in the area of Dogwood Circle and Cedar Crest Lane
   - Euclid Avenue
   - McCay Avenue
   - Graham Avenue
   - Clements Avenue
   - Johnson Avenue
   - Hillside Avenue
   - Chichester Avenue at Gardendale
   - Montecello Avenue cul de sac
   - The areas of Twin Oaks and Willowbrook

3. The residential areas of Yates, Ervin, and Fronefield Avenues in Lower Chichester experience street and property flooding with heavy rainstorms and snow events.
NPDES II Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

Recent revisions (2001) to the Clean Water Act’s Water Pollution Control Program require small, urbanized municipalities (such as Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester) to obtain permits under the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) NPDES program for municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). This program also requires municipalities to adopt a local stormwater management plan designed to reduce stormwater pollutants transported through the system. Required elements of this program include:

- Public education and outreach
- Public involvement
- Illicit discharge detection and elimination
- Construction site stormwater runoff control facilities
- Post-construction stormwater management for new developments
- Pollution prevention/good housekeeping

As mandated by Act 167, Aston and Upper Chichester Townships have adopted regulations that address how stormwater quantity and quality from new construction and redevelopment is managed. These regulations are based on a model ordinance that was a part of the Chester Creek Stormwater Management Plan. Adoption of the required water quality provisions included in the model ordinance also satisfies the post-construction stormwater management for new developments that is required under the NPDES II program. Because Lower Chichester does not fall within an Act 167 watershed, it will be required to adopt its own stormwater control ordinance that meets the requirements of NPDES Phase II. The adoption of such ordinance provisions, particularly if accompanied by the development of a public outreach strategy and a program to map, maintain, and enforce regulations governing discharges, will help the Townships to comply with the NPDES Phase II requirements.

Brownfields

Like other industrialized communities in the country, the three Townships have a number of properties that, at present or in the past, processed materials or manufactured products that could be considered hazardous by today’s standards. The possibility exists that through past disposal practices, storage methods, or accidents, certain sites may have become contaminated. Such sites, which either are or are believed to be contaminated, are most commonly known as “brownfields.” Redevelopment or reuse of brownfields may be complicated by the presence or perceived presence of contamination. Therefore, the use or reuse of these sites for activities other than manufacturing or heavy industry may not be safe. For example, it would likely be unsafe to place a day care center structure on a site that once manufactured a hazardous chemical without first decontaminating the site.

In 1980, Congress passed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as “Superfund.” This program’s primary purpose is facilitating the clean-up of extremely contaminated sites by requiring all
“potentially responsible parties” (PRPs) to contribute to the cost. A PRP is anyone who has
ever owned, had a legal interest in, or disposed of materials at a property and who is
therefore liable for the clean-up. Because of this liability, developers and banks have been
hesitant to purchase severely contaminated sites for development and/or redevelopment. The
process of identifying severe contamination, obtaining status on CERCLA’s National
Priority List (NPL) for clean-up, identifying all PRPs, and actually cleaning up the site is a
lengthy process that can take several years.

In May of 1995, Pennsylvania’s Governor Ridge signed three bills into law (Acts 2, 3, and
4). These Acts comprise Pennsylvania’s Land Recycling Program. Act 2, the Land
Recycling and Environmental Remediation Standards Act, is the legislative centerpiece
of the Land Recycling Program. The goal of the program is to foster voluntary reuse and
redevelopment of brownfield sites. The four major components of Act 2 are uniform clean-
up standards, standardized review procedures and time limits, financial assistance, and
liability relief for site testing and clean-up. An Act 2 clean-up effort generally involves a
private sector initiative to utilize the site for a profit-making venture. Thus, the required
level of clean-up is based mainly on the proposed use of the site, and clean-up efforts tend to
be completed much more quickly than they would have been under CERCLA alone.
According to Pennsylvania’s Land Recycling Program 2001 Annual Report, since 1995 the
program has been responsible for 892 clean-ups in the state, 67 of which were in Delaware
County. For more details concerning the various elements of the Land Recycling Program,
refer to DEP fact sheets in Appendix B.

Known or suspected brownfield sites in Aston include the Coruluzzo Twin Oaks Terminal
at 4041 Market Street and the Sun Pipeline at 106 Pennell Road. Sites in Upper Chichester
include the former Upper Chichester Shooting Range at the municipal complex on Furey
Road and the old Citgo gas station at Route 452 and Chestnut Street. These sites are a part
of the list developed by the DEP Act 2 Land Recycling Program.

There are also a number of brownfield sites that, according to DEP, have been appropriately
remediated to meet state standards. These include:

- Snow Environmental at 227 Pennell Road (now a Commerce Bank)
- Sun Pipeline 9000 at the intersection of Old Pennell Road and Route 452
- The Pennell Building at Duttons Mill Business Park at 300 Turner Industrial Way
- The Chari Stan property at 142 Conchester Road

In addition to these brownfield sites, the Sunoco owned property known as Reed Boyd Farm
is considered a hazardous site by DEP. The 71-acre area located along Laughead Avenue in
Upper Chichester was once used for the disposal of acid sludge and contaminated
diatomaceous earth. Currently, the site is being managed for groundwater contamination
indicated by low pH levels. Additionally, controls have been installed to prevent oil
contamination to nearby Marcus Hook Creek and its tributaries. According to DEP, the site
holds no redevelopment potential. Sunoco maintain ownership and responsibility.
The actual degree of contamination and relative determination of the clean-up needed for various sites cannot be determined until a site assessment is performed. Site assessments involve collection of historical data concerning uses of the site, an examination of permits and manufacturing processes for the site, and (in some cases) full soil, air, water, and other analyses to determine present-day site conditions. The specifics of the assessments that must be performed on each site will be determined by the State. Depending on ownership and status, funding for a site assessment may be available under Pennsylvania’s Act 2 Land Recycling Program.

Under Act 2, the basis for requiring a particular level of clean-up on a site is the proposed future use. Act 2 sets three standards for clean-up of sites: Statewide Health, Site Specific, and Background. These benchmarks take into account human health and the environment as well as the future use of the property. It is important for the Townships to maintain reasonable expectations for the future use of a brownfield site, keeping in mind the potential to attract redevelopment. While the first impulse may be to plan and zone for land uses that require the lowest level of clean-up in order to attract developers, this is not always the best option. Despite the negative connotation, redeveloped brownfield acreage can be a valuable commodity. If remediated properly, it can accommodate residential, recreational, or commercial uses in addition to industrial and other heavier uses. Each community in the area should maintain a vision for the “highest and best use” of these properties. This means that if a Township believes that the best use for a former industrial site is a park, office condominium, commercial district, or even a day care center, then it should plan and zone accordingly. The Upper Chichester municipal complex is a prime example of a reuse of a brownfield that did not involve turning it into an industrial site.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Environmental resource management is important for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of municipal residents. It is also important for the preservation and enhancement of the quality of life in a community. In addition to the floodplain management addressed in the previous section, there are also a number of federal and state programs that require municipalities to address other environmental issues in their communities, particularly as they relate to water quality.

In recent years, both federal and state regulatory programs have begun to emphasize improvement and maintenance of water quality, particularly through the control of nonpoint source pollution from stormwater. The federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop programs for the protection of waterways. It also requires businesses, and now municipalities, to obtain permits for the discharge of pollutants into waterways. Until recently, such permits addressed point sources only; however, new permit requirements address nonpoint source pollution from municipal storm sewer systems. Both the Act 167 and NPDES II programs address, to some degree, the importance of maintaining both water quantity and quality.

While the previously mentioned water quality programs address the prevention of and protection from pollution, Pennsylvania’s Land Recycling Program focuses on the clean-up and productive reuse of brownfield sites. Municipalities should consider land use regulation and local policies that support both approaches to the management of the environment in their communities.

The Townships should:

4-8 Partner with other municipalities located in the Chester, Marcus Hook, and Naamans Creeks watersheds to consider the most effective courses of action to protect streams from the impact of stormwater and to enhance the health of streams for public enjoyment.

Technical Assistance: CRC Watersheds Association
Delaware County Conservation District

Aston should:

4-9 Follow Lower and Upper Chichester’s lead by establishing or joining an existing Environmental Advisory Council (EAC). An EAC can be an excellent resource for advising the Townships on various environmental issues and problems. Such a group could take the lead in implementing the public education requirements of NPDES Phase II, including storm drain stenciling and outreach to residents and businesses concerning stormwater issues. This program should highlight how activities such as over-fertilization of lawns, dumping of motor oil, and failure to clean up after pets all contribute to the level of water pollution.
The Townships should:

4-10 Consider protection (through acquisition, easement, or zoning controls) of streamside parcels for stormwater management and/or public open space use.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Growing Greener Watershed Program

Technical Assistance: Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Delaware County Conservation District

4-11 Pursue funding for installation, expansion, repair, and replacement of storm sewer system components, in accordance with Act 167, to address current and future stormwater problems.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Pennsylvania Infrastructure and Investment Authority (PENNEVEST)

4-12 Develop a program, possibly in coordination with the EAC, to educate the public about nonpoint sources of pollution from stormwater runoff.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
Delaware County Conservation District
CRC Watersheds Association
Growing Greener Watershed Program

4-13 Coordinate NPDES II permitting activities with DEP and adjoining municipalities.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
Delaware County Conservation District
CRC Watersheds Association
Growing Greener Watershed Program

4-14 Establish a long-range vision for reuse of some of the three Townships’ industrial areas (see also Chapter 9 – Land Use).

4-15 Remain apprised of legislation concerning brownfields and their development.

Technical Assistance: Act 2 Land Recycling Program
Delaware County Commerce Center
Pursue both economic and institutional opportunities for site assessment and redevelopment of known or potentially contaminated sites within the Townships.

Technical Assistance: Act 2 Land Recycling Program Delaware County Commerce Center

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Objective 4-3: To participate in programs and initiatives that deal with regional and/or watershed issues.

Watershed Protection Coordination

There are currently two watershed-based initiatives active in the Chester Creek watershed: an Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan and a River Conservation Plan. Both plans offer guidance concerning the relief of stormwater flooding problems and areas that should be considered for preservation. The Chester-Ridley-Crum Watersheds Association (CRC) is active within the watershed and is a great source of information regarding stream quality. This nonprofit citizen organization works to support and promote the enjoyment, restoration, protection, and prudent management of the natural resources of the Chester, Ridley, and Crum Creek watersheds. The organization is also an excellent resource for information on organizing streamside clean-ups and educating citizens concerning what they can do to maintain and improve stream water quality.

There are currently no watershed-based initiatives within the Marcus Hook or Naamans Creek watersheds. As previously mentioned, neither of these watersheds is mandated by the State to have an Act 167 study performed. There are currently no active watershed-based organizations, either.

Environmental Advisory Councils

In December 1973, the Pennsylvania General Assembly adopted Act 148, the Environmental Advisory Council Law, which empowers the governing bodies of all municipalities to establish an EAC. The principal purpose of an EAC is to advise local government on issues concerning the conservation of natural resources. An EAC is empowered to:

- Maintain records that define the boundaries and the character of sensitive environmental areas (e.g., open space, floodplains, woodlands, natural animal habitats, bodies of water, etc.)
- Identify problems related to air, water, and land resources
- Recommend appropriate courses of action, such as the adoption of local regulations or the use of state or federal regulatory personnel
Municipal EACs can be an important vehicle for implementing many of the recommendations made in this document pertaining to water quality, stormwater management, and parks and recreation. Typically, the purpose of these Councils is to advise the local Planning Commission, Parks and Recreation Board, and elected officials on the protection, conservation, management, promotion, and use of natural resources within a municipality’s boundaries. Pennsylvania law provides EACs with this framework rather than a list of specific programs to undertake. The Lower Chichester and Marcus Hook EAC has played a vital role in monitoring air quality. While continuing this important work, the EAC could also become involved in promoting stormwater education to area residents.

EACs can serve a number of valuable advisory functions ranging from developing inventories of valuable natural resources to citizen outreach programs. This body may also be in an excellent position to work with adjacent municipal EACs and/or environmental organizations on watershed-wide matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Environmental issues, particularly those concerning streams and other natural resources, do not follow municipal boundaries. Therefore, it is extremely important that municipalities in the area work together, and cooperate with municipalities outside the area, to address environmental issues of a regional or watershed nature through participation in joint programs and initiatives. By doing so, it is possible to avoid duplication of efforts, achieve better results, and be more cost effective.

The Townships should:

4-17 Undertake activities associated with water quality improvements. As previously mentioned, a watershed-based approach is necessary to address the water quality and quantity issues in the area’s streams. Programs such as storm drain stenciling and citizen monitoring will be effective educational tools and will encourage residents to take an active role in improving water quality.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
Delaware County Conservation District
Pennsylvania Environmental Council
Growing Greener Watershed Program

Aston and Upper Chichester should:

4-18 Participate in the CRC Watersheds Association and coordinate municipal watershed activities with some of the existing programs and activities.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
Delaware County Conservation District
CRC Watersheds Association
Consider either forming their own EAC or joining an existing joint EAC. Lower Chichester should continue current activities underway with its joint EAC with Marcus Hook Borough.

Technical Assistance: Pennsylvania Environmental Council
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PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE
CHAPTER 5

PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE

Open space can take many forms, ranging from a public recreational area to a golf course, cemetery, or even a private natural area. It provides psychological, social, economic, and ecological benefits that relate directly to quality of life in a community. Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships comprise two distinct types of neighborhood development. Much of Aston and Upper Chichester is of the modern suburban residential subdivision design of the last fifty years. The other type is the dense urban grid street layout design as seen in Much of Lower Chichester and parts of southern Upper Chichester are characterized by the dense urban grid street layout design.

This largely built-out suburban area is fortunate to have a variety of types of open space including athletic fields, playgrounds, natural areas, and stream valley parks. Much of the small amount of land that is still undeveloped and could be used for future parks and open space uses is held in private, institutional, or industrial ownership. Therefore, it is extremely important that the Townships maximize the effective use of existing recreational land and facilities, as well as other public and private open space, in order to preserve and enhance the area’s livability. It is also important that the Townships utilize alternative methods for parkland acquisition aside from purchasing property, such as conservation or access easements.

GOAL: To provide and maintain parks and recreational facilities to meet the needs of the area’s residents, provide appropriate programs for all ages, and preserve and maintain the limited natural open space areas.

Measuring current parkland acreage against numerical regional standards is one cursory way to determine whether recreational needs are being met. All three Townships are in the same broad population density category of 500-4,999 persons per square mile. For this category in the Delaware Valley Planning Commission’s (DVRPC) Local (Municipal) designation, the standard is 8.00 acres per 1,000 persons. As indicated in Table 5-1, all three municipalities exceed their local municipal acreage standard. These numerical standards, however, provide only a rough indication of the conditions in the Townships. They do not reflect usable open space belonging to school districts, homeowners’ associations, or other private owners. Table 5-1 also indicates that each of the three Townships would far exceed the DVRPC standards if both school district lands and homeowners’ association open space were to be considered in the Local designation along with municipal lands.
In addition, consideration should be given to each community’s specific needs based upon demographic factors, including age. In areas such as the study area, where there is limited land available for new parks, it is important to maximize use of all available land and facilities. The municipalities in the study area are doing a reasonably good job of achieving this goal. All three Townships have entered into agreements with the school districts for public use of playfields. In turn, the Townships provide play space for school and other recreational programs within the area. The following section will discuss the three Townships’ existing public and private open space facilities, community programs, and opportunities for enhancing existing recreational facilities and for providing new open space opportunities.

**PARKS, RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, AND OPEN SPACE FACILITIES**

Each Township owns and maintains a number of passive and active parks and tracts of open space. The open space types within the study area boundaries include athletic fields, playgrounds, natural areas, and linear stream valley parks. While most of these facilities are Township owned, open space, parks, and recreational needs are also being met through agreements with the Penn-Delco and Chichester School Districts for playgrounds, ballfields, and basketball courts. As mentioned above, there are also a number of privately owned open space and recreational facilities, homeowners’ association parks and open space, and parcels of undeveloped land owned by private entities within each Township. Map 5-1 and Tables 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 show public parks and recreational areas within each Township. A brief overview of the larger municipally owned parks and open space facilities in each Township follows.

---

**TABLE 5-1**

REGIONAL NUMERICAL STANDARDS FOR PARKS AND RECREATIONAL AREAS, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Lower Chichester</th>
<th>Upper Chichester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in Square Miles</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>16,203.0</td>
<td>3,591.0</td>
<td>16,842.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Density (pop/sq.mi)</td>
<td>2,746.3</td>
<td>3,264.5</td>
<td>2,513.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVRPC Local (Municipal) Standards (acres)*</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parks and Open Space Acreages</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>154.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVRPC Local Deficit/Surplus</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Acreages</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>139.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners’ Association Open Space</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>174.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Municipal Parks &amp; Open Space + School District + Homeowners Association Acreages</td>
<td>302.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>469.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All three Townships are in the same population density category of 500-4,999 persons per square mile. In this category, the Local (Municipal) standard is 8.0 acres per 1,000 persons.

Source: Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD), Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Existing Public Parks and Recreational and Open Space Facilities

Aston Township

Aston Township presently contains a total of 302.3 acres of municipal parks and open space. Of these, the Township owns 139.3 acres, homeowners’ associations own 79.1 acres, and the Penn-Delco School District owns 84.2 acres.

TABLE 5-2
ASTON TOWNSHIP
OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aston-Middletown Little League</td>
<td>Pennell Road and Chester Creek</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Baseball diamonds, fishing area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aston Mills School Site</td>
<td>Aston Mills Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Natural wooded lot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aston Valley View Park</td>
<td>Vinsmith Avenue, between Edgar and Raymond Avenues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Basketball courts, ballfield with bleachers, tot lot playset, swings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bridgewater Park Open Space</td>
<td>Bridgewater Road near Chester Creek</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Open space, streamside wooded area (northwest parcel is homeowners' association land)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bridgewater Farms Park</td>
<td>Bent and Baldwin Run Lanes</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball diamond, new tot lot play set, other playground equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Collins Park</td>
<td>End of Norman Street</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Basketball court and new swing set</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concord Square Park</td>
<td>Surrey Lane, between Wickersham Lane and Heaterton Drive</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Basketball court, new tot lot play set, picnic tables</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eagle Field</td>
<td>Mount Road, near Maple Lane</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Basketball court, fishing, wooded streamside nature area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hillcrest Drive Open Space</td>
<td>South side of Hillcrest Drive</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Wooded open space, steep slopes, small tributary stream</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Lamp Post Lane Park</td>
<td>North Lamp Post Lane and Tuscany Road</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Basketball courts, swing set, streamside wooded area, tot lot, older children’s playground</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pennell Manor Park</td>
<td>Pennell Manor development</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Basketball court, tot lot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Poore Park</td>
<td>Intersection of New and Mount Roads</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Basketball court, wooded area, new tot lot play set</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Savage Park</td>
<td>Seward Lane, between Schoolhouse &amp; Mildred Lanes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Basketball court, playground equipment, tot lot equipment, wooded area, picnic tables</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Map #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Weir Park</td>
<td>Weir Road, east of Goodale Drive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baseball diamond, tennis court, new tot lot play set, streamside wooded area, restrooms, drinking water, picnic tables, parking lot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Woodbrook Park</td>
<td>Lamp Post Lane and Weathervane Road</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Basketball court, new tot lot play set, playground equipment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Highgrove Open Space</td>
<td>Highgrove Lane</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tot lot playground, wooded open space</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aston Valleybrook Open Space</td>
<td>Along the West Branch of Chester Creek, near Chester Heights</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Streamside open space</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Aston Elementary School</td>
<td>Concord Road and Tryens Road</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Playgrounds, open field</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aston Community Center Park</td>
<td>North side of Concord Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Three lighted baseball diamonds with scoreboards, concession building, new tot lot playground, newly planted trees</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Northley Middle School and Sun Valley Senior High School</td>
<td>Pancoast Avenue and Concord Road</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Baseball fields, tennis courts, and athletic fields for football, track and field, lacrosse, field hockey, and soccer</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pennell Elementary School</td>
<td>Pennell Road south of Weir Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Playgrounds, open field</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ballinhinch Homeowners’ Association Land</td>
<td>Glendale Boulevard and Dublin Way</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tot lot playground, older children’s playground, tennis courts, roller skating surface, wooded open space</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fortress PA LLC Development Easement</td>
<td>Birney Highway and the West Branch of Chester Creek</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Natural wooded and meadow space</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Greenbriar Place Open Space</td>
<td>Greenbriar Place and Chester Creek, 2 parcels</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wooded open space</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spring Valley Way Open Space</td>
<td>Spring Valley Way and Crozerville Road</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wooded open space, vista view, meadow</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPD
Aston Community Center Park
Aston Township and the Penn-Delco School District own a large piece of land on which a community center, indoor recreation, and library complex was recently built. In addition to the building and parking lot, the site contains an outdoor recreational area. Facilities include lighted baseball diamonds, a football field with scoreboards, a concession building, a tot lot playground with rubber mulch, and newly planted rows of trees in and along the parking lot.

Aston Valley View Park
Aston Valley View Park has entrances on Raymond Avenue, Vinsmith Avenue, and Edgar Road. It is surrounded by a neighborhood of ranch homes in southeastern Aston. There are entrances on two sides, but parking is on the street. The park contains a ballfield, open lawn with shade trees, and a tot lot playground.

Bridgewater Park Open Space
The perimeter of the southeastern panhandle of the Township comprises Chester Creek and bordering parcels of municipally owned open space. The northern parcel of this space is classified as homeowners’ association open space. A railroad right-of-way that is part of the planned Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail runs through this open space.

Eagle Field
Eagle Field is located on Mount Road near Maple Lane, but has no identifying signage. There is a health trail fitness area with signs to guide exercises, along with ample field space for playing football and other activities. A trail connects this park to land owned by the Southwest Delaware County Municipal Authority, which contains a wastewater pump station.

Weir Park
Weir Park contains the most recreational facilities of any park in the Township. Marcus Hook Creek and a tributary stream run through the park. Bridges cross the stream where paved walking paths connect to the various recreational facilities. These facilities include four baseball diamonds, batting cages, paved and fenced skating surfaces, a tot lot playground, tennis courts, and basketball courts.
Lower Chichester Township

Lower Chichester Township presently contains a total of 43.6 acres of municipal parks and open space. The Township owns approximately 41 acres, and the Chichester School District owns the remaining 2.3 acres.

**TABLE 5-3**

LOWER CHICHESTER TOWNSHIP

OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester Township</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anne R. Stevens Memorial Park</td>
<td>Yates Avenue</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Basketball court, tot lot, older children’s playground, street hockey,</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>picnic tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester Township</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analine Village Park</td>
<td>Sterling Avenue</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball diamond, tot lot, open fields</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester Township</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elliot Drive Playground</td>
<td>Palmer Drive</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Volleyball court (not seen); Lower Chichester owns parcels on the</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>southeast corner of the block, next to the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester Township</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lower Chichester Municipal Park</td>
<td>Hewes Avenue</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wooded area, basketball court, baseball diamond, volleyball court, tot</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lot, older children’s playground, street hockey, restrooms, drinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water, picnic tables, parking lot, pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester School District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morton Street Open Lot</td>
<td>Morton Street</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Open vacant lot, grass lawn</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester School District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road Park</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road and I-95</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Streamside wooded area</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester School District</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Simpson Playground</td>
<td>Simpson Street</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Basketball court, tot lot</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester School District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Linwood Elementary</td>
<td>Huddle Avenue</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Playground, swings, pull-up bars, wood chip ground cover, basketball</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPD

**Lower Chichester Municipal Park**

Lower Chichester Municipal Park is also known as “Hewes Avenue Park,” “Linwood Park,” and “Paulsen’s Field.” Winding paths paved with asphalt and blocks connect sloping lawns with the park’s various recreational features. These features include tennis courts, three baseball diamonds, soccer fields, a basketball court, an outdoor roller hockey rink with sideboards, a shade tree area with picnic tables, an older children’s playground, a bandstand style pavilion, a sand volleyball court, and a concessions and restroom facility with security camera. The park is well maintained and has a high usage level.
Upper Chichester Township

Upper Chichester Township presently contains a total of 469.2 acres of municipal parks and open space. Of these, the Township owns approximately 154 acres, homeowners’ associations own 174 acres, and the Chichester School District owns 139 acres.

### TABLE 5-4
**UPPER CHICHESTER TOWNSHIP**
OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bezors Run Stream Valley Open Space</td>
<td>Along Bezors Run, behind properties on Flora Lane</td>
<td>4.6 Streamside wooded area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carlton I. Wilson Memorial Playground</td>
<td>Excelsior Drive</td>
<td>0.8 Basketball court, tot lot, older children’s playground, picnic tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chichester Baseball League Fields</td>
<td>Conchester Road and Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>11 Four baseball fields, bleachers, bullpens/batting cages, concessions, dugout benches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Services Building</td>
<td>1952 Market Street</td>
<td>0.8 Basketball court, parking lot, indoor gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Furey Road Municipal Park (Township Farm)</td>
<td>Furey Road</td>
<td>42 Streamside wooded area, pavilion, tennis court, baseball diamond, fishing area, tot lot, restrooms, drinking water, picnic tables, parking lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Johnson Avenue Playground</td>
<td>Johnson Avenue</td>
<td>0.8 Basketball court, older children’s playground, picnic tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kingsman Road Playground</td>
<td>Kingsman Road</td>
<td>1.5 Basketball court, older children’s playground, picnic tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mill Road Woods</td>
<td>Mill Road, along East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>5.4 Open lawn, streamside wooded open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Naamans Creek South Municipal Open Space</td>
<td>Along Naamans Creek, between Carpenter Road and Lower Chichester boundary</td>
<td>8.6 Streamside wooded open space, trail (small portion extends into Lower Chichester and is owned by that municipality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ogden Fields</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>9.2 Basketball hoop, fields adjacent to firehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Peach Street Playground</td>
<td>Peach Street</td>
<td>6.7 Basketball court, wooded area, older children’s playground, picnic tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tara Circle Woods</td>
<td>Tara Circle along Naamans Creek, adjacent to Creekside Village (Dresner Tract)</td>
<td>3.2 Wooded area next to stormwater detention basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Map #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Twin Oaks Playground</td>
<td>Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Fenced in tot lot, plastic playground equipment, swings, benches, picnic tables</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unknown Municipal Woods</td>
<td>North of railroad, south of Mill Road residences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Woodland, streamside open space</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Boothwyn Elementary (current)</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Basketball court, tot lot, older children’s playground, restrooms, drinking water, parking lot, indoor gym</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Boothwyn Elementary (new, planned)</td>
<td>East side of Naamans Creek on Lower Chichester Township line</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chichester Middle School</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue and Marcus Hook Creek, just north of I-95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball diamond, football field, soccer field, restrooms, drinking water, parking lot, indoor gym</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chichester Senior High School</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue and Marcus Hook Creek, just north of railroad tracks</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball diamond, football field, soccer field, volleyball court, swimming pool, restrooms, drinking water, parking lot, indoor gym</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hilltop Elementary and Education Center</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball diamond, tot lot, older children’s playground, restrooms, drinking water, indoor gym, parking lot</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Belmont Road Open Space</td>
<td>Belmont Road and East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wooded streamside open space</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Park</td>
<td>Along Marcus Hook Creek, adjacent to Hilltop Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Open lawn and wooded lots adjacent to apartments and pipeline rights-of-way</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Creekside Village (Dresner Tract) Open Space</td>
<td>Off of Naamans Creek Road, along Naamans Creek</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wooded streamside open space, trails</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dana Court Townhouses Open Space</td>
<td>Dana Court, off of Dutton Street, straddling Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Streamside open space adjacent to townhouses and a pipeline right-of-way</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5-4
UPPER CHICHESTER TOWNSHIP
OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, 2004
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Branch Naamans Creek Homeowners’ Association Open Space</td>
<td>Next to Ogden Fields adjacent to West Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Streamside woodland and meadow</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>State and Township Line Open Space</td>
<td>On the corner of Lower Chichester Township and Delaware State borders along West Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Large streamside wooded lot</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPD

**Bezors Run Stream Valley Open Space**

This is municipally owned linear open space along a stream valley. The space is located where the stream splits off from Marcus Hook Creek and Conchester Road, behind and to the east of residences on Flora Lane. The open space here is characterized by a thick stand of tall trees and steep slopes leading down to the stream.

**Furey Road Municipal Park (Township Farm)**

The largest park facility in Upper Chichester comprises athletic fields, a new tot lot playground, a catch and release fishing pond with a pier and gazebo, the Roberts Run woods and trail, tennis courts, a pavilion with picnic tables, outdoor restroom and concessions building, and a field house attached to the new Upper Chichester Township building. The two larger baseball fields are lighted, while the two smaller practice fields are unlit. A fenced-in tree nursery used by the Township Shade Tree Commission is located near the pond and trail. The field house contains an indoor track, basketball courts, volleyball nets, arcade games, air hockey, weight rooms, and a kitchen. In the southeastern wooded section of the park is a garden, the “Living Memorial Garden of the Delaware County Chapter of the Parents of Murdered Children,” with trails and a parking lot.

**Chichester Baseball League Fields**

This is a large complex of three baseball fields with parking, dugouts, concessions, scoreboards, spectator seating, and practice support structures including bullpens and batting cages. The complex was recently acquired and is now maintained by Upper Chichester Township for use by the Chichester Baseball League and for other Township recreational programs. This well-maintained complex is located at the intersection of Chichester Avenue and Conchester Road.
Playground and picnic area at Upper Chichester municipal complex

Ogden Fields

Some municipally owned open space (in the form of meadows and fields) is located on the nine-acre Ogden Fire Company property. There is also a paved parking lot area that includes a basketball hoop. A pipeline right-of-way runs through and beyond the fields, obscuring the location of the field’s true boundary line.

Unnamed Municipal Woods

This 34-acre area of municipally owned woodland is located south of the Mill Road residences and north of the railroad tracks.

Additional Open Space

Homeowners’ Association Open Space

Some of the newer residential developments in Aston and Upper Chichester Townships contain substantial areas of open space that are officially owned and maintained by all the residents of the development (collectively known as the “homeowners’ association”). One of these spaces, Ballinahinch in Aston Township, contains a playground and tennis courts. The remaining spaces are natural, passive recreational areas such as woodlands, wetlands, floodplains, stream valleys, trails, and open meadows. In Aston Township, these include Greenbriar Place, Spring Valley Way, and Fortress PA. In Upper Chichester Township, these include Belmont Road, Cherry Tree Park, Dana Court Townhomes, West Branch Naamans Creek Homeowners’ Association, and State and Township Line Open Space. Creekside Village in Upper Chichester, which is currently
under construction, has planned a series of walking trails within the woods and along Naamans Creek.

These places are important for the preservation of valuable environmental resources. Occasionally, after a number of years of residential ownership, the land is dedicated to the municipality. This usually occurs because the responsibility of maintaining the land becomes too great for the residents, or because they would like the Township to implement a plan to develop a municipal park. Homeowners’ association open spaces are listed in Tables 5-2 and 5-4, which also identify their map numbers for Map 5-1.

**Public School District Recreational Facilities**

School district land requires special consideration since it is reserved for daytime school use during the school year. After school hours and in the summer months, these properties are, in many cases, made available to the general public when they are not in use by school athletic teams and clubs. A few schools have partnered with their Townships for use of recreational land at the municipal park location.

In Aston, the Aston Valley Baseball League utilizes both Weir Park and some Penn-Delco School District fields. Aston Youth Soccer and the Aston Athletic Association’s lacrosse teams, basketball teams, and baseball teener league also use the school facilities. Aston Township holds an annual fireworks display at Sun Valley High School Field.

There is only one school in Lower Chichester Township: Linwood Elementary School. The Chichester School District’s athletic programs utilize Lower Chichester’s park facilities, including the tennis courts and ballfields at Lower Chichester Municipal Park.

In Upper Chichester, the Township and the Chichester School District frequently make use of each other’s facilities. For example, Chichester High School utilizes two Furey Road athletic fields for lacrosse. Chichester Middle School utilizes one athletic field for softball.

Public school district properties in the three Townships are listed on Tables 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 and shown on Map 5-1.

**State Roadside Rest**

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has an easement on a piece of land used as a roadside rest area for I-95. This land is adjacent to the Lawncroft Cemetery in Lower Chichester. The facility contains a rest area with picnic tables, a visitor’s building with vending machines and restrooms, and a manned welcome station where maps and other travel information are provided. Although the State uses the land, Lower Chichester Township provides fire protection and back-up police services for the facility.
Key Institutional Lands

It is important to note some key institutions in the study area that have acted as stewards of open space. The Sisters of St. Francis convent and Neumann College are adjacent operations in the northern half of Aston Township. Each has holdings containing large portions of undisturbed open space in the form of lawns, hilly meadows, wetlands, and woodlands. While they are both privately owned, the institutions expect to keep large amounts of their open spaces undisturbed for the foreseeable future. The Sisters of St. Francis have initiated a Sustainable Land Use Initiative that incorporates an Environmental Vision Statement and an Environmental Task Force. In 1999, the Franciscan Center for Earth Education was established at the convent as part of the initiative.

Cemeteries

Cemeteries provide visual relief as well as some passive recreational opportunities such as walking and jogging. By their nature, cemeteries are large “green” parcels that are unlikely to be paved over. The three large cemeteries in the study area are Mount Hope Cemetery in Aston Township, Lawncroft Cemetery in the western end of Lower Chichester Township, and Immaculate Heart Cemetery at the southern border of Upper Chichester on Route 452. All are well maintained and have been “good neighbors” to the Townships in which they are located.

Major Commercial Recreational Facilities

Fun Spot and IceWorks are two significant commercial recreational facilities in the study area. Fun Spot is located in the eastern part of Upper Chichester Township on Route 322. This operation offers a number of athletic and family fun activities such as indoor roller hockey, ball (Dek) hockey, a volleyball club, a waterslide park, miniature golf, and go-cart tracks. IceWorks is a multi-purpose indoor ice-skating and fitness complex in Aston Township, located on Duttons Mill Road near Route 452. The facility provides public and private skating, classes, and organized hockey league play. The facility contains four skating rinks (including one professional quality rink), a fitness and physical therapy complex, and a full-service restaurant.

Vacant Lots

According to a 2004 DCPD field survey, there are 79 areas of privately owned vacant lots of varying sizes in the study area. Some of these areas are made up of two or more adjoining parcels of land. The total numbers of individual lots in each Township are 73 in Upper Chichester, 50 in Aston, and 27 in Lower Chichester.

In Upper Chichester, the vacant lots are generally located in or near the Twin Oaks neighborhood, with a smaller number located along Chichester Avenue and/or Conchester Road. In Aston, the vacant parcels are either in the vicinity of Pennell and Concord Roads, in the residential area west of Neumann College and the Sisters of St. Francis, or still further west in the industrial park. Aston Township has targeted a vacant
lot located at Pennell and Mount Roads for acquisition. The property, less than one acre, is located in a floodplain. The Township hopes to see it used for recreational purposes. In Lower Chichester, the majority of parcels are located either along Blueball Avenue in the industrial park, or in the mixed use area just east of Market Street.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Collectively, the Townships have done a good job of providing adequate parks and recreational areas to serve their neighborhoods. Considering the limited land area available for new public parks, the park usage agreements between the municipalities and school districts have helped to satisfy the needs of both the Townships and the schools. The Townships should, however, continue to pursue the acquisition of strategically located vacant lots, as well as maintaining stream corridors for flood protection and visual and/or passive recreation.

The Townships should:

5-1 Jointly or individually develop a master plan for open space, parks, and recreation to determine the adequacy of the existing facilities, identify potential areas for public recreational use (including greenways), and coordinate the use of open space, recreational programs, and funding.

Funding Programs: Community Conservation Partnerships Program (C2P2) PECO Green Region Program

5-2 Design individual plans for those Township parks specified in the above master plan. The plans will help determine how the parks might be improved, and will prioritize what facilities and landscaping design to include in the future.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance Pennsylvania Horticultural Society

5-3 Engage citizen support for open space and recreational activities through the development of meaningful projects that positively impact neighborhoods. Market these projects to improve community relations, build community support, and improve the image of the Townships’ parks system.

5-4 Develop and maintain an inventory of privately owned land parcels and vacant lots of which a significant portion is open space, and determine whether these lands represent opportunities for linkages with other significant green spaces.

5-5 Develop financial strategies to improve existing parks and acquire new parkland from each Township’s list of acquisition targets.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) Bureau of Parks

Aston Township should:

5-6 Improve the appearance and function of Collins Park by incorporating some landscaping design, a park identification sign at the entrance, bollards to prevent cars from entering the park to turn around on the grass, tot lot playground equipment, and a picnic table with benches.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-7 Maintain a natural wooded space for the Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail to pass through and encourage a recreational park or playground to be built (if a study suggests it is feasible) at the Bridgewater Park Open Space.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-8 Remedy the erosion problem at the tributary to Marcus Hook Creek by creating a vegetated riparian buffer, and improving both the small baseball diamond on top of the hill and the infield area of the large ball field at Weir Park.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-9 Add park identification signage at Aston Valley View Park and Eagle Field, and at the entrances to Concord Square Park, Pennell Manor Park, Poore Park, Bridgewater Farms Park, and Savage Park.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-10 Add benches at the basketball court and additional trash receptacles at Aston Valley View Park, repair the basketball hoop and clean graffiti from the playground equipment at Bridgewater Farms Park, replace worn out and dangerous playground equipment at Savage Park, add additional playground equipment and picnic tables at Eagle Field, and add additional picnic tables and a pedestal park grill at Woodbrook Park.

Funding Program: C2P2
Lower Chichester Township should:

5-11 Continue with the present course of action of making major improvements to a different park each year on a rotating basis.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-12 Continue to lease the Morton Street open lot while pursuing full ownership. Explore the surrounding neighborhood’s interest level in either a community ornamental plant garden or a playground.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-13 Remove all but one park identification sign at Lower Chichester Municipal Park to eliminate confusion. Periodically check the condition of playground equipment for safety.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

5-14 Install proper identification signage at Simpson Playground and line the ground beneath the playground equipment with wood or rubber mulch.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD

Upper Chichester Township should:

5-15 Clean the graffiti from playground equipment at Johnson Avenue Playground; maintain Mill Road Woods as a passive nature park open space; and repair or replace the playground equipment, and maintain the streamside trail, at the Peach Street Playground.

Funding Program: C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
DCPD
5-16  Acquire the open space at the end of Randall Avenue, which is currently owned by a local lumber company, and develop it as a nature park. This passive park should feature identification and educational signage, trails, and a vegetated riparian buffer on both sides of the stream.

Funding Program: PECO Green Region Program

5-17  Conduct a needs analysis of the neighborhood at Tara Circle to determine if a park should be developed at the Tara Circle Woods residential development. Connect Tara Circle Woods to the trails at the adjacent Creekside Village.

Technical Assistance: DCNR Bureau of Recreation and Conservation
Pennsylvania Recreation and Parks Society
National Recreation and Parks Association
Funding

5-18  Continue to pursue acquisition of the approximately 100’ by 100’ lot on Arlington Avenue, next to Twin Oaks playground, which would double the size of the existing playground.

Technical Assistance: DCNR Bureau of Recreation and Conservation
Pennsylvania Recreation and Parks Society
National Recreation and Parks Association
Funding

COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS

Recreational programming is the process by which a municipality creates opportunities for people to engage in recreational experiences. In contrast to park development and maintenance activities, which often require financial support from the municipality’s general fund budget, recreational programs are often self-supporting through activity fees. It is important for a municipality to coordinate activities among all of the community’s recreation providers, to offer programs to meet the needs of residents of all ages and interests, and to have grassroots citizen involvement. Recreational and park master planning is best handled by a municipal or multi-municipal recreation board. If there is a large demand for recreation and parks services, a municipality may consider employing a recreation and parks professional. The following is a summary of the recreational programs that exist in the three Townships as of April 2004.

Aston Township

Aston Township is currently in the process of forming a Recreation Advisory Board. The Township sponsors a number of sporting activities throughout the year, including three baseball leagues; football, soccer, and lacrosse leagues for five to fifteen year olds; and basketball leagues at the community center during the summer and winter seasons. On weekday mornings during the summer months, the Township and Neumann College run “Camp Rainbow” for a $15.00 a week fee. There are also special events such as the Fourth of July annual fireworks display and Community Day (which includes a parade)
on the first Saturday in October. Citizens can get involved in any of these programs by volunteering to help.

**Lower Chichester Township**

Lower Chichester Township does not have an official Parks and Recreation Board or Association. For two years, the Township has had a summer program for children ages seven to fourteen. Live music shows (two in July and one in August) are performed at the Lower Chichester Municipal Park. The Township also stages a Fourth of July fireworks show. Citizens are always welcome to volunteer to help out in any of these programs.

**Upper Chichester Township**

The Upper Chichester Recreation Board is a volunteer body that sponsors and directs recreational programming in the Township. Upper Chichester also has a full-time Director of Parks and Recreation. The Township offers over forty programs every year for families and residents of all ages. They are always open to new ideas to expand their offerings. Athletic recreational programs in Upper Chichester include basketball, volleyball, softball, sports camp, fishing tournaments, and dancing. Special event and holiday programming organized by the Township includes Community Day, drive-in movies, egg hunt and Easter program, family night at the baseball stadium, craft shows, holiday cooking for senior citizens, 3-on-3 basketball tournaments, shopping trips, musicals and plays, Firefighters Appreciation Day, Halloween trail, and the Christmas program. Other nonathletic programs include summer day camp, a discounted ticket program, and cooking classes. Senior citizens can volunteer at the field house to assist with programs, and the Township is always seeking volunteers for programs and events.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

In a built-out urban environment such as the study area, the amount of recreational land is essentially set at its current level. Therefore, it is important for each of the three Townships to have good recreational programs in place to serve residents of all age groups and of varied interests.

As explained above, particular Townships have more programming and citizen involvement than others. Upper Chichester has the most extensive programming structure, with both a volunteer Recreational Board and a full-time Director of Parks and Recreation. Aston is forming a Recreation Advisory Board and holding a number of special events. Ideally, this Advisory Board will organize some athletic and special interest programs for ongoing all-ages participation. Lower Chichester should create a new Parks and Recreation Board to administer both athletic and nonathletic programs. From this Board, new community interest in parks and community programs will hopefully occur. The Board may want to incorporate a volunteer Citizens Advisory Board to assist the Board and provide a base of dedicated volunteers.
Township officials from all three municipalities should examine their program structures for areas in which they can improve and better serve their residents. The Townships should plan to meet community needs, by discerning the specific activities their residents would like to have provided for them.

The Townships should:

5-19 Organize a citizens association to identify the community’s recreational needs and provide volunteer support for the various recreational programs.

Technical Assistance: DCNR Bureau of Recreation and Conservation  
Pennsylvania Recreation and Parks Society  
National Recreation and Parks Association  
Funding

Lower Chichester should:

5-20 Initiate the process of forming a Parks and Recreation Board to steer the Township’s park development, management, and programming.

Technical Assistance: DCNR Bureau of Recreation and Conservation  
Pennsylvania Recreation and Parks Society  
National Recreation and Parks Association  
Funding

OPEN SPACE AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Recreational open space should be evaluated in terms of active versus passive use. Passive open space serves a number of functions, including the protection of natural resources such as floodplains and woodlands, as well as offering aesthetic and psychological benefits to residents. Pocket parks and ballfields represent some of the most identifiable active open space opportunities. Making connections with greenways and making streetscape improvements would offer both active and passive recreational opportunities, while also serving transportation and natural resources preservation functions.

Pocket Parks

The “greening” of an urban area is not limited to developing recreational fields and playgrounds, but also includes establishing smaller “pocket parks” and community gardens on vacant properties. Many municipalities with similarities to Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester have established protected open spaces and provided scenic enhancements by restoring and reusing vacant or underutilized properties, utility rights-of-way, and stream corridors and floodplain areas.

Because of the high level of development in Lower Chichester Township, and some portions of Upper Chichester and Aston Townships, it is important to utilize not only existing open spaces and parks but also utility rights-of-way and vacant and/or abandoned
building lots in the commercial and residential neighborhoods. This will create visual relief and provide for active (tot lot) or passive (benches) pocket parks that can promote a sense of community. Providing pedestrian-friendly commercial areas with links to parks, train stations, and trolley stations would afford residents many of the same benefits they would gain from passive and active recreational areas.

At a Task Force meeting in October 2003, representatives of Lower Chichester Township indicated that when lots become available, the Township should consider these areas for small neighborhood parks, tot lots, and/or playgrounds.

**Greenway Linking Opportunities**

As defined in *Pennsylvania Greenways: An Action Plan for Creating Connections* (2001), “a greenway is a corridor of open space. Greenways vary in scale, from narrow ribbons of green that run through urban, suburban, and rural areas to wider corridors that incorporate diverse natural, cultural, and scenic features. They can incorporate both public and private property and can be land or water based…” The two best ways for the three Townships to make greenway connections are stream corridors and railroad or utility rights-of-way. Upper Chichester Township has recently made efforts to map its current and planned trails.

**Stream Corridors**

There are three watershed main stem streams in the study area: Chester Creek, Naamans Creek, and Marcus Hook Creek. West Branch and East Branch are the major branches from Chester Creek. East Branch, West Branch, and Spring Run are the major branches from Naamans Creek. Bezors Run is the major branch from Marcus Hook Creek. Map 5-1 illustrates that many municipal parks are situated with creeks at their boundaries or running right through them. Examples of parks with stream access include Poore Park on the West Branch of Chester Creek, the East Branch of Naamans Creek through Mill Road Woods, Marcus Hook Creek and its tributary in Weir Park, Chester Creek at the Aston-Middletown Little League Fields, and the Naamans Creek South Municipal Open Space.

While it is encouraging to see the amount of streamside with public ownership or access, there are also many creek areas that are restricted by private ownership. These stream corridors present several opportunities for public benefit. First, the portions of stream corridors under private ownership could, if properly managed, protect Township residents from flooding and provide for visual relief in this dense suburban environment. Second, the segments of stream corridor that lie within public property (or where an easement can be obtained on private property) can be utilized to create connections between parks, natural areas, community buildings, and business areas, thus elevating the quality of life for residents.

Properties with identified flooding problems should be considered for acquisition and inclusion in greenway plans. In 2001, the Natural Lands Trust prepared the *Chester Creek Conservation Plan* for the Chester-Ridley-Crum (CRC) Watersheds Association, under the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)
Rivers Conservation Program. The plan provides information about benefits associated with the development of a greenway along Chester Creek. It recommends strategies and techniques for conserving riparian lands. Projects implementing this plan are eligible for DCNR matching grants.

The Route 322 Land Use Study (DVRPC, 2002) recommends that Upper Chichester Township continue with plans to create a bicycle and pedestrian trail from the northern part of the Township, down a utility right-of-way, and along the East Branch of Naamans Creek. The Township would like this trail to cross Route 322 by means of a pedestrian bridge or tunnel, and connect to proposed trails in Bethel and Concord Townships, as well as to the East Coast Greenway along the Delaware River.

Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail

The planned Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail will be a multi-use trail on the unused Chester Creek Branch rail line right-of-way along Chester Creek. The Friends of the Chester Creek Branch are conducting this effort. Their mission is “to convert the existing Chester Creek Branch rail between the Caleb Pusey Plantation in Upland and the rail intersection with the SEPTA R3 line in Wawa to a multi-use trail.” Some portions of this trail are on the eastern edge of Aston Township. The trail would be ideal for recreational uses such as bicycling, walking, running, and cross-country skiing. It would also provide access to Chester Creek for fishing, and would preserve valuable green space while connecting many culturally and historically significant points along the route.
Utility Rights-of-way

More than any other area in Delaware County, the three-Township study area has a concentrated web of utility rights-of-way. These underground pipelines may contain gas, power cables, or petroleum. Above ground, these rights-of-way are long, wide corridors of open meadow that run through woodlands, housing developments, and industrial areas. Utility rights-of-way could be ideal for use as new trails through the Townships. The Townships would have to partner with the owner of the rights-of-way or obtain an easement for access. Should these trails be developed, they could not be published on a map since the owners do not wish their locations to be publicized.

Petroleum Pipeline right-of-way at Cherry Tree Park residential development

Streetscape Improvements

Developing attractive entranceways (including landscaping and signage) to Township neighborhoods would highlight the individual character of the communities. Mature trees show a community’s history of providing a sense of place and the importance it places on natural areas. Within parks, benches and natural areas offer passive recreational opportunities for residents. The Route 322 Land Use Study recommends streetscape improvements including additional sidewalks, pedestrian bridges or crosswalks, and bicycle lanes in areas such as Cherry Tree Road, Bethel Road, Route 452, Larkins Corner, and Chichester Avenue in Upper Chichester Township (see also Chapter 9 – Land Use and Chapter 10 – Livability of the Townships).
RECOMMENDATIONS

There are many opportunities to provide open space resources other than active playfields in a community. This open space can be small, linear, passive, solely visual, and need not be under public ownership to be a valuable amenity in a community. The following recommendations address activities that will allow the three Townships to maximize open space opportunities.

The Townships should:

5-21 Inventory and evaluate existing vacant and underutilized parcels for possible reuse or redevelopment as open space or recreational areas.

Technical Assistance: CRC Watersheds Association
DCPD

5-22 Prepare a streetscape improvement program that includes gateway signage, landscaping (particularly street trees), and amenities such as lighting, sidewalk improvements, and benches.

Funding Programs: Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program
C2P2
Technical Assistance: DCNR
Township Engineers

5-23 Increase pedestrian access to existing parks and recreational areas by providing signage and landscaping, and by linking these areas to adjacent Township properties, sidewalks, off-street parking, and bicycle racks.

Funding Program: TE Program

5-24 Implement the recommendations of the Chester Creek Conservation Plan.

Funding Programs: C2P2
Rivers Conservation Program
PECO Green Region Program
Technical Assistance: CRC Watersheds Association
DCPD

5-25 Revise local ordinances to require connected open space along stream corridors.

Funding Program: PECO Green Region Program
Technical Assistance: CRC Watersheds Association
DCPD
Friends of the Chester Creek Branch
5-26 Identify utility rights-of-way to determine their value as trails connecting points of interest, an alternative mode of transportation, a way to enjoy the natural environment, and a source of recreation. The Townships should plan for utility rights-of-way trails where it is feasible.

Funding Programs: 
- TE Program
- C2P2
- PECO Green Region Program

Technical Assistance: 
- CRC Watersheds Association
- DCPD

5-27 Develop a trail system along stream corridors to link parks within the study area.

Funding Programs: 
- C2P2
- Rivers Conservation Program
- PECO Green Region Program

Technical Assistance: 
- CRC Watersheds Association
- DCPD

Aston Township should:

5-28 Support the Friends of the Chester Creek Branch’s efforts to convert the abandoned rail line along Chester Creek into a multi-use trail.

Funding Programs: 
- C2P2
- PECO Green Region Program

Technical Assistance: 
- DCNR
CHAPTER 6

HOUSING

Strong residential neighborhoods are essential to creating and maintaining healthy and stable communities. This chapter examines existing housing conditions in the three Townships and offers recommendations and strategies for improving the housing stock, encouraging homeownership, and strengthening the overall residential community.

The three Townships have widely varying characteristics. Lower Chichester is a nearly fully developed, densely populated, walkable community located at the SEPTA R2 line. Both Upper Chichester and Aston are larger, less densely populated, developed at lower suburban densities, and contain a mixture of pre- and post-1960 housing.

This chapter provides a framework to organize the efforts of the three Townships to preserve and build upon the positive features of the housing stock, while also addressing existing housing problems.

GOAL: To maintain and support the existing residential character of the three Townships, to keep Lower Chichester a compact and walkable community that is free of vacant and deteriorated housing, and to address areas of deteriorated housing in Aston and Upper Chichester.

HOUSING CONDITIONS

Types of Housing

The Townships contain all major housing types: single-family detached, twins, rows, duplexes, and multi-family dwellings. Table 6-1 shows the percentage of each housing type in the study area. Aston has the highest percentage of single-family detached dwellings, Lower Chichester has the highest percentage of twins and rows, and Upper Chichester has the highest percentage of multi-family units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6-1</th>
<th>HOUSING TYPES, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age of Housing**

The study area has a rich history that is reflected in the housing stock. However, an aging housing stock has implications for the condition of that housing, which is evaluated in more detail in the next section. Table 6-2 shows that the vast majority of the housing stock in Lower Chichester was built before 1960, while Aston and Upper Chichester experienced continuing construction in the following decades. Thus the housing stock in Aston and Upper Chichester is substantially newer than that of Lower Chichester.

| TABLE 6-2 |
| AGE OF HOUSING STOCK, 2000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Field Surveys**

In the fall of 2003, the Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) and the Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) performed a drive-by assessment of the housing stock throughout Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships. The survey evaluated the condition of the housing stock based on the five criteria identified below.

**Housing Conditions Survey Criteria**

- **Foundation/Structural**
  - No cracks or signs of stress.
  - Some cracks, holes, etc.
  - Severe cracks, holes, etc.

- **Exterior**
  - No peeling or cracking paint/stucco, siding/capping in good condition, fascia boards in good condition.
  - Some peeling or cracking of paint/stucco, missing siding/capping, worn fascia boards.
  - Severe peeling or cracking of paint/stucco, missing siding/capping, missing or rotting fascia boards

- **Roof**
  - Appears in good condition, no sagging, and no missing or deteriorated shingles.
  - Some sagging and/or deteriorating shingles.
  - Severely deteriorating, holes, missing shingles, etc.
Windows
- No broken or boarded windows.
- Some broken or boarded windowpanes.
- Extensive broken or boarded up windows.

Yards/ Sidewalks
- No or minimal cracks in sidewalks, well maintained yards and common areas, no trash.
- Some cracks in sidewalks, some yards in need of maintenance, some trash.
- Extensive cracks in sidewalks and/or steps, overgrown yards, trash.

Source: Housing Conditions Survey, DCPD/OHCD, 2003

Rather than evaluating each house within the Townships, the survey analyzed housing by block or street. The overall condition and appearance of the area was recorded. It should be noted that the survey did not cover interior conditions.

Overall, a substantial portion of the study area’s housing stock is well maintained. However, the survey noted blocks containing houses that need rehabilitation and maintenance, such as a little extra paint and attention to the exterior and roofs. Several areas/blocks were also found to contain more serious exterior structural problems. These areas are identified in Table 6-3 and Map 6-1, and are discussed in the following section entitled Residential Areas Targeted for Improvements.

### TABLE 6-3
**AREAS/BLOCKS TARGETED FOR IMPROVEMENT/REHABILITATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Green Street and Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Ridge Road and Morton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laughead Avenue to Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Morton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North of Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Johnson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Chichester Avenue and Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Huddle Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Johnson Avenue and I-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Thomas Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off Washington Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPD/OHCD Housing Conditions Survey, 2003

During the survey, twenty-five properties were classified as noticeably vacant: three in Aston, eight in Lower Chichester, and fourteen in Upper Chichester. There were no particular clusters of vacancies in the three Townships, with the exception of five vacancies in Upper Chichester’s Twin Oaks neighborhood.
PROBLEMS AND STRENGTHS

Residential Areas Targeted for Improvements

Objective 6-1: To review and prioritize areas recommended for rehabilitation and to initiate conservation and rehabilitation activities.

The housing conditions survey conducted by DCPD and OHCD identified the areas in the three Townships where the housing stock requires additional property rehabilitation and maintenance. It is recommended that initial rehabilitation efforts and improvement initiatives focus on the areas listed in Table 6-3. Prioritizing the rehabilitation of these areas would help to stabilize the housing stock and prevent further deterioration, thereby helping to maintain property values and improve the overall look and feel of the neighborhoods in question. These areas are also indicated on Maps 6-1 and 6-2.

Expansion of Rehabilitation Assistance

Objective 6-2: To devise creative programs and find mechanisms to assist persons whose income is not low enough to qualify for most housing assistance programs but not high enough to repair and maintain their property.

A fundamental component in the revitalization of the three Townships is housing stabilization and rehabilitation. Most assistance programs are available only to low- and moderate-income families. Often, homeowners in the area have incomes that exceed the low- and moderate-income thresholds necessary to qualify for assistance to rehabilitate their properties. These exclusions may lead to further deterioration of properties and neighborhoods. In order to resolve this situation, the County should institute a revolving loan program in conjunction with implementation funding from the Delaware County Renaissance Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study area’s aging housing stock and infrastructure underscore the need to establish a program(s) designed to repair and rehabilitate housing. The Townships need the tools to assist homeowners to make repairs and renovations that will maintain or even improve the housing stock and neighborhood stability. These housing improvements would thus ensure that the housing stock remains attractive to prospective homeowners and consistent with market demand.

The Townships should:

6-1 Partner with a local lending institution to offer a low-interest revolving loan program to finance improvements on rental properties.

Funding Program: PNC Bank
6-2 Appoint a citizen housing committee, comprising both homeowners and renters, to develop a program with the three Townships that addresses housing rehabilitation needs.

6-3 Publicize and market the various Delaware County Housing Rehabilitation programs.

Funding Programs: Delaware County Housing Rehabilitation Program
               Delaware County Minor Repair Program
               Pennsylvania Accessible Housing Program
               Home Weatherization Program

Technical Assistance: OHCD

6-4 Establish a home improvement program through the County to provide grants and revolving low-interest loans to middle-income owners.

Technical Assistance: OHCD

6-5 Develop a home improvement educational program for residents with the assistance of the Delaware County OHCD.

Funding Programs: Community Revitalization Program
                  Chester Community Improvement Project
                  Habitat for Humanity

Technical Assistance: OHCD

6-6 Investigate the feasibility of establishing an area Community Development Corporation (CDC) that would acquire vacant or blighted properties, rehabilitate them, and re-sell them to interested homebuyers who would agree to live in them for a specified minimum period of time. See also Appendix C: How to Create a Community Development Corporation (CDC).

6-7 Prioritize and initiate rehabilitation work on areas and blocks cited in Table 6-3.

Funding Programs: Owner-occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program
                  Home Improvement Loan Program
                  Home Weatherization Program
                  Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
                  (where applicable)
                  Federal Housing Administration (FHA) 203(k) Program
                  Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Technical Assistance: OHCD
Housing Maintenance Concerns

Objective 6-3: To maintain and enhance housing units in order to prevent deterioration in the plan area.

Overall, a good portion of the study area’s housing stock is in satisfactory condition. However, as noted in the above survey, some blocks contain houses that need substantial repair and rehabilitation (see Table 6-3). One important reason for these housing problems is the advanced age of the dwellings. Therefore, maintenance of these structures is a critical, ongoing concern.

It is noteworthy that although the small lots and compact development in Lower Chichester are positive characteristics of livable communities, these same features intensify the need for diligent maintenance and vigorous code enforcement. Where buildings are located close together in the three Townships, deteriorating conditions are more visible and tend to spread more rapidly to other properties in the neighborhood.

Also, the increased number of elderly households expected in the coming decades suggests that there will be more Township residents who, because of their fixed incomes, might be significantly limited in their ability to afford the high costs of maintaining and/or upgrading their properties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improving housing conditions by upgrading inspections and code enforcement procedures, revising codes and ordinances that cause or contribute to undesirable land use patterns, and establishing a vigorous and ongoing rehabilitation program will all be critical components in revitalizing the area.

The Townships should:

6-8 Appoint a citizen housing committee comprising homeowners and renters to develop a program with the Townships that addresses the housing needs of residents.

   Technical Assistance: OHCD

6-9 Institute the vigilant regulation and inspection of rental and non-rental units in the Townships by strict enforcement of the Pennsylvania Uniform Construction Code and any other appropriate local ordinances.

   Funding Programs: DCED
   Township Funds
   Technical Assistance: Uniform Construction Code (UCC)
6-10 Consider allowing property tax relief on the value of the improvements for property owners who rehabilitate their properties.

Funding Programs: Township Funds
Technical Assistance: DCED

6-11 Develop a home improvement educational program for residents, with the assistance of the Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development.

Funding Program: Community Revitalization Program
Technical Assistance: Chester Community Improvement Project
Habitat for Humanity
OHCD

6-12 Conduct periodic clean-up, spruce-up, or fix-up drives in targeted blocks or areas to perform minor repairs and maintenance, as well as cleaning vacant lots in order to improve the appearance of residential areas. These drives can take the form of a well-publicized competition in which the winner, second place, and third place finishers would be awarded with recognition from the Commissioners, an article in the local newspaper, and/or prizes. In addition to involving residents, these efforts could also enlist the volunteer services of the Boy and Girl Scouts, school students, local business employees, halfway home residents, local athletic teams, and other service organizations.

Technical Assistance: Chester Economic Development Authority
Community Action Agency of Delaware County Habitat for Humanity
Media Presbyterian Church
Delaware County Housing Coalition
Community Service Program

6-13 Conduct an inventory of local housing stock with particular emphasis on older, deteriorating buildings. This inventory should provide a basis for implementing rehabilitation efforts to improve these properties.

Section 8 Housing

Objective 6-4: To work with the Delaware County Housing Authority (DCHA) to strengthen the Section 8 Program in the Townships by implementing more stringent but reasonable requirements on landlords and tenants in order to encourage homeownership and prevent deterioration of neighborhoods.

The Section 8 Program is a federal rental assistance program operated by the county’s public housing authorities. To be eligible for Section 8 assistance, a household must have
an income below 50% of the median family income for the Philadelphia metropolitan area. The eligible household pays 30% of its adjusted monthly income towards rent and utilities, and the Section 8 Program pays the difference directly to the landlord. Table 6-4 calculates the Section 8 assisted units as a percentage of total occupied rental units.

**TABLE 6-4**

SECTION 8 ASSISTED UNITS, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Occupied Rental Units</th>
<th>Number of Section 8 Assisted Units</th>
<th>Percentage of Section 8 Units</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Hook</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>5%*</td>
<td>6%*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*excluding Chester City

Source: Delaware County Housing Authority, Fall 2002 and 2003; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2000

These DCHA statistics from 2003 indicate that Aston and Upper Chichester had a lower percentage of Section 8 units than Delaware County as a whole. Lower Chichester, however, showed a percentage higher than the County average.

One way to reduce the percentage of Section 8 rentals is by limiting the number of years a person can be enrolled in the program. In April of 2003, the City of Philadelphia revised its program by allowing residents of Section 8 units seven years to use their vouchers. During this period, the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) will educate tenants on how to manage their finances and maintain a property. After seven years, the rent subsidy will become a form of mortgage assistance. Elderly and disabled tenants are exempted from this seven-year limitation. This program is modeled on that of Delaware, which was the first state to initiate Section 8 Program time limitations. Delaware placed a five-year maximum on Section 8 rental subsidies. The Townships can attempt to set similar limits on the number of years Section 8 Program participants can use their vouchers.

Other changes initiated by the PHA that might have relevance to DCHA include:

- An expedited termination process to respond more quickly to community concerns
- A full-day workshop to train landlords in the standards and procedures for managing Section 8 units
- An allowance that includes vouchers for up to two years for workers who lose their jobs as a result of downsizing
- Obtaining authority from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to ensure PHA pays rents comparable to those charged for similar properties in the area.

The areas with greater numbers of rental properties may be prime neighborhoods to focus on code compliance of the rental units. These areas would also benefit from efforts to transfer ownership from landlords to their tenants through a lease purchase program, or through direct assistance to enable the renter household to purchase the property.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

In order to bring about changes in the Section 8 Program, the Townships must direct their requests to DCHA. Then HUD must approve any requested changes to this federal program.

The Townships should:

6-14 Advise DCHA of specific problems and complaints concerning Section 8 units.

6-15 Consider the development of joint guidelines and regulations for Section 8 housing in the three Townships.

Technical Assistance: HUD

DCHA

6-16 Consider limiting the number of years a Section 8 unit resident could be eligible for the rent subsidy; note that Philadelphia’s Section 8 Program limits rent subsidies to seven years.

Technical Assistance: HUD

DCHA

6-17 Request intensive training for landlords of Section 8 properties.

Technical Assistance: HUD

DCHA

6-18 Request regular inspection of Section 8 properties to be conducted jointly by Township code officials and inspectors from DCHA.

Technical Assistance: DCHA

**Owner/Renter Ratio**

**Objective 6-6:** To maintain the percentage of homeowner occupied units in Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester.
The percentage of homeowners versus that of renters within a given community is a strong indicator of neighborhood stability. While a supply of affordable rental housing is an important resource for every community, homeowners do tend to place greater stock in their neighborhoods and to prioritize the maintenance and improvement of their homes. The present owner-tenant ratios in the study area are stable, but the Townships can certainly encourage additional homeowners to settle in the area. Since 1980, the percentage of owner-occupied housing units has held steady in Aston. It has fluctuated in Lower and Upper Chichester, while still remaining higher than 1980 levels. However, it should be noted that only Upper Chichester’s owner-occupied units percentage is less than that of Delaware County’s overall homeownership rate of 71.9%.

## Table 6-5
**Owner-Occupied Units, 1980 – 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,933 Units)</td>
<td>(4,584 Units)</td>
<td>(5,186 Units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(911 Units)</td>
<td>(989 Units)</td>
<td>(944 Units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,343 Units)</td>
<td>(3,855 Units)</td>
<td>(4,510 Units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Townships’ housing stock continues to be quite affordable for the first-time buyer, as reflected in the tables below. Table 6-6 shows that from 1997 to 1999, the median sales price of the study area’s housing stock remained stable or increased, in keeping with the trend for Delaware County overall. Table 6-7 shows an increase in the median value of owner-occupied property between 1980 and 2000, which represents a benefit to current property owners. Given these relatively low housing sale prices, many of the properties are affordable to first-time and/or moderate-income buyers.

External factors such as high property taxes have negatively affected many older communities in Delaware County. The enactment of meaningful property tax reform would remove the disincentive of high property taxes relative to other communities, and would contribute toward increases in property values.

## Table 6-6
**Median Sales Prices, 1997-1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>$119,750</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$124,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$63,450</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$118,400</td>
<td>$119,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6-7
MEDIAN VALUE OF OWNER-OCCUPIED PROPERTIES, 1980-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>$55,700</td>
<td>$127,600</td>
<td>$136,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>$28,200</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
<td>$119,600</td>
<td>$128,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
<td>$113,200</td>
<td>$128,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the following actions be implemented to help stimulate and encourage homeownership.

The Townships should:

6-19 Publicize Delaware County’s Homeownership First Program, with particular emphasis on encouraging renters to purchase the properties that they are presently renting. Marketing efforts could include a mailing of the Renaissance Revitalization Homeownership First Program brochures to all renters in Lower Chichester Township. The same can be done for the non-Renaissance communities of Aston and Upper Chichester using the regular Homeownership First Program brochure.

Funding Programs: Renaissance Revitalization Homeownership First Program
Technical Assistance: OHCD

6-20 Intensify efforts to promote the study area’s communities as attractive options for first-time homebuyers.

Technical Assistance: Delaware Valley Realtors Association

6-21 Use the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Dollar Homes Initiative as a means to provide housing for families in need.

Funding Program: HUD Dollar Homes Initiative
Technical Assistance: HUD

6-22 Consider allowing property tax relief on the value of improvements for first-time homebuyers who purchase and rehabilitate a deteriorated property.

Funding Program: Township Funds
Technical Assistance: DCED
6-23 Encourage residents to form neighborhood associations to address neighborhood-scale issues such as maintenance and neighborhood beautification.

Funding Program: Township Funds  
Technical Assistance: Housing Association of the Delaware Valley

6-24 Pursue the housing rehabilitation and other improvement programs discussed in this chapter’s section on Areas Targeted for Housing Improvements to provide both additional rehabilitated units and some newly constructed units, thus increasing the supply of housing and the percentage of homeowners.

Development of New For-sale and Mixed Use Housing

**Objective 6-7:** To achieve the construction of new for-sale housing in Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester that complements and connects to the surrounding neighborhoods and replaces underutilized or poorly utilized parcels in residential districts.

As part of this plan, Lower Chichester seeks to create a new vision for residential and commercial development that will promote the area’s vitality. While both Aston and Upper Chichester saw significant new construction between 1995 and 2000, Lower Chichester saw very limited new construction during this time period, with only two residential units proposed. Thus, any potential homebuyer looking for a newly-constructed home rather than a rehabilitation opportunity will likely bypass Lower Chichester.

Financing is perhaps the most critical impediment to building infill housing. The risk premium associated with uncommon development types – which, for many lenders, includes most forms of compact and sustainable development – can be considerable. Given their unique character, compact and sustainable developments may take longer to complete and market.

The three Townships should emphasize the retention of existing households by providing new construction alternatives for buyers seeking smaller properties, and the attraction of first-time buyers to maintain or increase homeownership. The small land parcel sizes permit the development of only one or two housing types, which limits the field of potential buyers but also refines the list of potential builders, helping to create a niche market for those who wish to build at this scale of housing. The median sales prices in Aston and Upper Chichester allow for the development of market rate infill housing, but the same may not be true for Lower Chichester.

In general, the Townships should review their zoning ordinances to ensure that regulations provide for the changes and allowances necessary for the construction of compact and sustainable infill residential development, including the requirement of off-

---

1 Source: DCPD 2001
street parking. This especially applies to Aston and Upper Chichester. This new development could include mixed-use properties in the Market Street corridor in Lower Chichester and the Chichester Avenue/Meetinghouse Avenue corridors in Upper Chichester. These areas represent older “downtowns” that provide unique amenities in relation to competing suburban development. They are characterized by:

- A compact and walkable environment built at a human scale
- A concentration of mixed uses in one place (e.g., housing, employment, shopping, and cultural and tourist attractions)
- Civic public places and public parks not found in or near indoor malls
- The presence of historically significant structures that distinguish the downtown from newer suburban development, especially where adaptive reuse has creatively used formerly deteriorated structures

It must be noted that many current zoning ordinances do not adequately provide for and control mixed-use properties. These zoning ordinances would need to be changed to properly accommodate this type of development. Business district redevelopment and neighborhood revitalization cannot happen in isolation. A central business area can possess a wide range of functions in one compact area. Developing housing in or near that conventional retail and service mix greatly enhances the capacity to attract both diversity and volume of downtown visitors. Types of housing developed could include infill townhouse development, rehabilitation of historic buildings into senior housing, and conversion of underutilized second and third floor commercial space into apartments.

In Aston, opportunities exist for mixed-use development in and around Neumann College, where additional student housing is needed. The need for additional student housing construction could be combined with services and stores directed to meeting the students’ needs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Although on a limited scale, it is important for the Townships to identify areas and hold discussions with builders to encourage the construction of new housing at a density generally consistent with the housing stock in nearby neighborhoods.

The Townships should:

6-25 Initiate and continue actions that make them more livable, walkable, and desirable communities in which to reside, and publicize all such efforts to the consumer market seeking compact and sustainable residential infill development.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania
6-26 Create a Vacant Property Review Committee with the ability to declare properties blighted, thus allowing redevelopment on the site once acquisition occurs.

Technical Assistance: DCHA
Delaware County Redevelopment Authority

6-27 Use a “charette” process to bring together a parcel’s developer and the Township stakeholders to reach consensus on a development plan that complies with local ordinances.

Funding Programs: Pennsylvania Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP)
Community Revitalization Program
Technical Assistance: DCPD

6-28 Revise zoning ordinances to ensure that regulations allow for the construction of compact and sustainable infill residential development.

Funding Programs: LUPTAP
CDBG Program (where applicable)
Technical Assistance: DCPD

6-29 Apply to Delaware County’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Renaissance Programs for funds for infrastructure work, to underwrite the cost of new housing.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program (where applicable)
Delaware County Renaissance Program
Technical Assistance: OHCD
DCPD
CHAPTER 7

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES
CHAPTER 7
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

This chapter discusses and analyzes the existing conditions of local community facilities and services in Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships, and offers recommendations for improvements. Community facilities and services can be either physical or programmatic. They are provided by public, quasi-public, or private institutions. The facilities and services discussed here include Township administration and municipal facilities; emergency services including police and fire protection; education; library services; and utilities and related services including sanitary sewer, water, solid waste, and recycling services.

The complexity of the services needed and provided is evident in both their number and variety. Each facility and service should be understood in the context of the others, in hopes that they can work together even more effectively and efficiently. Each service should also reinforce this chapter’s goal as well as the vision established for the entire comprehensive plan (see the Vision Statement on page 1-3).

The various public facilities and services provided by the three Townships can have a significant impact on the lives of their residents. They represent local efforts to improve the quality of life throughout the Townships. They are also an important part of creating an environment that attracts investment from the private sector. A municipality whose residents support superior services is more attractive to private investors and prospective residents than one that does not. Map 7-1 shows the location of key community facilities in the study area.

**GOAL:** To provide high quality community facilities and services to all residents of the three Townships in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

TOWNSHIP ADMINISTRATION AND FACILITIES

**Objective 7-1:** To provide municipal administrative services and facilities that meet the needs and desires of local residents and businesses.

The Pennsylvania Constitution gives local units of government the right to operate under the laws of the Commonwealth. Local municipalities are empowered by the State to levy taxes, authorize expenditures, borrow money, direct government administration by their appointees, and make policy decisions. Local municipal functions include police and fire protection, maintenance of local roads and streets, provision of water supply, sewage collection and treatment, parking and traffic control, local planning and zoning, parks and recreation, garbage and recycling collection, health services, libraries, licensing of businesses, and code enforcement.
**Township Administration**

Pennsylvania has two classes of Townships: first class and second class. There are 91 first class townships in Pennsylvania, which includes the more urban Townships located in the State’s metropolitan areas. There are 1,457 second class townships, which are generally more rural. The study area Townships are all of the first class. Their governing bodies consist of five Commissioners with four-year overlapping terms. In addition to the Commissioners, elected Township officials include the Tax Assessor, Controller, and a Treasurer. Appointed officers include the Secretary, Township Manager (if desired), Chief of Police, Fire Chief, Engineer, Solicitor, and others.

**Aston Township Municipal Facilities**

The Aston Township building is located on Pennell Road between Concord and Weir Roads. Built in the early 1960s, it houses a variety of municipal functions. The first floor contains the police department, paramedic headquarters, and public meeting room. The second floor houses the administrative staff including the Township Manager, Code Enforcement Officer, Tax Collector, and Fire Marshal. A caucus room and conference room are also present on the second floor.

When the building was renovated in 1989-1990, the second floor was added and the first floor was expanded to accommodate the growing police department. With an elevator and ramps to the public meeting room, the building is only partially handicapped accessible. There are 48 parking spaces on the grounds.
The public works department garage, a storage shed, and a salt storage building are located behind the Township building. The garage houses the public works department’s vehicles and equipment, and the storage shed contains the Township’s administrative records and data.

Additional Township property in the area includes the Aston community center and library, which are located on Concord Road near Raymond Avenue. This facility was built in 1996-1997, and officially opened in the fall of 1997. It consists of two sections: the community center and the library. The community center houses a gymnasium with two basketball courts, two meeting rooms for community groups, a small office, a display room for the Township Historical Society, and a kitchen for community functions. Additionally, there are outdoor sports and recreational fields and a tot lot for children. The library contains approximately 20,000 square feet. It is open seven days a week and employs a professional librarian. The community center and library are both fully handicapped accessible.

**Upper Chichester Township Municipal Facilities**

Upper Chichester Township’s government operations are located at the Township municipal complex on Furey Road, off Chichester Avenue in the northwestern corner of the Township. The complex comprises the municipal administration and community center building, the highway and sanitation department garage and offices, the police station, and a landscaped outdoor recreational area with sports fields, a gazebo, tables, and seating.

The centerpiece of the complex, the administration and community center building, was completed in June of 2003. The entire building measures 42,000 square feet and is fully handicapped accessible. Roughly 8,000 square feet of this facility are dedicated to the Township administration and support staff offices, two conference rooms, and a public meeting hall. The remaining space houses the community recreational center, which has a large gym with two basketball courts, a volleyball court, an indoor track, and an exercise and weight room. The gym, along with the field house and kitchen, are used for a variety of community functions and events.

The highway and sanitation department building is located to the east of the administration and community center building. This 12,230 square foot facility contains the department’s administrative offices, and a large garage and storage area for Township garbage trucks, highway equipment, utility vehicles, snowplows, and salt. The police station is located in the old Township administration building and houses department staff and operations. Two attached garages are used for vehicles and storage. The complex includes fields used for baseball, football, and soccer, as well as two recently completed tennis courts. A pavilion with seating overlooking the fields is planned for completion in 2005. This municipal complex is a truly multi-purpose facility containing all major Township administrative departments and operations, as well as providing recreational and civic activities for local residents.
Lower Chichester Township Facilities

The Lower Chichester municipal building is part of a cluster of Township buildings located at the intersection of Chichester Avenue and Market Street (Route 452), just north of the intersection of Market Street and Ridge Avenue. The original stone and stucco structure was built in 1869. Originally used as the Rockhill Public School, the building became the Township municipal facility in 1928. It was expanded in the 1950s, when the former police station and holding cell were converted into the present-day public meeting room.

The first floor contains the main Township office, Manager’s office, code enforcement office, and public meeting room. The second floor contains the Commissioners’ offices, a private meeting room, and storage space. Both floors have been completely remodeled within the past five years, and the first floor was made handicapped accessible. The property has a total of 21 parking spaces, and Township officials have emphasized the need for more parking.

The municipal complex includes three other Township-owned buildings: the youth center and police station, the senior center, and the vacant building formerly used by the Oddfellows fraternal organization. The youth center, located just north of the Township building, is used for indoor sports practices (e.g., basketball, volleyball, and high school cheerleading) as well as arts and crafts fairs and other community events. The Township police station is a small facility attached to one end of the youth center, with its own entrance and exit. The Township Manager indicated that the police department was in
need of more space and would require a new location. The senior center, located behind the Township building, is available to all resident seniors and is used for a variety of meetings and events throughout the year. The vacant Oddfellows building is situated south of the Township building at the northwest corner of Market Street and Ridge Road.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The three Townships should look at ways to continually upgrade the physical plant of their municipal facilities, such as expanding existing space when needed and upgrading building operating systems, including telecommunications and information technology systems. They should attempt to create or improve these municipal facilities so that they function as multi-purpose civic activity centers (see Chapter 9, Land Use).

Aston Township should:

7-1 Consider constructing a new municipal building or expanding the present one to provide needed additional space for the Township’s expanding municipal operations.

Funding Program: Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program

Technical Assistance: Township Engineer
Examine the costs and benefits of creating and hiring for the new position of Assistant Township Manager to provide needed additional administrative supervision over the Township’s expanding municipal operations.

Lower Chichester should:

7-3 Consider hiring a consultant to design a unified municipal complex and/or town center at the intersection of Market Street, Chichester Avenue, and Ridge Road.

Funding Program: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

7-4 Consider hiring a consultant to assess the feasibility of rehabilitating the vacant Oddfellows Local building to provide a renovated facility for the police department and other municipal functions.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Historic Preservation Grants
Technical Assistance: Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)

Upper Chichester should:

7-5 Continue to maintain and further develop its recently occupied administration and recreation center building and municipal complex.

**Emergency Services**

**Objective 7-2:** To maintain and enhance the level of service being offered by the Townships’ fire departments, police departments, and emergency medical services.

The Delaware County Emergency Services Department operates its Communications and Management divisions from Lima, Middletown Township. Requests for police, fire, and ambulance assistance are received here and are routed to the appropriate local department. The County’s enhanced “911” system, regarded as one of the nation’s best, reported 490,522 computer aided dispatch (CAD) calls countywide in 2003. Of these calls, 431,013 were for police departments, and 59,509 were for fire departments. In extreme cases, the departments of surrounding municipalities, or even those outside of the County, respond after being called via a common radio frequency.

The County, and the individual Townships, each maintains emergency response plans. Each Township’s Emergency Management Coordinator organizes the local response with all other entities and has authority to initiate actions such as evacuations. The Emergency Services Training Center in Darby Township, which opened in 1992, provides course instruction, training grounds, and facilities for 78 volunteer fire companies, 33 ambulance services, and 31 municipal police departments in Delaware County. Facilities include an
indoor pistol range, burn building, confined space training facility, three-story live fire training building, propane training area, flashover simulator, driver’s training area, and six classrooms.

**Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services**

Fire protection services are provided to residents by each Township’s own department. As is the case throughout Delaware County, the three Township fire departments consist almost entirely of volunteers. Mutual aid agreements for fire protection services exist among the three Townships as well as with other nearby municipalities. The area’s emergency response services are provided through the local fire companies and cooperative agreements with surrounding municipalities and Crozer-Chester Medical Center.

**Aston Township Fire Department and Emergency Services**

The Green Ridge Fire Company and the Aston-Beechwood Fire Company provide fire protection services for Aston Township. Green Ridge Fire Company maintains a quick response unit. The Aston-Beechwood Company houses the Township’s basic life support (BLS) and advanced life support (ALS) services. BLS service does not include invasive emergency techniques; ALS service has the capability to administer invasive emergency procedures. These two companies are presently merging into one company at one central facility.

A paid part-time Township Fire Marshal and Emergency Services Coordinator manages fire and ambulance services in Aston. All firefighters are required to complete 180 hours of Firefighting Level 1 training, which is the national certification required of all firefighters. Advanced classes are required for officers. Additional training is provided in hazardous materials, vehicle rescue, CPR, and related areas.

**Green Ridge Fire Company**

Formed in 1942, the Green Ridge Fire Company is located at 500 W. Duttons Mill Road. The station, which was built in 1976, has four engine bays, an office, a crew room, a bunkroom, a restroom, a closet, and two storage sheds. Additionally, there are five acres of open space and ball fields behind the building. In 1997-1998, the facility was refurbished, with upgrades to the heating and air conditioning systems, new electrical systems, new brickwork, and fresh paint.

The company has thirty-five active volunteers including a fire chief, a deputy fire chief, two assistant fire marshals, a captain, three lieutenants, and five engineers. The company owns five vehicles: one new ladder truck, one engine, one wet rescue vehicle, one QRS/Utility vehicle, and a fire chief’s vehicle.
Aston-Beechwood Fire Company

Formed in 1947, the Aston-Beechwood Fire Company is located at 793 Mount Road. The building was constructed in 1947, and over the years there have been piecemeal renovations and additions. In 1995, the building was upgraded with new bays, a banquet hall, sprinklers, alarams, and video cameras. The building contains five engine bays, two shorter ambulance bays, a crew room, five offices, two bathrooms, a kitchen, and a banquet hall.

The company presently has fifteen active volunteers including a deputy chief, an assistant chief, two captains, one lieutenant, one ambulance captain, one ambulance lieutenant, and four engineers. The company owns five vehicles: one engine/rescue, one engine, one tactical/field unit, and two BLS ambulances.

The Fire Marshal indicated that the fire station is located in the floodplain of the West Branch of Chester Creek, and flooding has been a problem. During Hurricane Floyd, the building received 2-3 inches of water and sustained damage to drywall, baseboards, and carpeting. Prior to Hurricane Floyd, the last flood to affect the building occurred more than twenty years ago. The company uses utility and hand pumps at the station to remove water during floods. The Fire Marshal reported that the station’s location in the floodplain is not a viable long-term situation, and that other locations should be considered. Additionally, he cited the need for more parking, a back-up emergency generator, and newer, more advanced, computer and phone systems.

Upper Chichester Township Fire Department and Emergency Services

There are three fire companies in Upper Chichester Township: the Boothwyn Fire Company, the Ogden Fire Company, and the Reliance Hook and Ladder Company. A paid, part-time Fire Marshal/Emergency Services Coordinator directs the firefighting services. The companies are funded by annual allocations from the Township’s general fund, the Pennsylvania Firefighters’ Relief Fund, occasional state and federal grants, various fundraising efforts, and facility rental activities.

Upper Chichester Township’s Fire Marshal indicated that the department’s equipment needs include a thermal imaging camera, collapse and high angle rescue equipment, detectors and protective equipment for weapons of mass destruction, a command vehicle, spare turn-out gear, and recovery and rehab equipment.

Boothwyn Fire Company

Established in 1921, the Boothwyn Fire Company is located at 1415 Meetinghouse Road. Construction of the facility was completed in 2003. The company has twenty active volunteer members. The equipment of the company includes one pumper, one pumper-rescue, and one light rescue vehicle. Additionally, the Township’s BLS ambulance service operates out of the Boothwyn Fire Company. The service employs four full-time
and nine part-time paid paramedics and EMTs. It maintains two vehicles and operates twenty-four hours a day.

**Ogden Fire Company**

Organized in 1923, the Ogden Fire Company is located at 4300 Naamans Creek Road. The current facility was built in 1971. The company, which has twenty-two active volunteers, maintains two pumpers and a mobile tactical unit. It also houses the Township’s ALS ambulance service. This service, which is provided through a contract with the Chester-Crozer Medical Center, employs one full-time staff member. The Fire Marshal listed the station’s equipment needs as a generator, an automatic sprinkler system, and an exhaust system for the engine room.

**Reliance Hook and Ladder Company**

Founded in 1921, the Reliance Hook and Ladder Company is located at 1661 Mill Road. The current facility was built in 1984. There are twenty-five active volunteer firefighters. The company’s equipment includes one pumper, one squirt unit, one 95-foot ladder truck, and one car. The company’s equipment needs are the same as those of the Ogden Fire Company: a generator, an automatic sprinkler system, and exhaust system for the engine room.

**Lower Chichester Township Fire Department and Emergency Services**

**Lower Chichester Fire Company**

Lower Chichester Fire Company provides fire protection services to Lower Chichester Township. Organized in 1915, the company is located at 1540 Huddle Street (in the Linwood area of Lower Chichester). The facility was built in 1950. It contains an engine room; offices for the fire chief, desk officer, and paramedic; a general meeting room; and a kitchen. There is a banquet hall attached to the building that is used for fundraising, community events, and private functions that are associated with a fee.

The Lower Chichester Township fire chief indicated that the company needs a new, larger facility not located on a residential block. Huddle Street’s on-street parking is often occupied by neighborhood residents. When there is a fire, noise generated by the sirens and trucks leaving the station is a nuisance to the surrounding neighbors. The chief indicated an interest in potential sites at Ridge Road and Blueball Avenue, and Ridge Road and Baker Street.

The company’s equipment includes one pumper/rescue, one pumper, and a chief’s truck/utility vehicle. The company contracts with Crozer-Chester Medical Center for a combined mobile intensive care unit (MICU) that handles ALS and BLS life support services out of Huddle Street.
There are thirty active volunteer firefighters, although the chief indicated that only three to four firefighters generally respond to a given call. The chief would prefer ten responders per call. He also emphasized that the department’s need for more volunteers. The department is funded through the Township’s general fund allocations, the Pennsylvania State Relief Fund, federal and state grants, and fundraisers.

**Police Protection**

Police protection services in the three Townships are provided by each municipality’s own department. As is the case throughout Delaware County, police personnel are paid employees. Mutual aid agreements for additional police support when needed exist among the three Townships, as well as with other neighboring municipalities.

**Aston Township Police Department**

The Aston Township Police Department is located on the first and second floors of Aston’s municipal building. The department has approximately 3,500 square feet of floor space that includes the front counter area, booking area, evidence room, armory, chief’s office, administrative office (with vehicle dispatch), and storage space. Twenty-one full-time officers staff the department, including the chief, five patrol sergeants, a detective sergeant and detective, a juvenile officer assigned to Penn-Delco School District facilities, and twelve patrol officers. In addition, there are five part-time officers and three administrative staff persons. Four full-time and three part-time officer positions remain unfilled due to budget constraints. The department operates around the clock in three shifts, with three officers on duty per shift.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the suggested officer-to-citizen ratio for adequate police protection is 1.9 full-time officers per 1,000 residents. It should be noted that this is only a suggested standard that does not account for part-time officers. In 2000, Aston had 16,203 residents, which would require 31 full-time officers to meet the FBI standard. Although Aston has only 21 full-time officers, there are also 5 part-time officers, bringing the Township closer to meeting the FBI standard (although part-time officers are often difficult to retain).

The department maintains six patrol vehicles and one four-wheel drive vehicle. The department uses the ALERT computer software package for recording police actions, portable Motorola two-way radios, and Vascar Speed Enforcement devices. The police chief indicated that some of the vehicles and equipment needed to be replaced. The four-wheel drive vehicle is fairly old, the portable radios are aging, and some of the Vascar units are not functioning. The department’s budget last year was approximately $2.3 million, which includes traffic light maintenance expenses. The majority of the funding for the police department budget comes from Township taxes, including the real estate tax, occupational licensing tax, and allocations from the Township’s general fund.

In addition to these equipment needs, the department requires space for an expansion of a few thousand square feet. This would allow space for suspect interview and holding
rooms, detectives’ offices, and an attached garage for the safer transfer of arrested individuals from police vehicles to the station.

**Upper Chichester Township Police Department**

Upper Chichester’s Police Department is located in the former municipal administration building that is part of the Township municipal complex on Furey Road. The department moved to this location in October 2003, and portions of the upstairs continue to be renovated. Department facilities include a patrol office, video arraignment rooms, an evidence room, chief’s offices, detective’s office, lieutenant’s office, supervisor’s office, a staff room, a gun closet, and a lunch/break room. Two garages attached to the back of the building are used as a booking and processing cell area for prisoners, as well as for vehicle storage.

Currently, the police department consists of twenty-two employees including a chief, a lieutenant, five sergeants, two school resource officers, eight part-time officers, and three administrative staff members (one full-time and one part-time). The department operates around the clock in two shifts, with four officers on duty per shift. According to the FBI, the suggested officer-to-citizen ratio for adequate police protection is 1.9 full-time officers per 1,000 residents. In 2000, Upper Chichester had a population of 16,842, which would require 32 full-time officers to meet the FBI standard. It should be noted that this is only a suggested standard that does not take into account Upper Chichester’s eight part-time officers.

The department’s vehicular fleet consists of ten police cars: two marked, two unmarked, four mobile data terminals (MDT), one all terrain vehicle, and one tactical response truck containing shields, vests, gas, and an infrared thermal imager. Identified equipment and technology needs include linkage with the Delaware County database for digital fingerprinting.

**Lower Chichester Township Police Department**

Lower Chichester’s Police Department is located at 1410 Market Street, near the intersection with Chichester Avenue. In the early 1990s, the department moved to this location from the Township municipal building. The station consists of the patrol room, chief’s office, evidence room, gun storage room, lockers, and a restroom. The police chief estimated that the station’s size is around 750 square feet, and indicated the department’s need for more space. There is presently no holding cell or processing room for individuals who have been arrested. Thus detainees are in proximity to officers when they are being prepared for transfer and/or reports are being filed. Also, in response to new regulations related to 9/11, the department has been required to obtain a variety of tactical equipment that takes up additional space in the already cramped quarters.

Currently, the department employs five full-time officers (including the police chief) and six part-time officers. The department operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, in three shifts. According to the FBI, the suggested officer-to-citizen ratio for adequate police
protection is 1.9 full-time officers per 1,000 residents. In 2000, Lower Chichester had a population of 3,591, resulting in an officer-to-citizen ratio of 1.3 full-time officers per 1,000 residents, below the suggested ratio. It should be noted that this is only a suggested standard that does not take into account Lower Chichester’s six part-time officers.

The department’s vehicular fleet includes three cars, two SUVs (one unmarked), one motorcycle, one mobile tactical unit, and four bikes. Officers are supplied with two-way radios to receive calls from Delaware County’s 911 Emergency Services Center. All cars are equipped with computers that allow officers to access a variety of data and reports related to daily police work.

Equipment and technology used in the station includes the ALERT computer software package for recording police actions and an inkless fingerprinting system. The chief indicated a need for a mountable digital camera that could be used for taking better quality photographs of suspects then is currently possible.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Intergovernmental cooperation among neighboring municipalities in the operation of police, fire, and emergency services departments has recently been an increasing trend. With the rising costs of operating local government protective service departments, and the proximity of the three Townships to each other, Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester should look for opportunities to implement cooperative agreements for shared services and the daily operation of their departments.

The Townships should:

7-6 Consider developing a regional approach to the provision of police and fire protection services to increase efficiency and offset rising operating costs.

**Funding Programs:** Regional Police Assistance Program  
Shared Municipal Services Grant Program  
U.S. Communities Government Purchasing Alliance

**Technical Assistance:** Pennsylvania State Association of Townships  
Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

7-7 Examine potential funding sources that would cover the cost of additional officers and upgrades to outdated equipment and technology.

**Funding Programs:** Community Revitalization Program  
Emergency Responders and Training Program
Aston should:

7-8 Examine the cost and feasibility of combining the Township’s two fire companies in one new, centrally located facility.

Funding Program: Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

7-9 Consider either constructing a new municipal building at the present site or completing an addition to the existing building that would provide needed additional space for the police department’s expansion.

Funding Programs: Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Community Revitalization Program
Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

Lower Chichester should:

7-10 Plan to relocate the police department to the vacant Oddfellows Local building at the corner of Market Street and Ridge Road to provide the department with more space.

Funding Programs: Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Community Revitalization Program
Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

7-11 Study the costs and benefits of building a new Township fire department station on vacant sites at Ridge Road and Blueball Avenue, or Ridge Road and Baker Street.

Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

Upper Chichester should:

7-12 Examine the feasibility of consolidating the Township’s three fire companies into one combined unit.

EDUCATION

Objective 7-3: To provide the highest level of educational services to children in both school districts in the study area.

The Penn-Delco School District and the Chichester School District operate the public schools in the three Townships. Penn-Delco serves a portion of Aston, and Chichester serves Upper Chichester, Lower Chichester, and a portion of Aston. Both districts, along with the Garnet Valley School District, meet regularly to discuss issues of mutual
concern such as current tax assessments, truancy, and underage drinking. Additionally, the localities served by districts meet to discuss issues of shared interest. Neumann University in Aston is another key educational institution in the study area.

**Penn-Delco School District**

Located in southwestern Delaware County, the Penn-Delco School District encompasses a portion of Aston Township and Brookhaven and Parkside Boroughs. The district was founded as the Penn-Delco Union School District Authority in 1958, but changed its name to the current Penn-Delco in 1987. Approximately 3,300 students are enrolled in the district’s four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. Of these six schools, Pennell and Aston Elementary Schools, Northley Middle School, and Sun Valley High School are located in Aston Township.

A School Board composed of nine members governs the Penn-Delco School District. Each member is elected to a four-year term. The district’s annual budget for the 2003-04 fiscal year was $38,804,462. Approximately 76% of funds came from local funding sources (primarily the real estate and earned income taxes), 23% came from the State, and less than 1% came from federal grants. The total amount budgeted for the district has increased over the past few years, from $34,701,156 in the 2001-02 fiscal year to $37,234,823 in the 2002-03 fiscal year.

The district’s enrollment has increased gradually since the 1990s, from 3,100 students in 1991-92 to 3,312 students in 2003-04. Projections show a peak enrollment of 3,360 students in 2004-05, then a slight decline to 3,163 students in 2011-12. The racial composition of the student body is almost entirely White, with small numbers of Blacks, Hispanics, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and American Indian/Alaskan natives (see Table 7-1).

There are currently two major building projects underway in the district. A new wing is under construction at Sun Valley High School to provide space for classrooms, a laboratory, and administrative staff offices. Pennell Elementary is undergoing a
substantial renovation to upgrade air conditioning, lighting, and security; add a new gymnasium/multi-purpose room; expand the library; develop a new entrance and traffic pattern; and provide additional parking. Also, the district has acquired the State Farm Building on Duttons Mill Road to serve as the new district service center.

Penn-Delco School District staff includes 233 classroom teachers, 51 teaching assistants, 10 guidance counselors, 2 psychologists, and 2 speech therapists. The district offers a variety of courses and programs including Advanced Placement classes (with the possibility of receiving college credit), a summer enrichment program for continuing studies, a range of elective courses, extracurricular and after-school activities, and an “internship” with a local employer that is required for graduation. A variety of learning support and tutoring options are available for students who need them, and extensive special education offerings are available for qualifying students. Nearly $5 million is budgeted for these special education services.

Technology is fully integrated into all programs and activities. All classrooms are equipped with at least one computer, and there are mobile computer labs with wireless Internet access available for class instruction. Multi-media presentation capabilities are available in most classrooms, and computers are always available in labs as well as in the libraries. Technology is also used in the integrated learning system, a computerized educational tool that assesses student aptitudes in specific academic areas. Further, student grades are e-mailed home on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.

The superintendent identified the need to seek out additional qualified math and science teachers, to secure greater funding for special education student needs, to make Aston Elementary School completely handicapped accessible, and to identify replacement funding to make up for the loss from the Public Utility Realty Tax Act system (PURTA). The District addressed these needs, beginning in 2005.

Chichester School District

The Chichester School District serves Upper Chichester and Lower Chichester Townships, a portion of Aston, and Marcus Hook and Trainer Boroughs. Five of the district’s six school facilities are located in the three-Township area: Chichester High School, Chichester Middle School, and Boothwyn, Hilltop, and Linwood Elementary Schools. Linwood Elementary is the newest facility, having been completed in 1998. In 2005, Boothwyn Elementary will relocate to a new facility on Blueball Avenue, and the present facility will be sold.

As with the Penn-Delco District, a School Board composed of nine members governs the Chichester School District. Each member is elected to a four-year term. The district’s annual budget for the 2003-04 school year was over $43 million.

The district enrolls 3,870 students in grades Kindergarten through 12. Enrollment totals have declined since the 1998-99 school year, with a projected decline through the 2007-08 school year. Enrollment is projected to increase in the 2008-09 school year, and to
continue increasing over the next five years. Enrollment projections show declines occurring in the 5-8 year old category and 10-12 year old category.

As with the Penn-Delco District, a School Board composed of nine members governs the Chichester School District. Each member is elected to a four-year term. The district’s annual budget for the 2003-04 school year was over $43 million.
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The district enrolls 3,870 students in grades Kindergarten through 12. Enrollment totals have declined since the 1998-99 school year, with a projected decline through the 2007-08 school year. Enrollment is projected to increase in the 2008-09 school year, and to continue increasing over the next five years. Enrollment projections show declines occurring in the 5-8 year old category and 10-12 year old category.

Of the total enrollment, approximately 17% are special education students and a little over 2% are gifted students. Thirty-three percent of students are classified as low-income, with the greatest numbers attending Linwood Elementary and Chichester Middle School. The student body’s racial composition is more diverse than that of the Penn-Delco School District, with larger numbers of Black students, as shown in Table 7-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic (%)</th>
<th>1998-99 Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn-Delco</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnet Valley</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-Upland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chichester School District employs 133 teachers, 68 teaching specialists, 56 teacher’s aides, 5 speech therapists, 6 psychologists, and 12 guidance counselors. As does Penn-Delco, the district offers its students a variety of courses and programs including Advanced Placement classes for high school students, summer school and summer enrichment programs, alternative school, work study and shadowing school-to-work programs, vocational tech, allied health career options, and partner programs with neighboring community and four-year colleges.

Learning support and tutoring options are available for students who need them, and special education programs are available for qualifying students. All schools are equipped with computers that have Internet access. The high school and middle school have at least one computer in every classroom, and the elementary schools have them in computer labs.

**Neumann University**

Located in the northwestern part of Aston Township, Neumann University is a private Roman Catholic college that was founded and operated by the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia. The college was established in 1965 as Our Lady of Angels College. While the Sisters had a number of facilities at the present site of Neumann University, the decision to found a formal college with religious and secular educational offerings was made in the late 1950s. The school originally opened with an enrollment of 115 women. Over the years the college has expanded substantially and it now enrolls approximately 2,589 men and women. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools accredit it.

Neumann University offers undergraduate and graduate programs as well as adult and continuing education learning opportunities. Of the approximately 2,100 undergraduate students, about one-quarter are part-time. Approximately 475 students are enrolled in graduate programs.

The university offers a full range of cultural and recreational activities including participation in fifteen NCAA Division III sports. In recent years, campus facilities have expanded, most notably with the construction of a state-of-the-art Living and Learning Center that houses close to 200 students on campus. The university is an important presence in Aston that should provide educational and economic benefits to the surrounding communities for years to come.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The school districts should:

7-13 Actively recruit qualified math and science teachers to fill staffing shortages.
Penn-Delco School District should:

7-14 Explore and pursue any options to generate revenue to cover the costs incurred by the recent influx of special education students from neighboring districts.

7-15 Seek alternative sources of revenue for the PURTA program to offset losses due to state funding cutbacks.

7-16 Initiate improvements to make Aston Elementary School fully handicapped accessible.

Chichester School District should:

7-17 Consult the Building Survey Study prepared by the Ray Group and the School District Feasibility Study prepared by the PHM Group, Inc., to schedule a building maintenance and improvement program for the upkeep of the district’s physical stock and infrastructure.

**LIBRARY SERVICE**

**Objective 7-4:** To provide the highest level of library services to area residents.

Two libraries serve the study area: the Aston Public Library and the Upper Chichester Free Library. The Aston Public Library is a member of the Delaware County Library System (DCLS). The DCLS is a federated system comprising 26 libraries throughout Delaware County. It maintains an online catalog of over 1.2 million books and other materials, and has rotating collections of DVDs, videocassettes, and books on CD. The DCLS offers programs for toddlers, children, and young adults, as well as outreach services for older adults. Through the DCLS linked card catalog system, patrons can take advantage of an inter-library loan program that makes the entire County collection accessible to residents, usually within 48 hours. The inter-library loan program also eliminates the need for extensive storage areas to house a complete literary collection within each branch library. The Upper Chichester Free Library is not a part of the DCLS.

**Aston Public Library**

The Aston Public Library has been located in the Aston Township community center on Concord Road since the community center was built in 1997. The library, which includes a meeting room and board room, occupies approximately 9,000 square feet and is fully handicapped accessible. It employs one full-time and seven part-time staff members, and houses over 39,450 catalogued items.

According to the American Library Association’s publication, *Planning the Small Public Library Building*, a library should contain a minimum gross floor area of 12,089 square feet per 12,000 people. Aston’s population of 16,203 (2000 Census) equates to a 16,323 square foot spatial standard. The library’s current size of 9,000 square feet equates to
about 55% of the suggested minimum gross floor area for a community of Aston’s size. Furthermore, the library also provides service to patrons from other municipalities.

The library currently has over 8,600 registered members. They can choose from a collection of over 35,000 books that includes paperbacks and best sellers. There are more than 25 magazines and over 140 videos, as well as a rotating collection of over 200 books on tape. There are nineteen computers, ten of which have Internet access and four of which provide word processing, spreadsheet, and other software. Photocopy and fax machines are also available.

The library has evolved into a vital information center for local residents. It is also a depository for information about many local, state, and federal programs ranging from SEPTA schedules to changes in Medicare and Social Security. The head librarian indicated the need for an additional full-time paid reference librarian and children’s specialist. She also cited the need for a family and children’s center addition modeled after the one at the Marple Public Library.

Upper Chichester Free Library

The Upper Chichester Free Library, an all-volunteer library at its inception, was established in September of 2001 but is not as yet part of the DCLS. The library is located on Chichester Avenue in the Willowbrook Shopping Center and now employs one full-time librarian along with the volunteer staff. The Township pays the monthly
rent on the facility and covers the costs of insurance, utilities, and the alarm system. The approximately 1,600 square foot building contains close to 15,000 books.

The library is funded by annual allocations from the Township budget that cover rental and utility costs, book acquisition, and the full-time librarian’s salary. Needs identified by the head librarian include a larger facility to allow more space for present operations and future expansion; the hiring of a paid, full-time assistant librarian; higher levels of funding than those proposed by the Township; and membership in the DCLS.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Libraries are important public facilities that serve the needs of various constituents of the community, from the reading and educational needs of children and young adults to providing a site for book club meetings to offering computer classes. Therefore:

Aston should:

7-18 Consider increasing library funding to allow for the hiring of an additional reference librarian/children’s specialist.

7-19 Examine the feasibility of building an addition to the library, or reconfiguring existing space, to allow for the opening of a family and children’s center.

**Funding Programs:** Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Community Revitalization Program

**Technical Assistance:** DCLS

Upper Chichester should:

7-20 Evaluate the feasibility of expanding the current facility, or relocating to a larger facility, to obtain needed space and to allow for future expansion.

**Funding Programs:** Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Community Revitalization Program

**Technical Assistance:** DCLS

7-21 Review the requirements for joining the DCLS and consider becoming a member.

**Technical Assistance:** DCLS

**UTILITIES**

**Objective 7-5:** To ensure efficient operation and continued availability of necessary public facilities and services such as water supply, sewage treatment, and solid waste disposal.
Sanitary Sewers – Act 537 Planning

The three Townships are almost completely sewered. Less than 1% of the homes and businesses in Aston and Upper Chichester rely on individual on-lot systems, and Lower Chichester reported no on-lot systems. When failing on-lot systems are discovered, they are generally connected to public sewers if possible. The age of the sanitary collection systems in Aston and Upper Chichester date back more than 30 years, while large sections of Lower Chichester’s system are more than 80 years old. These systems were originally composed of terra cotta, but sections have been replaced with more modern piping when repairs were made. Problems characteristic of an aging conveyance system have arisen in the study area, such as blockages caused by roots and pipe failures and overloads caused by inflow and infiltration (I&I).

Lower Chichester currently recognizes the Delaware County Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update: Eastern Plan of Study (2002) as its Official Municipal Act 537 Sewer Plan. The plan offers recommendations to municipalities (i.e., Lower Chichester) that are connected to the Western Regional Treatment Plant (WRTP) in Chester regarding the repair and maintenance of each of the collection systems. General recommendations include implementation of a downspout disconnection program, consideration of a municipal flow-metering program, reconstruction of trunk sewers at specified locations, and initiating a pipe-cleaning program. By adopting the sewage facilities plan, the Township committed to undertaking the necessary actions to maintain the system in good working order, including implementing the corrective actions identified in the individual I&I studies.

Aston and Upper Chichester each have their own municipal Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan (Aston, April 16, 1997; Upper Chichester, April 1, 1999). In April of 2004, the County completed an Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for the western half of Delaware County, which encompasses Aston and Upper Chichester. This plan catalogs the existing treatment facilities in the western municipalities and addresses future needs to continue effectively treating and conveying their wastewater. It also identifies and recommends opportunities for intermunicipal cooperation for current and future wastewater conveyance needs. This is a unifying plan for the wastewater facility needs of western Delaware County.

Aston Township’s sanitary sewer system is a tributary of the Southwest Delaware County Municipal Authority (SWDCMA) system. The SWDCMA owns and maintains approximately 63 miles of sanitary sewer line, seven pump stations, and the Chester Creek and Baldwin Run main delivery interceptors. Wastewater flows are currently directed to the Baldwin Run Pollution Control facility (owned and operated by the SWDCMA) for treatment. The SWDCMA bills its Aston customers using two criteria: a base sewer fee (to cover the authority’s financial obligations) and a metered fee based on a percentage of the previous year’s water usage. Residential and commercial customers have different base and metered fees. Table 7-2 indicates prototypical costs for residential and commercial uses based on a four-person household using 350 gallons per day and commercial establishment with eight employees using 700 gallons per day.
TABLE 7-2

ASTON TOWNSHIP SEWER FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Water Usage for Previous Year (gallons)</th>
<th>% of Usage Used for Rate Calculation</th>
<th>Usage % Total (gallons)</th>
<th>Water Usage Rate Charged (using $4.75 per 1,000 gallons of water)</th>
<th>Base Sewer Fee</th>
<th>Total Sewer Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (4 person)</td>
<td>127,400</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>108,290</td>
<td>$256 + $280 = $536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (8 person)</td>
<td>254,800</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>242,060</td>
<td>$1,150 + $700 = $1,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rates based on American Water Works Association average water usage figures.

Lower Chichester Township’s sanitary sewer system directs its flow to the Delaware County Regional Water Quality Control Authority (DELCORA) WRTP in Chester via the Marcus Hook pump station. DELCORA has a service agreement with Lower Chichester for the treatment of wastewater only, and relies on the Township to maintain the 32,716 linear feet and one pump station that comprise its collection system. According to the Delaware County Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update: Eastern Plan of Study, no data indicates that the sewer system’s capacity is being exceeded or that excessive infiltration is occurring. Residential and commercial customers are billed at a rate of $166.60/year for sewage disposal.

Upper Chichester Township, along with Bethel Township, is a member municipality of the Southern Delaware County Authority (SDCA). The Authority’s service area includes portions of Marcus Hook, Naamans Creek, and the Bezors Run watersheds. The SDCA contracts the maintenance of approximately 65 miles of sewers and five interceptors to General Sewer Service. In 2002, an amendment to SDCA’s Act 537 Sewer Plan was submitted and approved by Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). This allowed the redirection of approximately 0.8 million gallons per day from the SWDCMA Baldwin Run Pollution Control Plant to DELCORA’s WRTP. The SDCA distributes the cost of conveyance and treatment to residential municipal customers at a rate of $260 per year. Commercial customers are billed at a rate of $260 per year for every four employees.

Water Service

Chester Water Authority (CWA) is responsible for supplying a majority of the study area with potable water. Aston’s needs are supplemented by Aqua Pennsylavnia, Inc. (formerly Philadelphia Suburban Water Company). The CWA is supplied with raw water from the Octoraro Reservoir and the Conowingo Pool of the Susquehanna River. Aqua Pennsylavnia, Inc. is supplied with raw water from Crum Creek and the Springtong Reservoir, and is complemented by other out-of-County sources. Both water companies appear to have adequate supplies to serve the long-term needs of the study area residents.
The CWA also provides fire hydrant service to the three Townships. Rates are determined using the industry standard American Water Works Association’s Basic Extra Capacity Method of Cost Allocation. A rate study is conducted every three years by a private consultant. The most recent study and rate adjustment was completed on January 1, 2003. Currently, the rate for a gravity-supply hydrant is $387.60 per year, while a boosted supply hydrant incurs a rate of $435.60 per year. These rates do not reflect the entire cost of the service, because a portion of the fee is absorbed by the CWA. The maintenance and routine flushing of the system by the CWA is included in the rate. Hydrant flows are not metered, and there is no limit to their usage for fire protection demands. Table 7-3 shows the number of hydrants in each Township along with the annual service expense.

### TABLE 7-3
**FIRE HYDRANT STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Lower Chichester</th>
<th>Upper Chichester</th>
<th>Three - Township Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Supply Hydrants ($387.60/yr. for each hydrant)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosted Supply Hydrants ($435.60/yr. for each hydrant)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hydrants</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Expense</td>
<td>$8,567</td>
<td>$1,292</td>
<td>$8,839</td>
<td>$18,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expense</td>
<td>$102,804</td>
<td>$15,504</td>
<td>$106,068</td>
<td>$224,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures were verified by the Chester Water Authority.

**Solid Waste Management and Recycling**

While municipal solid waste disposal is a service provided by the County to all municipalities at no charge, the methods and associated local costs for its collection can differ. All three Townships operate their own solid waste disposal departments. Total municipal waste and recycling statistics, along with the cost billed to homeowners, are shown in Table 7-4. Both bulk waste collection and commercial collection are privately contracted. All residential and commercial waste is taken to a County transfer station for subsequent transport to the American Refuel plant in the City of Chester, where it is incinerated. The incinerator ash is subsequently transported to the County-owned landfill in Berks County.
TABLE 7-4
SOLID WASTE STATISTICS
2003 Figures unless otherwise indicated, waste amounts in tons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aston</th>
<th>Lower Chichester</th>
<th>Upper Chichester</th>
<th>Three-Township Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>16,203</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>16,842</td>
<td>36,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside Program (Y/N)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipal Solid Waste</td>
<td>8,349.7</td>
<td>2,049.2</td>
<td>8,005.0</td>
<td>18,403.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recycling</td>
<td>3,278.9</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>1,814.3</td>
<td>5,163.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trash and Recycling</td>
<td>11,628.6</td>
<td>2,119.4</td>
<td>9,819.3</td>
<td>23,567.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recycling includes:**

- All Igloo (Drop-off) Glass: 21.0 N/A 2.8 23.8
- Paper & Cardboard: 1808.4 52.8 1251.2 3112.4
- Mixed and Other Plastics: 2.1 N/A 10.9 13.0
- Yard Waste: 239.6 N/A 242.2 481.8
- Commingled*: 965.9 27.5 277.6 651.2
- All Curbside: 1029.4 0.0 489.3 1518.7
- All Drop Off: 22.3 0.0 3.3 25.6
- All Commercial: 2227.2 70.2 1321.7 3619.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times per week residential waste collected (2003):</th>
<th>1 (Nov.- Apr.)</th>
<th>2 (May-Oct.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Township bills homeowners/year (2003):</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commingled material includes glass, bimetallic, aluminum, and plastic.

Source: DCSWA, Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships

Disposal of waste requiring special handling, including infectious, pathological, and chemotherapeutic waste, is not the responsibility of either the municipality or Delaware County. Each producer or processor of such waste is responsible for the storage, transport, and disposal of these materials in accordance with their respective operating permits, as issued by DEP.

Pennsylvania Act 101 (Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling, and Waste Reduction Act of 1988) requires municipalities with a population over 5,000 to collect separated recyclable waste. As such, both Aston (population 16,203) and Upper Chichester (population 16,842) have bi-weekly curbside collection programs. Both Townships utilize the same collection company for curbside pick-up. Aston and Upper Chichester also have igloos available for residents to drop off their recyclable products. In Aston, igloos are available at the Municipal Building to collect aluminum, glass, plastics, and bimetals. In Upper Chichester, igloos are available at the Kingsman Road Playground to collect aluminum, glass, plastics, and bimetals.

The Delaware County Solid Waste Authority (DCSWA) reports that in 2003, the Townships collectively delivered 18,404 tons of solid waste to the County’s transfer station and recycled 5,163 tons, a recycling rate of 22%. Table 7-4 shows detailed solid waste information for 2003.
Delaware County presently conducts a regular household hazardous waste collection program. It permits drop-off of designated items several times a year at various County facilities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Public services such as sewage disposal, water supply, and solid waste disposal are critical to public health. All measures should be taken to ensure the continued availability and effectiveness of these services.

The Townships should:

7-22 Conduct an inflow and infiltration study to identify deficiencies in the municipal sewage collection system and implement corrective action or programs as needed.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Pennsylvania Infrastructure and Investment Authority (PENNVEST)

7-23 Consider implementing a sewage flow-metering program to monitor flows within the system and ensure return on investment from the corrective action plan.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
PENNVEST

7-24 Work closely with the CWA and Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. to ensure continued effective service to the residents of the study area.

Lower Chichester should:

7-25 Consider working with the County Recycling Coordinator to arrange for igloos to collect aluminum and other recyclable products.

Technical Assistance: DCSWA

7-26 Explore the feasibility of collecting and recycling paper products such as newspaper and cardboard.

Technical Assistance: DCSWA

Aston and Upper Chichester should:

7-27 Explore the possibility of providing more DCSWA igloos throughout the Townships to promote recycling.

Technical Assistance: DCSWA


**COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS**

**Council of Governments (COG)**

One means of implementing regional goals is the establishment of a Council of Governments (COG) where all participating municipalities, school districts, or other jurisdictions are represented. As defined by state law, a COG is a voluntary association of municipalities established by a written agreement. The COG should address policy issues that can be resolved only by the elected representatives of the member municipalities and that affect decisions to be made in the short run (e.g., within twelve months). The central focus of the COG usually is to serve as a forum for discussion of regional needs and problems.

Of the three Townships, only Lower Chichester is presently an official member of a COG. The group began in the mid-1980s as the Crum and Ridley Creeks Council of Governments. The group originated for the purpose of developing and facilitating mutual cooperation and coordination among the participating municipalities. Members seek to realize cost savings and assist each other in the delivery of services through cooperative actions such as sharing information and equipment, joint purchasing, joint planning and public needs studies, and joint grant applications. Recently the group has expanded its membership, updated its bylaws, and changed its name to the Delaware County Consortium of Local Governments.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

7-28 Assess situations and seek opportunities where cooperative agreements and the sharing of resources represent a viable approach to addressing issues that affect both the Townships and their neighboring municipalities.

Aston and Upper Chichester should:

7-29 Explore the possibility of joining the Delaware County Consortium of Local Governments or another COG to promote cooperation among the area’s local governments and foster increased efficiency in the delivery of municipal services and purchase of materials and equipment.

**Funding Program:** Shared Municipal Services Grant Program

**Technical Assistance:**
- DCPD
- DCED
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TRANSPORTATION

The transportation system enables residents, workers, and visitors to travel to work, school, stores, recreation, health care facilities, and other destinations. An effective transportation system improves mobility, expands job and educational opportunities, and enlarges the labor pool and market area for sellers of goods and services.

In the three-Township area, the transportation system is composed primarily of a street and highway system supplemented by several public transit bus and rail routes and a freight rail line. The principal transportation facilities in the Townships include Interstate 95 (I-95), the Amtrak Northeast Corridor, the CSX freight railroad line, and U.S. Route 322.

This chapter provides descriptions of the existing transportation system in the three Townships and makes recommendations for improvements. It examines street and traffic issues, walking and bicycling facilities, and public transit service.

GOAL: To provide a safe transportation system for residents, businesses, and employees that offers a choice of travel modes, minimizes pollution, enhances health, and builds a sense of community.

STREETS AND TRAFFIC

Street Ownership and Classification

The street system of Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester Townships consists of a total of 25 miles of state-owned highways and 94 miles of municipal streets. Aston Township has 53.4 miles of municipal streets, Upper Chichester Township has 36.4 miles, and Lower Chichester has 4.2 miles.

The main roads in the study area are functionally classified to aid in prioritizing improvements and funding. Collector roads collect traffic from the residential areas and deliver it to the arterials. Minor arterials carry heavier volumes of traffic at slightly higher speeds, usually serving commercial uses with an emphasis on easy access to land uses. Principal arterials are larger roads that feature higher speeds and some access control. They are intended to serve longer-distance traffic and feed into the freeway system. Principal arterials usually serve major employment and shopping centers. Normally, roads of a higher classification are expected to carry more traffic than those of a lower classification.

1 Source: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), 2004
Table 8-1 shows the functional classification and ownership of roads in the study area that are eligible for federal aid. These routes are shown on Map 8-1 – Roads Eligible for Federal Aid.

### TABLE 8-1
**FUNCTIONAL ROAD CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>State Route Number</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interstate arterial</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway</td>
<td>0095</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal arterial</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>0322</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal arterial</td>
<td>Market Street/Pennell Road</td>
<td>0452</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>0491</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>3012</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road to Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>3009</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Concord Road</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Duttons Mill Road</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Ridge Road</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor arterial</td>
<td>Aston Mills Road/Birney Highway/Llewellyn Road</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Road</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Bridgewater Road</td>
<td>3012</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Delaware State Line to Naamans Creek Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bethel Township to Chichester Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Larkin Road</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue to Conchester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Bethel Road</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bethel Township to Chichester Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Conchester Road to Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>3022</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Conchester Road to Cherry Tree Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Knowlton Road</td>
<td>3022</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Weir Road</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Lenni Road</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>3008</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Market Street to Chester City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collector</td>
<td>Valleybrook Road</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Entire Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PennDOT, 2004
NOTES:
1. USGS - Municipal Boundary
2. PennDOT - Roads
3. Delaware County Board of Assessments - Parcels
This classification system is fundamental in deciding which roads are eligible for outside funding. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) typically owns roads of higher classifications, as they are of regional importance. In addition to the state-owned roads, there are several Township-owned streets that are part of the Federal-aid Highway System. Although these roads are Township owned, they are eligible for federal-aid highway funding because they carry a significant amount of regional or inter-municipal traffic. I-95 and U.S. Route 322 are part of the National Highway System (NHS), and are thus eligible for additional funds.

In addition to the road network described above, there are three Delaware County-owned bridges in the project area, all of which are located in Aston Township. The first is the Rockdale Bridge, which carries Convent Road over Chester Creek at the Middletown Township border. Built in 1926, this bridge is officially known as County bridge number 6; it is also known as the Brown’s Mill Bridge. The second is the Crozierville Bridge, which carries New Road over the West Branch of Chester Creek. Built in 1931, this concrete bridge is officially known as County bridge number 7. These two bridges are currently programmed for improvement in the region’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The final County-owned bridge in Aston is the Mt. Alverno Road Bridge, which crosses Chester Creek at the Middletown Township border. Built in 1926, this bridge is officially known as County bridge number 9. A partial list of other bridges in the Townships can be seen in Appendix E – Bridge Information.

**Street Conditions**

Generally, the roads in the study area are in good condition. A few areas need minor patching due to potholes or cracking. Most of these streets, however, carry predominantly local traffic, and their condition may help to prevent motorists from using excessive speed in residential neighborhoods. The streets should be maintained in accordance with road safety, but other than those roads already programmed for improvement, nothing currently warrants major reconstruction. Since safety conditions of the roads can change dramatically, especially during the winter months’ freezing and thawing, street inspections should be maintained to ensure that streets do not become dangerous.

Map 8-2 – Accident Totals, 1996-2003, shows the accident counts along roadways in the area. Conchester Road (U.S. 322) has the greatest number of accidents. PennDOT has scheduled this road for improvement in the upcoming TIP to address these safety issues.

Several intersections in the study area have views that are obstructed by shrubbery, parking, or other barriers. These should be remedied where appropriate, but removing sight obstructions is not always essential. There are many issues to consider when looking at the removal of such sight restrictions, including the aesthetic and historic qualities of the obstruction, speed of traffic, accident history, and whether opposing traffic is required to stop. Sight-restricted intersections should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Concerns are greater where there is an obstruction at a T-intersection, or at a four-way intersection where motorists in at least one lane of travel are not required to stop.
The Spring Hill Drive and Lenni Road intersection in Aston is one example of how a combination of high traffic volume and sight restrictions can create a dangerous turn.

Some intersections in the study area lack proper travel land markings. On wider roads this can make it difficult to differentiate how many lanes the road can handle. Even if the roadway is clearly only wide enough for one lane, lane markings help center drivers in that lane, leading to more predictable driving at lower speeds. Lane markings are also important at intersections to distinguish turning from through lanes. Lane markings should be consistently implemented in areas that are either unclear or lack adequate land markings altogether. Intersections such as these should be evaluated, and the proper number of lanes should be determined so vehicles can more safely use the intersections.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Townships should:

8-1 Maintain street inspections and maintenance on a regular basis to ensure that patching and cracking roadways do not become hazardous at their posted speed limits. Resurface Township streets that are found to be in poor condition.

Funding Programs: State Liquid Fuels Tax Program
Federal and state highway funds for federal aid streets
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
(where eligible)

8-2 Work with PennDOT and provide input during efforts to reconstruct Conchester Road (U.S. 322).

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)
Transportation section

8-3 Study dangerous intersections to see if sight restrictions are seriously hindering motorist operations, and remedy those deemed problematic. Provisions against sight restrictions at corners (such as shrubs and fences) should be included in the zoning code if not already present.

Funding Program: Township funds
Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
Township Planning Commissions
NOTES:
1. USGS - Municipal Boundary
2. PennDOT - Roads and Accident Totals
3. Delaware County Board of Assessments - Parcels
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Properly stripe multiple lane roads and intersections to alleviate confusion and optimize the flow of traffic.

Funding Program: Township funds
Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
PennDOT
DCPD Transportation section

Traffic Volumes

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) has completed many traffic counts in Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester. Traffic volumes are generally reported in terms of Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT or ADT). AADT is a statistical estimate of the number of vehicles that pass a particular section of roadway during a period of 24 consecutive hours, averaged over a period of 365 days. AADT is the average traffic volume of the road independent of hourly or seasonal variations. The highest AADT in the area (101,298) occurs along I-95 at the Delaware border. I-95, Conchester Highway, Route 452, and Chichester Avenue have the highest AADT of all the roads surveyed in the study area. Table 8-2 shows traffic counts at some of the principal locations in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Count Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7/26/1999</td>
<td>101,298</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway</td>
<td>TR 452</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>10/12/1999</td>
<td>51,706</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7/26/1999</td>
<td>50,965</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7/26/1999</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Exit</td>
<td>TR 95</td>
<td>10/7/2002</td>
<td>34,201</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Sommers Lane</td>
<td>Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>12/2/1998</td>
<td>28,845</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>TR 452 Ramps</td>
<td>9/5/2001</td>
<td>27,145</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>TR 322 Ramps</td>
<td>12/7/1998</td>
<td>26,592</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Sommers Lane</td>
<td>Chelsea Parkway</td>
<td>9/5/2001</td>
<td>26,162</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>TR 95 Ramps</td>
<td>Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>11/3/1998</td>
<td>22,928</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Willers Road</td>
<td>Duttons Mill Road</td>
<td>8/23/1999</td>
<td>23,176</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>TR 322 Ramps</td>
<td>10/29/1997</td>
<td>20,785</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Kristine Court</td>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>10/14/1997</td>
<td>20,692</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8-2
TRAFFIC COUNTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Count Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Beeson Avenue</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>12/9/2003</td>
<td>19,808</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>Meetinghouse Road</td>
<td>11/4/1998</td>
<td>19,395</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Beeson Avenue</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>11/4/1998</td>
<td>18,990</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Beeson Avenue</td>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>10/14/1997</td>
<td>18,720</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Hall Drive</td>
<td>Weir Road</td>
<td>10/20/1997</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Duttons Mill Road</td>
<td>Concord Road</td>
<td>10/7/2002</td>
<td>17,487</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Exit</td>
<td>TR 95</td>
<td>10/7/2002</td>
<td>17,190</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Ridge Avenue</td>
<td>Laughead Avenue</td>
<td>11/3/1998</td>
<td>17,090</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Exit</td>
<td>TR 95</td>
<td>10/7/2002</td>
<td>17,011</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Kristine Court</td>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>10/7/2002</td>
<td>16,106</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, 2004

Traffic Calming

Methods of slowing or limiting through traffic on streets are referred to as “traffic calming.” Traffic calming can be of particular interest on residential streets that drivers use as cut-throughs to avoid congested arterial streets. The Institute of Traffic Engineers defines traffic calming as “…the combination of mainly physical measures that reduce the negative effects of motor vehicle use, alter driver behavior, and improve conditions for non-motorized street users.” These vary from expensive street reconstruction to the fairly inexpensive installation of signage. See Appendix D – Traffic Calming for a list of traffic calming techniques and some of their results.

“Curb bump-outs (left), speed humps (center), and traffic circles (right) are more effective than stop signs in slowing traffic on residential streets.”

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers, www.ite.org/traffic

2 Traffic Calming, State of the Practice, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1999
Shoulder striping narrows the travel lane, requiring drivers to lower their speed to remain centered in their lane.

One example of a commonly used traffic calming technique is the one-way street. This has been implemented at several locations in the Townships to limit through traffic, such as Red Hill and Old Pennell Roads in Aston Township. This is an excellent way to limit through traffic because it is inexpensive to implement and self-regulating in enforcement. It can cause inconvenience for residents, however, and should only be used in particular circumstances and in locations meeting the requirements of the Pennsylvania Code.

Stop signs are another method used to limit through traffic on residential streets. This means of slowing traffic is less effective because drivers who know that there is little cross traffic tend to barely slow down when approaching the stop sign and going through the intersection. This may lead to potentially serious safety issues. If stop signs prove ineffective but the desire to slow cut-through traffic is high, other traffic calming techniques can be used to achieve the desired effect.

The geometry of the street is a consideration in limiting through traffic speeds on residential streets. Certain factors can encourage speeders and through traffic. Long, wide, straight, and/or unimpeded roadways encourage faster speeds, as there is nothing that requires drivers to slow down. Narrowing travel lanes with paint stripes helps to slow traffic because drivers center themselves in their lane and must slow down to stay in the center of a narrower lane. This has been done along Chichester Avenue in Upper Chichester. Planting trees near the road also produces the effect of decreasing drivers’ perceived width of the road, thus causing them to slow down.

If the problem with speeding or cut-through traffic is more severe, other more expensive methods can be used to force drivers to slow down. The use of traffic calming measures such as speed humps and chicanes on long, wide, and/or unimpeded roadways can discourage speeding by necessitating slower speeds. At intersections, traffic circles can also slow movements. New federal regulations accept traffic circles as an effective traffic control measure, require that they be considered prior to traffic signal installation, and make them eligible for 100% federal funding. Compared with traffic signals, roundabouts save costs on maintenance. In high traffic areas they should include pedestrian amenities to allow pedestrians to cross the street safely.

Residential streets in the study area generally do not have many interconnections because they are designed as individual, car-oriented, residential developments. Though this design is good for limiting through traffic, it can lengthen drive times to nearby destinations and increase congestion on major roads. One way to remedy this problem without encouraging through traffic is to link developments with pedestrian and bicycle accessible connectors, such as the link between the Cherry Tree Woods development and Evans Way in Aston Township’s Tryens Run development. These links can be made over

8-11
natural barriers as well. Links to commercial developments should also be encouraged. Pedestrian and bicycle links can be required by revisions to the zoning code.

Pedestrian and bicycle links between developments, such as this bridge connecting Peach Street in Upper Chichester, can help link neighborhoods to cut down on traffic.

Truck traffic concerns are not uncommon in areas where industry shares many roads with residential development. This has been the historical pattern in many parts of the study area, such as Aston Mills. This problem cannot be eliminated entirely, but having a well marked truck traffic route limits traffic to certain streets. The Townships should work together to identify industrial and residential concerns with truck traffic, and to design a clear and uniformly designated truck traffic route through the Townships.

Several programmed PennDOT projects will help alleviate the problem with truck traffic in the long term. The first is a study to examine improved access to I-95 and U.S. 322 from the industrial parks north of I-95. This will involve assessing the feasibility of a Bridgewater Road extension to Route 452 and interchange improvements for I-95 and U.S. 322. PennDOT is also beginning final design on highway improvements to U.S. 322 throughout Upper Chichester.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Townships should:

8-5 Identify and prioritize all residential streets with considerable cut-through use and speeding traffic. Examine any traffic calming methods currently in place on those streets and consider updating them. Where existing stop signs and one-way streets do not remedy the problem, install roundabouts, speed humps, or other traffic calming measures in compliance with state regulations.

Funding Programs: Liquid Fuels Tax Program
Surface Transportation Program
Transportation Enhancement (TE Program)
CDBG Program
### Technical Assistance:

*Pennsylvania’s Traffic Calming Handbook*, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, 2001

*Traffic Calming, State of the Practice*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1999

PennDOT District 6-0 Traffic Unit

DCPD

8-6  Encourage shoulder striping during road repainting and resurfacing where speeding traffic is an issue.

8-7  Update zoning codes to require pedestrian and bicycle connections between new developments, allowing residents an alternative to using busy streets to access nearby neighborhoods and commercial uses.

**Funding Programs:**

- TE Program (for construction)
- CDBG Program (for updates to zoning codes)
- Pennsylvania Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP)
- Safe Routes to School (for construction)

**Technical Assistance:**

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

8-8  Enact an ordinance identifying streets on which heavy trucks are prohibited and including fines, which would help pay for damage caused by trucks. Adjacent municipalities should also be consulted to guide truck traffic across municipal boundaries to interstate highways or port facilities. This will minimize the impact on residents, simultaneously making industrial areas more attractive in terms of access.

8-9  Work with and provide input to PennDOT during its efforts to improve access to I-95 and U.S. 322 from industrial parks north of I-95.

**Technical Assistance:**

PennDOT

8-10 Work with and provide input to PennDOT during its efforts to reconstruct Conchester Road (U.S. 322).

**Funding Programs:**

- Liquid Fuels Tax Program
- Surface Transportation Program
- TE Program
- National Highway System funds
- CDBG Program (where eligible)
**Signs and Speed Limit Issues**

Traffic-related signs are generally in good condition and serve their purpose. Several signs have issues such as being faded to the point of illegibility. These faulty signs should be replaced as they are discovered.

Signs can be used to create a sense of place in a community or neighborhood, as well as serving as a navigation tool. Street signs should be appropriate for both the character of the area and the use of the street. On streets used for through traffic, large street signs that are easily visible even at high speeds should be used. On residential streets, smaller signs posted at pedestrian scale should be used to avoid visual clutter. Street sign designs should have a common theme by municipality, neighborhood, or development to convey a sense of place to both visitors and residents. Street signs in the Townships typically label only the side streets, which can make navigation difficult for visitors. Street signs should also label the major routes such as Route 452, Route 491, Ridge Road, and Concord Road.

Many residential and commercial developments mark their entrances with decorative name signs. The Townships themselves, however, rely on small white signs posted by PennDOT on state roads (see below). Creating decorative Township welcome signs or banners can foster a greater sense of community pride and cause visitors to take in the Township name and location. Bridges are another key area where municipalities can foster civic pride, as has been done with the I-476 bridges in Radnor Township.

The speed limits in the Townships are generally appropriate. However, some roads with a generally residential character have relatively high speed limits (e.g., Ridge Road, Market Street, and Chichester Avenue in Lower Chichester). It is possible that lower speed limits would be more appropriate on these roads, but traffic calming measures may also be necessary to ensure speed limit compliance. Traffic studies would need to be completed to see if lower speed limits are appropriate in these neighborhoods.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Townships should:

8-11 Replace faded and missing street identification signs to ease wayfinding for visitors and residents. Identification of major routes such as Route 452, Chichester Avenue, and Concord Road, should also be included at every side street.

Funding Programs: Liquid Fuels Tax Program
Township funds
Technical Assistance: PennDOT
Township Engineers

8-12 Provide decorative welcome signs at Township boundaries to encourage a sense of place. These signs serve the dual function of increasing civic pride among residents and increasing visitor awareness of the Townships.

Funding Programs: TE Program
Surface Transportation Program
Liquid Fuels Tax Program
Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
PennDOT

8-13 Work with PennDOT to incorporate decorative historical and cultural elements on reconstructed bridges throughout the Townships.

8-14 Consult residents to determine if they find any speed limits to be excessive. Conduct spot speed studies to determine whether lower speed limits are warranted on these roads.

Funding Programs: Liquid Fuels Tax Program
Township funds
Technical Assistance: PennDOT, District 6-0 Traffic Unit
DCPD

Traffic Signals

The most common type of signal currently found in the three Townships is the actuated signal. Actuation consists of (1) a magnetic loop wire buried below the surface of the side street that indicates to the signal’s controller that a vehicle has approached and (2) a push button for pedestrians to use to cross the street. Once actuated by the presence of a side-street vehicle or pedestrian, the light at the major street changes to red, allowing the side street vehicle or pedestrian to cross.
A new type of signal activation system is the closed loop traffic signal system. This system allows for interconnection of signals that are controlled by a master controller. This permits changes in signal timing from a central location, such as a personal computer at a Township building, depending on time of day or special events. There is also the possibility of including signal preemption for emergency vehicles and prioritization for transit. These systems can be useful on heavily traveled corridors with signals not farther than one-half mile apart. They allow cars to flow more smoothly through intersections, limiting pollution caused by starting and stopping at timed lights. Upgrading Route 452 signals to a closed loop system may improve traffic flow by limiting stopping and starting at traffic lights.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should…

8-15 Study the feasibility of implementing a closed loop traffic signal system along Route 452.

Funding Programs: Surface Transportation Program
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

Technical Assistance: PennDOT, District 6-0 Traffic Unit

**Railroad-Highway Grade Crossings**

There are three railroad-highway at-grade crossings in the study area, all of which are located in Upper Chichester Township where the CSX freight railroad line crosses Carpenter, Naamans Creek (PA Route 491), and Meetinghouse Roads. The CSX railroad line is the “I-95 of freight railroads,” serving the East Coast from Maine to Florida. It carries thirty trains, each averaging one mile in length, every day.

In past years, trains have blocked the road crossings for significant periods of time. This has caused traffic congestion and motorist inconvenience, and has impacted emergency vehicle access. In 2002, more than 7,000 vehicles crossed the tracks daily at the Naamans Creek and Meetinghouse Road crossings. More than 4,000 vehicles crossed the tracks daily at the Carpenter Road crossing. To develop long-term solutions to this problem, DCPD requested that DVRPC undertake a feasibility study for grade separations of the railroad-highway grade crossings along the CSX line throughout Delaware County. The *Delaware County Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing Study* is expected to be completed in 2005.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Upper Chichester Township should:

8-16 Participate in DVRPC’s *Delaware County Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing Study* and consider its recommendations so that the Township can potentially implement improvements in the future.

Funding Programs: No funding is necessary to participate in the study. Federal and state highway funds and CSX funds could be used for grade crossing improvements.

Technical Assistance: DCPD DVRPC PennDOT CSX

Parking Facilities

Parking is generally ample in most parts of the three-Township area. In fact, there may be an issue of too much parking in parts of Aston and Upper Chichester. Excessive parking decreases nearby land values, decreases overall tax revenue by limiting land available for development, and increases costs associated with stormwater runoff.

There are several techniques for ensuring the appropriate number and design of parking facilities. Communities around the country that want to avoid the excess pavement associated with development use the technique of including parking maximums in the zoning code. Maximum parking requirements can be particularly useful in retail areas that tend to overestimate parking demand. They should, however, still include design guidelines to ensure that landscaping is included in the parking facilities. Zoning provisions that allow shared parking agreements could be contingent on Zoning Hearing Board approval. Shared parking is particularly useful where uses have different hours of operation, as in the case of a church and an office building. Adding this provision to the zoning code does not force the communities to accept shared parking, but rather allows for its use where it is appropriate.

Parking regulations can also be altered to create a more visually appealing streetscape. These regulations do not typically address the amount of parking, but instead encourage both the location of parking behind buildings instead of in front, and the consolidation of multiple access points. There are many benefits of fewer curb cuts. Congestion is reduced because traffic flows more smoothly on major streets due to fewer turning movements. Pedestrians feel safer on the sidewalks because there are fewer points where they conflict with automobiles. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) compliance for sidewalks is easier to achieve because there are fewer areas where elevation changes are needed for curb cuts. Drainage issues are improved because there is a more even gutter, which decreases the need for street maintenance. Zoning should also allow for shared driveways in residential developments because they decrease impervious surface,
therefore improving water quality. Many of these ideas are specifically expressed for the Conchester Highway Corridor in the Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study (DVRPC, 2002).

There are areas of older development where it is more difficult to find parking, such as Lower Chichester, Boothwyn, and northern Aston Township. It is important to encourage a pedestrian-friendly environment in these areas because visitors and residents have to walk farther from parking areas to their destinations. Crosswalks should be boldly marked or textured to increase visibility to drivers. Parking laws should be enforced to maintain sidewalk clearance. Promotional campaigns can inform business owners and employees that occupying parking in front of their stores only makes it more difficult for customers to park.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

8-17 Update zoning codes to:
- Include parking maximums as well as minimums to protect against excessive parking area, particularly where shared parking agreements are worked out with neighboring uses.
- Encourage parking at the rear of buildings to improve the streetscape.
- Encourage fewer curb cuts in commercial developments.

Funding Programs: LUPTAP  
CDBG Program  
Township funds

Technical Assistance: DCPD  
DCED
Update zoning to reflect the findings of the Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study (DVRPC, 2002).

Improve pedestrian facilities throughout the Townships, particularly focusing on areas where parking is limited and individuals have to walk longer distances to homes and businesses.

Funding Programs: TE Program
CDBG Program
Property owners or developers
Township funds
Technical Assistance: DCPD

Use promotional campaigns to inform businesses about parking issues.

Funding Programs: Private developers
Township funds
Technical Assistance: DVRPC
PennDOT

Streetscape Issues

The three Townships have varied streetscapes that range from traditional neighborhood areas to 1960s style suburban strip malls, and from large suburban enclaves to large industrial areas. This variety of land uses and distribution requires a variety of streetscaping strategies. Several plans involving streetscape elements have been prepared for the study area.

A consultant prepared an Action Plan for Lower Chichester as part of the Delaware County Revitalization Program (formerly the Delaware County Renaissance Program). This plan includes streetscape recommendations for Market Street, Ridge Road, and Laughead Avenue. The Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study includes recommendations for the Conchester Highway corridor in Upper Chichester. In general, the zoning ordinance update process addresses streetscaping issues. The three Townships should meet with their residents to develop a consensus and then plan future streetscaping efforts that would be desired in the Townships.

A transit-oriented development (TOD) or traditional neighborhood development (TND) code most accurately represents the current development patterns of the older areas of the Townships. TOD codes encourage the viability of transit use by increasing population density along the line. Newer developments created under a TND code typically look similar to the residential Yorktown development in Upper Chichester, but can include neighborhood commercial nodes.

TOD codes are applicable to areas that are largely built out. They usually take the form of urban overlay districts that specify new design standards similar to the general
characteristics of the existing streetscape. Urban overlay districts are established to ensure that new development either fits in with the standard of development currently in place or alters the development pattern to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. For the Ridge Road or Chichester Avenue corridors, the urban overlay would require buildings to be flush with neighboring buildings at the sidewalk, have a certain percentage of display windows, and require parking at the rear or to the side of the building instead of in the front. This would allow for new infill developments, such as pharmacies or banks, without necessitating alteration of the streetscape. Urban design integrity will both preserve the historic character of the buildings and attract visitors to the area.

If the desire is to maintain a more automobile-oriented character, such as that on Route 452, improvements can still be made in visual quality. The inclusion of sidewalks, street trees, or even a shared-use path in front of the parking areas provides a visual buffer, creating a more pleasant atmosphere along the corridor. If there is a desire to alter these areas to be less automobile-oriented, changing the zoning code to an overlay district code can achieve this goal over time.

A potential action related to improving the streetscape is removing unsightly power lines. Utility poles also have safety issues, especially when they are placed too close to the curb. There are cases within the study area where utility poles do not comply with the current standard of an eighteen-inch distance from the curb, thus creating a hazard for vehicles forced to leave the road because of adverse conditions. This is because the placement of utility poles predates PennDOT’s 1969 safety standards. Often, it is prohibitively expensive to bury existing above ground power lines, but with large-scale new construction, this cost is generally covered by the developer.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

8-21 Implement the recommendations for Lower Chichester Township made in the Delaware County Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Programs:</th>
<th>Liquid Fuels Tax Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Town Streets Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Highway System funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG Program (for eligible portions of the Townships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance:</td>
<td>PennDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-22 Implement the recommendations made in the *Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study*. 

8-20
Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Township funds
LUPTAP
Technical Assistance: DCPD

8-23 Develop and adopt TND and TOD codes where appropriate and desired by residents. Consider applying elements of these codes to already developed areas by way of a zoning overlay.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
LUPTAP
Technical Assistance: DCPD

8-24 Consider adopting TOD or urban commercial overlay zoning for areas near transit stops or stations. This type of zoning will ensure that future development optimizes accessibility to transit, promotes pedestrian and bicycle travel, creates focal points and meeting places for residents, and matches the current design of the community.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
Delaware County Renaissance Program
LUPTAP
Technical Assistance: DCPD

8-25 Revise zoning codes to require developers to bury power lines at their expense as part of any large-scale new development.

Funding Programs: DCPD
CDBG
Technical Assistance: DCPD

8-26 Work with utility companies to relocate poles that are too close to the curb.

Funding Programs: Utility companies
Private developers
Township funds
Technical Assistance: Utility companies

**PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES**

**Bicycle Facilities**

Currently, the streets of the study area serve as the facilities for bicycling. There are no on-street bicycle lanes or off-road bicycle trails in the three Townships, although children use the sidewalks. On low-traffic, low-speed residential streets, bicycle and automobile traffic can share the road quite effectively. On the major streets, however, high traffic
speeds and volumes may warrant the creation of bicycle lanes (a portion of roadway striped with pavement markings and signed for exclusive use by bicycles). These lanes must meet certain standards for width, striping, marking, and signing. Bike lanes increase bicyclists’ sense of security, notify motorists of where to expect bicyclists, and legitimize bicyclists’ place on the road. Roads should be easily crossed by people on bicycles and should not pose a barrier. Children, who often are not allowed to cross roads that would require bike lanes, do not typically use them.

Bicycle parking facilities are sparse in the Townships. The current standard for bicycle parking is the inverted “U” rack, which is less damaging to bicycles than old-style bike racks because it secures them by the frame, not the wheels. It is more resistant to vandalism because of sturdier construction. Bicycle use will increase as trail systems and bicycle links between neighborhoods become standard with new developments. In order to keep up with the increasing demand, bicycle parking facilities should be required in new developments.

DCPD is currently completing the draft Delaware County Bicycle Plan. Routes for examination have been selected using a combination of accident and survey data with the goal of examining them for improvements in bicycle safety and level of service where feasible, but not necessarily through the creation of striped bicycle lanes or marked bicycle routes. Several routes through the project area have been highlighted for study as possible on-road bicycle routes. These are shown on Map 8-3 – Bicycle Opportunity Areas. As these roads are resurfaced, the bicyclists who currently use them should be considered, and the creation of shoulders should be encouraged. Narrower travel lanes are a safety measure not only for bicyclists, but also for pedestrians and automobile users (as described above). Signage should be included where appropriate to provide guidance to bicyclists on where facilities are located. Additionally, as bridges are rebuilt, they should accommodate bicycle use by providing bike lanes, wider shoulders, or a wider cartway.
Street sweepers should be sensitive to the needs of bicyclists and avoid leaving debris in the shoulder or bicycle lane.

When making improvements to signalization, it is important to consider the needs of bicyclists. Actuated signals should be responsive to bicycles and pedestrians as well as cars. Activation buttons should be installed and function properly for pedestrians, and special loop detection devices should be installed to detect bicyclists. This technology is not typically more expensive than the standard actuation process. These piecemeal efforts can eventually create more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly routes.

In coordination with bicycle improvements, there is a prime opportunity to educate the public on safe operating methods. Programs such as Safe Routes to School educate students who would bike to school on proper safety techniques. Safe Routes to School relies on the four E’s: Engineering and Planning, Education, Enforcement, and Encouragement. The program also educates students about the advantages of walking and riding to school by incorporating pedestrian- and bicycle-related topics into the curriculum at schools. Further, this program assists municipal officials in targeting bicycle and pedestrian improvements along students’ routes to school. Through this type of program, students become more aware of the safest methods to ride and walk in congested areas.

**Chester Creek Rail-Trail**

The on-road bicycle system can be augmented with off-road multi-use trails that serve bicyclists, walkers, joggers, runners, and rollerbladers. There are some exciting plans for multi-use trails, also known as shared-use paths, in the study area.

For example, the proposed Chester Creek Rail-Trail is a 6.7 mile trail from the former Wawa train station in Chester Heights Borough to Upland Borough. This trail, which would pass through portions of Aston Township, has been listed on PennDOT’s Transportation Improvement Program. When finished, it will be a truly regional recreational trail, with some value to commuters. The trail would connect many existing sites, including the proposed Wawa train station, Route 1 employers, the Aston/Middletown Little League baseball fields, trails in Middletown Township (the Rocky Run, Darlington, and Linvilla Trails), Linvilla Orchards, Camp Upland Park, the Caleb Pusey historic site, and many housing developments. The trail will provide a useful link among these varied resources (recreational, historic, transportation, and commercial) through scenic, rolling, forested woodland. The Friends of the Chester Creek Branch are negotiating to obtain an easement from SEPTA, which owns the railroad right-of-way.

Similarly, Upper Chichester is working on a planned network of shared-use paths that will link destinations within the Township. These trails are also recommended in the *Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study* (DVRPC, 2002).
Future developments should be encouraged or required to link directly to this trail network, and connections should also be made to nearby communities. Trail system links have been shown to increase the desirability of nearby residential developments.3

![Creating links to trails is good for trail users and good for business.](image)

**East Coast Greenway**

The three-Township area is also fortunate to be very near the proposed route for the East Coast Greenway. A national organization, the East Coast Greenway Alliance is trying to create a Maine-to-Florida bicycle route connecting the major cities of the eastern seaboard. The goal is to achieve a fairly direct, mostly off-road route from city to city by connecting planned trails and promoting the creation of additional trails. A continuous route will benefit all of the participating municipalities by promoting long-distance bicycle tourism.

Delaware County recently hired a land planning consultant to prepare a feasibility study for the portion of the East Coast Greenway that will run through the County. This area corresponds with the landscaping and beautification efforts along the Route 291/13 Industrial Heritage Corridor. The *Delaware County Industrial Heritage Parkway: Route 291/13 Beautification and Greenway Plan* outlines proposed landscaping and signage standards for the corridor. Marcus Hook Borough, Chester City, and Tinicum Township have secured over $4 million in Transportation Enhancement Program funds for

---

segments of the East Coast Greenway in those municipalities. The private sector has also responded with strong support for the vision of this study. Likewise, Delaware County has strongly supported this project and has created a signage and identity program as well as a feasibility study for the crossing of Darby Creek.

Through the reconstruction of the Market Street Bridge, Lower Chichester has an opportunity to link bicycle improvements to the East Coast Greenway in Marcus Hook. While there may not be space for an off-road bicycle facility, a signed bicycle route with improved bicycle facilities would encourage bicycle tourism in the three-Township area. Currently, one of the only bicycle facilities in Delaware County is in Ridley Creek State Park, which attracts large numbers of visitors as shown in Table 8-3. These visitors represent an economic possibility for the three Townships.

### TABLE 8-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>7,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>7,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>7,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>7,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>7,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>7,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>6,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>4,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 62,984**

*Source: Ridley Creek State Park*

In addition to the opportunities presented by the Chester Creek rail line right-of-way, utility corridors throughout the three Townships provide opportunities for shared-use paths. There are several difficulties in using utility corridors for multi-use trail facilities. Utility corridors often have slopes that are steep and lack tree cover, making them less desirable for use as trails. Utility corridors often consist of easements, casting doubt on the legal right to build a trail, but federal and state money can be used to build on easements of over 25 years. Utility corridors usually have no grade separation or useable structures. Yet utilities often benefit from the creation of shared-use paths because they allow for easier access to their infrastructure for maintenance purposes. The presence of the public on shared-use paths also deters loiterers and vandals. The three Townships should examine the possibility of using utility corridors as connections between bikeable streets or short paths, where feasible.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Townships should:

8-27 In cooperation with DCPD, PennDOT, SEPTA, and bicycle groups, encourage bicycling for short trips as a way to improve health, reduce congestion, and reduce air pollution.

Funding Program: Township funds
Technical Assistance: DCPD
Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia (BCGP)

8-28 Install inverted “U” bicycle parking at public facilities, such as Township buildings, libraries, schools, business districts, and parks. Also, encourage provision of these facilities at private and parochial schools, SEPTA train and trolley stations, post offices, churches, and apartment complexes.

Funding Programs: Township funds
Property owners
CMAQ
TE Program
SEPTA
Technical Assistance: DCPD

8-29 In cooperation with PennDOT, adjacent municipalities, and DCPD, stripe bicycle lanes on major streets where space is available. Particular care should be given to connecting with the East Coast Greenway over the reconstructed Market Street Bridge. In areas where it is not appropriate to stripe bicycle lanes on the road, ensure that these roads do not form a barrier to bicycle travel. In particular, the reconstruction of Conchester Highway should include provisions to allow for the crossing of bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Funding Program: Township funds
Technical Assistance: DCPD
PennDOT
BCGP

8-30 Work with school districts to encourage the Safe Routes to School Program.

Funding Programs: School district funds
Safe Routes to School Program
Technical Assistance: DCPD
BCGP
Along with neighboring municipalities, look for shared-use path opportunities and connections to existing recreational facilities, and strive to create shared-use paths in current green areas and future developments through negotiations with utilities.

**Funding Programs:** Township funds
Developers
Utility company funds

**Technical Assistance:** DCPD

Support the Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail and the East Coast Greenway.

Link transportation via bike lanes and trails with recreational opportunities.

**Funding Programs:** TE Program
CMAQ
SEPTA
William Penn Foundation
DCNR
Township funds
Property owners

**Technical Assistance:** DVRPC
DCPD

Implement the bicycle recommendations in the *Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study.*

**Funding Programs:** Township funds
Developers
Utility company funds
Safe Routes to School Program

Update zoning adjacent to existing or planned bicycle facilities to require bicycle parking and provision of access to developments.

**Funding Program:** DCED

**Technical Assistance:** DVRPC
DCPD

**Pedestrian Facilities**

A good pedestrian facility system is crucial to a community’s quality of life. A continuous sidewalk and trail system enables individuals to walk for exercise and to destinations such as school, stores, and friends’ houses. Sidewalks and crosswalks also allow public transportation riders to walk safely between the transit stop and their destination. Providing these facilities can improve health and reduce obesity, improve
social interactions in neighborhoods, and reduce traffic congestion and air pollution. Encouraging students to walk to school can also reduce school busing costs.

A survey of the sidewalk system in the three Townships was undertaken in neighborhoods surrounding schools, shopping centers, community facilities, municipal buildings, and public transit stops. This survey revealed that sidewalks exist in some places but not in others. In Aston Township, sidewalks exist to connect the community center with surrounding neighborhoods, with the exception of Sheridan Lane. A sidewalk connection from Schoolhouse Lane to the athletic fields behind the community center provides direct access from that neighborhood.

Near Northley Middle School and Sun Valley High School, sidewalks are present in most areas. Notable exceptions include the neighborhood east of Concord Road and opposite the middle school (Miriam Avenue, Crystle Road, etc.) and certain areas in the neighborhood north of the high school (Patterson and Roberts Roads, Ronald Avenue, etc.).

Numerous destinations line Pennell Road from Concord Road to Duttons Mill Road, including shopping centers, Aston Elementary School, and the Aston Township building. The SEPTA Route 116 bus also serves this area. Generally, there is good pedestrian access to these destinations from the surrounding residential areas. In addition to the sidewalk system, an opening in the fence at the rear of the shopping center at the Shubrook Lane and Donnelly Avenue intersection allows residents to walk directly to the shopping center, avoiding a longer and more circuitous route.

Pedestrian access to the Aston Township building from the residential areas behind it could be significantly improved. There is no direct access from these areas, which makes it quite difficult for residents to walk to it. In addition, Thomas Road lacks sidewalks from Concord Road for several hundred feet.

In Upper Chichester Township, the Larkin’s Corner area lacks sufficient sidewalks. Better pedestrian facilities are also needed along Chelsea Parkway between the SEPTA Route 119 bus stop and the offices and shopping center. Sidewalks are needed to the north of the Larkin Road and Chichester Avenue intersection to connect with the shopping center, stores, and restaurants, as well as to existing sidewalks to the south of the intersection. Likewise, sidewalks are needed to connect existing sidewalks with the Chichester Baseball League field. Pedestrian facilities are also lacking in the Naamans Creek Business Park and the Upper Chichester Township building area. The SEPTA Route 119 bus serves these areas, but the lack of sidewalks discourages individuals from using the bus service. The extensive Township facilities, including playing fields, gymnasium, and walking paths, are only accessible by car.

Hilltop and Boothwyn Elementary Schools, Chichester Middle School, and Chichester High School all have sidewalks leading to them, allowing children to walk to school. For example, a sidewalk connects Thornton Road with the rear of the high school property, allowing students from this residential neighborhood to walk directly to school. Three
locations need sidewalks: from Hilltop Elementary School directly to Orchard Way; along streets such as 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th Avenues leading to the Meetinghouse Road sidewalk near Boothwyn Elementary School; and along Meetinghouse Road from Chichester Middle School to the east side of Marcus Hook Creek.

PennDOT is designing improvements to Conchester Road (U.S. Route 322) from U.S. Route 1 to I-95, including the portion that traverses Upper Chichester Township. The section from Chichester Avenue to east of Cherry Tree Road has many stores and other businesses with residential developments nearby. Therefore, as part of the improvement project, PennDOT should construct sidewalks and crosswalks along Conchester Road in this area. DCPD recommended this in a November 2001 letter to PennDOT, commenting on the 322 Environmental Assessment and preliminary engineering drawings.

Lower Chichester Township has an extensive pedestrian system, with sidewalks on every street. Because the Township’s developments are generally older than those of Upper Chichester and Aston, the sidewalks are also older and in need of more repair in some areas.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Aston and Upper Chichester Townships should:

8-36 Construct missing links in the sidewalk system, especially in the vicinity of schools, shopping centers, employment sites, community facilities, and Township buildings, so that residents, students, and transit riders can safely walk to their destinations. The locations where sidewalks are needed are:

**Aston**
- Sheridan Lane
- The neighborhoods surrounding Northley Middle School and Sun Valley High School, including Miriam Avenue, Crystle Road, Patterson Road, Ronald Avenue, and Roberts Road.
- From the Aston Township building directly to neighborhoods to the rear
- Thomas Road from Concord Road to the existing sidewalk on Thomas Road.

**Upper Chichester**
- Chichester Avenue (east side) from Larkin Road to Chelsea Parkway
- Larkin Road (north side) from Chichester Avenue to Conchester Road
- To Chichester Baseball League field from both Chichester Avenue and Larkin Road
- Chelsea Parkway from bus stops to offices and shopping center
- Furey Drive and Naamans Creek Business Park roads
- From Orchard Way directly to Hilltop Elementary School
- 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th Avenues to Meetinghouse Road
- Meetinghouse Road from Chichester Middle School to east of Marcus Hook Creek
8-37  Ensure that sidewalks are properly maintained, so that residents are not discouraged from walking to nearby destinations and the Townships and property owners are not liable for injuries sustained from poorly maintained sidewalks.

Funding Programs:  CDBG Program
Safe Routes to School Program
Home Town Streets Program
TE Program
CMAQ
Surface Transportation Program
Township funds
Property owners

Technical Assistance:  DCPD
PennDOT

8-38  Install crosswalks for pedestrians near schools, shopping centers, employment sites, community facilities, municipal buildings, and bus stops. The crosswalks should be, at a minimum, striped in a ladder or continental design (thick painted blocks parallel to traffic flow which are more visible to motorists), rather than the traditional thin stripes perpendicular to traffic flow. The Townships should consider designs such as raised crosswalks, crosswalks made of a different material (brick or stone), and crosswalks with curb bump-outs to make pedestrians more visible to motorists and reduce the amount of street they have to cross.

Funding Programs:  TE Program
CMAQ
CDBG Program
Surface Transportation Program
Safe Routes to School/Home Town Streets Programs
Township funds

Technical Assistance:  DCPD
PennDOT
Upper Chichester Township should:

8-39 Formally request that PennDOT construct sidewalks and crossing facilities on Conchester Road (U.S. Route 322) from Chichester Avenue to east of Cherry Tree Road as part of the Conchester Road construction project.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
PennDOT

**TRANSIT SERVICE AND TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

**Transit Service**

SEPTA provides two modes of service for daily mass transit riders in Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships: the R2 regional rail line (with stops in Marcus Hook and the Linwood section of Lower Chichester), and bus routes 114 and 119, which replaced various portions of former bus routes 116 and 314. As part of its fiscal year 2005 Annual Service Plan, SEPTA changed the routing of route 114 and eliminated routes 116 and 314 in Delaware County. (Note that SEPTA still offers route 314 bus service in the West Chester area of Chester County.) This plan focused on routes originating from the Chester Transportation Center. Service proposals were developed by SEPTA’s Service Planning staff or were requested by local municipalities who desired changes. The changes for Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester Townships were implemented in November 2004.

SEPTA abandoned route 116 in its entirety because of low ridership, replacing portions of it with the 114 line. Riders who formerly boarded the route 116 in Aston no longer have bus coverage in the following areas:

- Duttons Mill Road between Middletown and Concord Roads
- Aston Mills Road (after Neumann College)
- Birney Highway
- Llewellyn Road
- Lenni Road
- New Road
- Mount Road

In Upper and Lower Chichester Townships, route 119 took over the 114 and 314 routes, essentially providing bus service along the same route. Unlike route 114, however, route 119 does not terminate at Larkin’s Corner Shopping Center but continues along Route 322 to Cheyney University before circling back to the Chester Transportation Center. Route 119 also covers route 314’s former service area in Upper Chichester, with the exception of the Naamans Creek Center, where route 119 makes one stop at the corner of Creek Parkway and Furey instead of looping through the center as route 314 did.
R2 Regional Rail Service

SEPTA’S R2 regional rail line provides seven-day-a-week service between Newark, Delaware and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Because Amtrak owns the R2 line, SEPTA leases the two outside rail tracks and the Marcus Hook station from Amtrak. SEPTA train service provides connections to Amtrak trains in Wilmington, Delaware and Philadelphia. There are 26 weekday inbound trains to Philadelphia; 27 weekday outbound trains to Marcus Hook, Wilmington, and/or Newark; 17 inbound and outbound Saturday trains; and 14 inbound and outbound Sunday trains stopping at Marcus Hook. According to the 2003 SEPTA Ridership Census, a weekday average of 357 inbound riders board the train in Marcus Hook, and 371 outbound riders depart the train. After the Wilmington and Claymont, Delaware, stations (respectively), Marcus Hook has the third highest number of boardings on the R2 line. Table 8-4 shows the 2004 schedule at the Marcus Hook station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inbound to Suburban Sta.</th>
<th>Number of Runs</th>
<th>Service Time at Marcus Hook</th>
<th>Average Headway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5:50 a.m. - 12:40 a.m.</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5:50 a.m. - 8:51 pm</td>
<td>36 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:48 a.m. - 11:18 p.m</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8:48 a.m. - 9:37 p.m</td>
<td>59 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outbound to Wilmington</th>
<th>Number of Runs</th>
<th>Service Time</th>
<th>Average Headway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5:27 a.m. - 12:09 a.m.</td>
<td>43 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4:48 p.m. - 7:10 p.m.</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:29 a.m. - 11:01 p.m.</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8:09 a.m. - 9:10 p.m.</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: October 2004 R2 Wilmington/Newark Line Schedule
*The time interval between trains in the same direction

SEPTA’s Marcus Hook train station and ticket office is located at 12th Street and Washington Avenue in Marcus Hook Borough, on the inbound side. This side has approximately 133 parking spaces. There are approximately 75 parking spaces on the Lower Chichester outbound side of the Marcus Hook station, which is south of the Market Street overpass, for a total of 208 spaces. There are approximately 150 daily spaces and 58 monthly permit spaces.

SEPTA Bus Route 119

SEPTA bus route 119 travels on Ridge Road and Huddle and Chichester Avenues in Lower Chichester. It then proceeds north into Upper Chichester on Chichester Avenue, to Larkin’s Corner Shopping Center. Then it proceeds on Furey Road and Creek Parkway to Conchester Road, where it connects with Baltimore Pike.

Route 119 provides seven - day - a - week service. It connects the Chester Transportation Center in Chester City with Cheyney University in Thornbury Township. It serves Naamans Creek Center in Upper Chichester as well as Concordville. Table 8-5 shows the 2004 schedule.
There are no bus shelters in Lower Chichester to protect riders from the elements as they wait for the route 119 bus. In Upper Chichester, Clear Channel Advertising has placed bus shelters with benches and concrete flooring along Chichester Avenue to Larkin’s Corner. Some of these shelters lack proper route number indicators and SEPTA logos as identifiers for those unfamiliar with this route.

SEPTA Bus Route 114

SEPTA bus route 114 offers seven-day-a-week service along Concord, Duttons Mill, and Pennell Roads in Aston Township. This route also services Neumann College. Route 114 connects the Darby Transportation Center in Darby Borough, the Chester Transportation Center in Chester City, and the Granite Run Mall in Middletown Township. All terminal points provide connections with other bus and regional rail routes such as routes 11, 13, 113, 115, and 305 at the Darby Transportation Center; the R2, 37, 109, 113, 117, 118, and 119 at the Chester Transportation Center; and 110, 111, and 117 at Granite Run Mall. Table 8-6 shows the 2004 schedule.

TABLE 8-6
SEPTA BUS ROUTE 114 IN ASTON TOWNSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Service Time</th>
<th>Average Headway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5:05 a.m. - 8:35 p.m.</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5:45 a.m. - 10:15 p.m.</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Westbound</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5:35 a.m. - 9:05 p.m.</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Eastbound</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:05 a.m. - 10:35 p.m.</td>
<td>62 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Westbound</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7:15 a.m. - 6:15 p.m.</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Eastbound</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6:45 a.m. - 6:40 p.m.</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: November 2004 Route 114 Schedule
* The time interval between buses in the same direction
There are no bus shelters in Aston to protect riders from the elements as they wait for the route 114 bus. The Delaware County Transportation Management Association (TMA) and Clear Channel Advertising are good sources for technical advice on this matter.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

8-40 Evaluate the routing and service frequency of SEPTA bus and rail routes in order to optimize service provision in the area.

   Technical Assistance: DCPD
   Delaware County TMA

8-41 Request that SEPTA improve the visibility of routes 114 and 119 bus stop signs. Many SEPTA signs stapled to telephone poles are either faded or missing, and need to be replaced as a basic service to riders.

   Funding Program: SEPTA

8-42 Request that SEPTA install and/or post schedules and maps as a basic service for riders at bus stops and shelters. It would be helpful for riders who are not near a bus shelter to be able to view a laminated bus route map and schedule that is stapled to a telephone pole underneath the bus stop sign.

   Funding Program: SEPTA

Aston and Lower Chichester Townships should:

8-43 Install bus shelters at routes 114 and 119 bus stops to provide riders with a dry waiting area.

   Funding Program: Shelter/advertising agency through advertising revenue
   Technical Assistance: Delaware County TMA
   Clear Channel Advertising

**Paratransit Service**

Paratransit is customized door-to-door service for individuals who are unable to use fixed-route transportation systems. The primary operator of paratransit services within Delaware County is Community Transit of Delaware County, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization based in Eddystone Borough. Trips are made on a “demand responsive” first-come, first-served basis. Most passengers schedule trips at least two or three days in advance. Rides are available Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and on Saturdays from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Although Community Transit extends its transit service to all Delaware County residents, the vast majority of passengers participate in
three key programs: SEPTA Customized Community Transportation (CCT), the Shared-Ride Program, and the Medical Assistance Transportation Program (MATP).

Under requirements of the ADA, SEPTA must provide comparable transportation service to people with disabilities who are functionally unable to use regular fixed-route transit for some or all of their transportation needs. In Delaware County, SEPTA’s CCT program is contracted to Community Transit. In order to be eligible for CCT, individuals with disabilities must complete an extensive application process and receive approval from SEPTA. Qualified CCT passengers may travel wherever SEPTA’s fixed-route transit system operates.

Community Transit is also contracted to operate the County’s Shared-Ride Program. This program allows senior citizens who are 65 years or older to use paratransit services for their transportation needs at a heavily discounted rate. The Pennsylvania State Lottery provides funding through a grant from PennDOT.

Finally, Community Transit operates Delaware County’s MATP. This program offers free transportation to approved medical facilities for low-income individuals with serious medical conditions. The Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare funds MATP, and county governments administer it. In order to qualify for the program, each applicant must complete an MATP application, which must also be certified by his/her physician. Special ACCESS cards are issued to qualified participants.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

8-44 Educate residents to ensure that they are properly informed of, and enrolled in, appropriate paratransit or shared-ride programs.

**Funding Programs:**
- Community Transit of Delaware County (CTDC)
- SEPTA

**Travel Demand Management**

Despite observed and perceived deficiencies in the transportation system, expanding the supply of roads is rarely possible. Elected officials and transportation agencies need to manage or reduce the demand for more roads. Strategies include public transit use, ridesharing, bicycling, walking, telecommuting, and compressed workweeks (four workdays instead of five in one week, or nine workdays instead of ten in a two-week period). The Delaware County TMA and DVRPC provide several travel demand management (TDM) programs that would be useful to Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Township’s employers and employees.

For example, DVRPC and the TMA operate the Share-a-Ride carpool matching program. They also operate the TransitChek® program, an employer-provided tax-free fringe
benefit that subsidizes employees’ transit and vanpooling costs. The TMA administers a “guaranteed ride home” program for its members’ employees who ride transit or carpool, in the event that they need to get home during the middle of the workday for an emergency.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships should:

8-45 Meet with employers and TMA staff to discuss carpooling, vanpooling, and the TransitChek® program to make ridesharing and transit use more attractive and work sites more accessible to existing and potential employees who do not have cars or who choose not to use them to get to work.

Funding Program: Employer funding  
Technical Assistance: Delaware County TMA  
DCPD  
DVRPC
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Communities in Aston, Lower Chichester, and Upper Chichester Townships have widely varying characteristics. The main dichotomy is between Lower Chichester Township and Aston and Upper Chichester Townships. Lower Chichester is a nearly fully developed, densely populated community with small residential lots. The dwellings are older, and there is a much greater percentage of attached housing than in Aston or Upper Chichester. It is a walkable community with short blocks and sidewalks in most areas. It also has a large area devoted to heavy industrial (mostly petroleum-related) uses. In contrast, Aston and Upper Chichester Townships are newer, developing, less dense suburban communities. They have larger land areas with residential lots developed in a curvilinear suburban fashion. Many streets lack sidewalks. Industrial uses, which constitute a small percentage of Aston and Upper Chichester, are mainly light industrial or flex parks. Due to these different characteristics, some recommendations and proposals will apply to all three Townships. Others will relate either to the more suburban Aston and Upper Chichester Townships only or to the older, more densely developed Lower Chichester.

GOAL: To revitalize the three-Township area through updates to ordinances, streetscape improvements, development of Town Centers, and preservation of residential areas.

EXISTING LAND USE INVENTORY

Area Distribution

In the fall of 2003, the Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) staff conducted a windshield survey of the existing land uses in the study area. Based on this survey, single-family detached dwellings represent 36% of all land use in the study area, by far the largest use category. Other categories had a much lower percentage. For example, the next highest groupings were open space with 13.7% and roads with 12.8%. Commercial and office uses combined to cover 8.4%, and industrial uses covered 9.6% of the area. These statistics illustrate the dominance of single-family detached dwellings. Upper Chichester and Aston Townships contain the majority of these single-family detached dwellings. Combined, all residential uses occupy almost one half (40.2%) of the three-Township area. Single-family detached dwellings occupy 36%, and all other residential uses occupy a mere 4.2%, further emphasizing the dominance of land devoted to single-family detached dwellings. Table 9-1 shows the acreage and percentage of land uses throughout the planning area. Also see Map 9-1 – Existing Land Use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Aston Acres</th>
<th>Aston %</th>
<th>Upper Chichester Acres</th>
<th>Upper Chichester %</th>
<th>Lower Chichester Acres</th>
<th>Lower Chichester %</th>
<th>3 Twp. Total Acres</th>
<th>3 Twp. Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached</td>
<td>1,506.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1,601.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3,151.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family attached</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>158.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>346.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>583.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy industrial</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>379.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>517.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industrial</td>
<td>290.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>325.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>362.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>182.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>562.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>197.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/open space</td>
<td>630.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>539.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,204.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>427.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>594.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1,121.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>207.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>301.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,762.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,311.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>691.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,765.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCPD field surveys, 2003, and Delaware County Board of Assessment parcel data

**Individual Township Distributions**

**Lower Chichester Township**

Lower Chichester’s total area is much smaller than the other Townships. Heavy industrial uses (most of which are refinery-related facilities) comprise about 19.6% of the Township’s land. Cemetery is the next highest category, accounting for 16.4% of the Township. Roads cover 14.4%, and commercial establishments cover 11.4%. Residential uses do not comprise large portions of the Township, with attached single-family dwellings covering 6.9% and detached single-family dwellings covering 6.4%. Vacant land covers 9.7% of the Township.

**Upper Chichester Township**

Upper Chichester Township is a much larger municipality than Lower Chichester. At 41.1% of the Township’s land area, residential uses occupy the largest portion of land, with single-family detached dwellings accounting for 37.1%. The category covering the next highest area is roads (13.8 %) followed by open space (12.5%), heavy industry (8.8%), and commercial uses (8.0%). These statistics emphasize the dominance of residential uses, particularly single-family detached dwellings.
Aston Township

Of the three Townships, Aston is the second largest municipality. As in Upper Chichester, residential uses (especially single-family dwellings) dominate Aston Township’s land use. Residential uses cover 43.6% of the Township, with a full 40% consisting of single-family detached dwellings. Open space occupies 16.8%, institutional uses occupy 9.6%, and industrial uses occupy 7.8%. Roads cover 11.4% of the Township.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Future Land Use Categories

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM), located at the end of this document, is the fundamental component of the comprehensive plan. It is intended to provide a general framework for guiding the Townships’ decisions concerning land use and community development. It is cognizant of the patterns of existing development but not constrained by them.

Recommendations for future land use are the essence of the comprehensive plan. These proposals indicate the type of land use determined to be most appropriate for the respective parcels or land areas. These recommendations are based on factors that include existing land use patterns; size, shape, and slope of the parcel; traffic volume and accessibility, floodplain; condition of existing structures, and other considerations.

The FLUM is not a zoning map. It is a comprehensive planning tool designed to assist the Townships in their planning and zoning efforts. Because the FLUM is based on studies of factors such as adjacent land use, zoning, topography, and access, it justifies a zoning map that is generally consistent with the FLUM. Therefore, a zoning map that is based on a well-conceived FLUM has a much stronger legal standing and validity than one not based on a comprehensive study.

The following categories are conceptual groupings displayed on Map 9-2 – Future Land Use Map. They should provide the basis for any zoning ordinance revisions enacted after the completion of this plan. As indicated on the Map, they show general locations for a range of uses; specific uses permitted, and their locations, will be indicated in any future revisions to zoning ordinances and maps.

These designations refer to a range of appropriate potential uses or activities. For example, the Civic Activity Center designation includes municipal, institutional, recreational, or other similar uses. Similarly, the Pedestrian-oriented Corridor group includes retail, office, service, apartments, and similar uses. Residential future land use categories can include home businesses, residential conversions, community residential facilities, and residentially based day care facilities in addition to the principal residential uses.
Descriptions of the categories on the FLUM are:

**Residential Uses**

1. **Low-density Residential**
   
   These areas are proposed mainly for single-family detached dwellings at a density of less than 4 units per acre. The largest concentration of this type of housing is found in the northern parts of Aston and Upper Chichester.

2. **Medium-density Residential**
   
   These areas are proposed for residential development at a density range from 4 to 14 units per acre. They generally consist of semi-detached and attached (row) homes. They are proposed throughout the three Townships.

3. **High-density Residential**
   
   These areas are proposed for multi-family housing and apartment complexes with a density greater than 14 units per acre. They are proposed mainly for Lower Chichester Township, where the existing lot layout of small lots comprising high densities is anticipated to continue.

4. **Village**
   
   A cluster of compact uses characterizes the areas in this category, which are often located the vicinity of an intersection or crossroads. Uses in this category include high-density residential and small-scale retail, commercial, and/or service uses. Community facilities such as churches, fire stations, and recreational areas can be included, particularly at the periphery. The FLUM proposes that areas currently developed according to this pattern be continued and nurtured as “Villages.” These areas are located in northern Aston Township.

**Nonresidential Uses**

1. **Pedestrian-oriented Corridor**
   
   These areas are proposed mainly for pedestrian-oriented commercial establishments located along major roads. These establishments include convenience stores, pharmacies, food stores, sandwich shops, variety stores, restaurants, and service-oriented uses such as barber shops and dry cleaners. Offices may be included as secondary uses. Apartments or other high-density dwellings may be near or above the stores, other commercial establishments, and professional offices. These establishments are intended to serve customers mainly from nearby neighborhoods.
As shown on the FLUM, the principal areas proposed as Pedestrian-oriented Corridors are Market Street in Lower Chichester, and Chichester Avenue in Lower and Upper Chichester Townships.

2. Auto-related Commercial/Shopping Center

Uses in this category include commercial areas, both in the form of shopping centers and independent retail and/or personal service shops. Rite Aid and CVS stores are examples of uses in this grouping. These establishments serve customers from the local area and nearby towns as well as some through customers.

Areas where these uses are proposed on the FLUM include along Pennell and Concord Roads (radiating out from the Five Points intersection) in Aston, and Chichester Avenue (north of the CSX railroad line) in Upper Chichester.

3. General Commercial

This category identifies areas proposed mainly for more remote, non-pedestrian-oriented, higher impact, and frequently auto-related commercial uses. Specific uses in this category include wholesale and distribution facilities, offices, gasoline service stations, and auto repair shops, and auto parts establishments.

On the FLUM, this land use category is proposed primarily along Market Street in Upper Chichester (from the boundary with Interstate 95).

4. Highway Commercial

This land use category is characterized by general commercial uses as well as other retail, food service, commercial recreation, and similar uses. Frequently these are in the form of larger (e.g., big box) stores and/or restaurants. On the FLUM, this category is proposed along the Conchester Highway (Route 322).

5. Town Center

Areas that are centrally located, compact, and characterized by a mix of uses are included in this classification. These areas are designed to function as hubs of local commercial, residential, and civic activity. Uses include retail, service, restaurant, apartment, or other high-density residences. Municipal, recreational, or other civic activities are also included.

The principal example of this land use category is the vicinity of Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road in Upper Chichester.
6. Institutional

This category includes individual community facilities such as schools, churches, municipal buildings, and libraries that are not clustered, as they would be in the Civic Activity Center designation.

7. Civic Activity Center

This designation identifies centrally located use groupings that may include civic, institutional, municipal, residential, and recreational uses. Examples of these facilities are municipal buildings, civic centers, libraries, fire and police stations, post offices, parks and recreational areas, plazas, and similar community-oriented uses. Nearby schools or churches may also be considered part of this category.

On the FLUM, areas in this category are proposed for Furey Road in Upper Chichester, Market Street and Ridge Road in Lower Chichester, and both Pennell and Concord Roads in Aston.

8. College Campus

This designation includes areas intended for and presently occupied by college buildings and facilities. Specific uses include classrooms, dormitories, administrative offices, recreational fields and facilities, auditoriums and theaters, and other facilities customarily found on college campuses. This category is proposed for the land holdings of Neumann College in Aston.

9. Open Space and Recreation

This heading encompasses areas proposed for conservation and open space as well as parks and recreation. Areas on the FLUM designated for this land use category fall along Chester Creek in Aston Township, and in the western portion of Upper Chichester Township.

10. Flex Development/Business Park

This land use category includes areas proposed for industrial, business, and office establishments; hotels and motels; and light industrial establishments in a unified, planned arrangement. On the FLUM, these areas are found throughout the study area.

11. Industrial

This land use category designates areas suited for facilities having greater impact than those in the flex development group, e.g. petroleum storage. These areas are found throughout the study area.
12. Cemetery

This designation includes areas suitable for and presently used as cemeteries.

13. Utilities

This category includes areas for utility facilities (e.g., water, sewer, and natural gas) and the CSX railroad right-of-way lines.

14. Roads and Expressways

This category denotes streets, highways, and the Interstate 95 (I-95) expressway.

**Critical Parcels**

Although the FLUM shows the recommended future uses for all properties in the three-Township area, there are certain “critical parcels” whose current vacant or underutilized status, location, size, or other characteristics make their future development particularly important to the Township where they are located, and perhaps to the entire study area. In this largely developed area, it is important to identify parcels that are expected to have a particularly strong impact. Table 9-2 identifies these critical parcels and lists their location, area, present use, and proposed use.

**TABLE 9-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL PARCELS, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twp. Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynes-Kibbel House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton Road Tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanby Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naaman’s Creek and Meetinghouse Road Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible TOD Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) and Comprehensive Plan Task Force, 2004
RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Townships should:

9-1  Review the existing zoning of each critical parcel listed in Table 9-2 to ensure that it is consistent with the proposed future use. The Townships should proactively rezone those parcels that are not presently compatible with the proposed use.

NONRESIDENTIAL LAND USE PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS

Abandoned and Vacant Buildings

Objective 9-1: To identify, evaluate, and determine whether to reuse or demolish vacant and abandoned buildings, and to determine the best possible use for these properties.

DCPD and the Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) conducted a survey of vacant housing and lots in November of 2003. It is important to note that this survey did not include the entire three-Township area. Therefore, the number of vacant houses is much lower than the number indicated in the Census 2000 data that did include the entire area. Based on this survey, twenty-five houses in the area were found to be vacant: eight units in Lower Chichester, fourteen in Upper Chichester, and three in Aston. Additionally, there was one vacant lot in Lower Chichester and three in Upper Chichester, for a total of four vacant lots.

Upper Chichester has the greatest number of vacancies, with a concentration of six units in the Twin Oaks neighborhood and two units on Chestnut Street and Wharton Avenue, just across Route 452 from Twin Oaks. In addition to these vacancies, a number of houses on blocks in the Twin Oaks neighborhood were noted as needing improvements. Two additional vacancies are located south of I-95 near the Lower Chichester border on Huddle and Johnson Avenues. The remaining four vacancies are scattered between Route 322 and I-95. There are four vacant lots in the Township. Two of these are located south of the CSX tracks at Pleasantview Avenue and Osborne Street. The other two are located north of the tracks at Rogers Avenue and Currant Street.

In Lower Chichester, the vacant units are located between Hewes Avenue and Market Street. All but one are located north of Ridge Road. There is an additional vacant unit in Analine Village near the Delaware State border. One vacant lot is located on the block bounded by Simpson Street, Yates Avenue, and White Avenues.

In Aston, there are three vacant buildings and no vacant lots. The vacancies are located on Oak Avenue, Crystle Road, and Spring Hill Drive.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, a substantial portion of the housing stock in the three Townships is in good condition. Except for Lower Chichester, a majority of the housing stock was built between the 1960s and present day. However, as noted in Map 6-1 – Lower and Upper Chichester Housing Rehab Areas and Table 6-3 – Areas/Blocis Targeted for Improvement/Rehabilitation, there are some areas where deteriorating and/or abandoned units need to be rehabilitated or demolished. Aston has subsequently updated and amplified the DCPD survey as Recommendation 9-2 suggests, providing a list of ten units in the Township that are vacant or abandoned.

Upper Chichester and Lower Chichester should:

9-2 Update and amplify the above list of vacant/abandoned houses, other uses, and properties.

The Townships should:

9-3 Identify vacant structures, evaluate their structural soundness, and either rehabilitate them for productive use or demolish them to prevent the further spread of blight.

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers

Incompatible Uses

Objective 9-2: To identify areas of incompatible uses (in addition to the examples in this plan) and select appropriate mitigation strategies such as screening and/or zoning ordinance revisions.

Incompatible land use situations involve uses with higher impacts locating near residential or other similar uses that have lower impacts. The classic example is the location of industrial establishments next to residences or similar low impact uses such as churches or schools. Another type of incompatibility is the location of larger apartments next to residences, without adequate screening and buffering safeguards. Incompatible land uses are found in a number of locations throughout the study area, such as:

- Residences across the street from oil refinery operations and storage tanks along Blueball Avenue
- Residential Excelsior Village in Upper Chichester surrounded by heavy industrial uses
- Impact of the IceWorks facility on Duttons Mill Road in Aston on the adjacent residential neighborhoods
- Commercial uses along Route 452 and Concord Road in Aston that back up to residential lots
Incompatible uses in built-up areas with established roads and infrastructure, such as the three Townships, create a difficult problem. Frequently, the academic solution is to separate them by establishing sufficient distance between the higher impact uses and the residential or similar lighter impact uses. This is not a viable solution in the study area, given the scarcity of nearby developable land, the legal right of existing uses to continue, and the contribution of industrial and other heavier uses to the local economy. In most cases, the solution will involve creating screening and buffering provisions to minimize the negative impacts. Also, preventing any future incompatibilities will serve not to further exacerbate the problem any further. For example, the uses of any infill or redeveloped parcels need to be reasonably consistent with those of the surrounding area.

Zoning revisions are a principal method to prevent additional incompatible uses and protect residential and similar uses from those with higher impacts. These revisions include:

- Changes to zoning boundary lines
- Revised lists of permitted uses
- Avoidance of strict cumulative zoning arrangements
- Adequate dimensional standards
- Comprehensive screening, buffering, and landscaping

Where a list of permitted uses in a given district allows both residential and nonresidential uses, or in some cases apartments and single-family residences, incompatible uses may arise. Revising the local zoning ordinances to realign zoning boundaries, and revising the lists of permitted uses to prevent incompatibilities, would minimize future incompatible use problems. Zoning boundaries should be drawn so that
there is sufficient area and/or a physical barrier between, for example, industrial and residential uses. Also, screening, buffering, and landscaping provisions need to be strengthened to protect residences, institutions, and similar uses from the negative influences of industrial and other higher impact establishments. Finally, comprehensive performance standards in the zoning ordinance would place limits on various higher impact uses, thus controlling the severity of their impact on adjacent residential or other low impact uses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Some of the most significant land use issues in the Three Townships concern the incompatible uses of land and structures. Dense development in portions of the study area has intensified the incompatible use problem. Revisions to the zoning ordinances are a principal way to prevent the creation of additional nonconforming uses.

The Townships should:

9-4 Review zoning ordinances to determine what revisions are needed to minimize the negative impact of existing incompatible uses (e.g., screening provisions), and prevent new incompatibilities by ensuring that the permitted uses in a given district are such that new incompatibilities are avoided.

   Technical Assistance: DCPD

9-5 Review zoning ordinances to determine whether existing screening and buffering requirements adequately protect existing incompatible uses.

   Technical Assistance: DCPD

**Streetscape Improvements**

**Objective 9-3:** To support the implementation of streetscape projects to improve the appearance and stimulate business activity along commercial corridors, especially in nodes of commercial activity.

The appearance of a downtown area or commercial corridor is a critical component in attracting patrons, due to its impact on the quality of the walking and shopping experience. Improvements in appearance would make this area more attractive. This, in turn, would lead to an increase in shoppers patronizing the businesses located there, helping to stabilize and revitalize these shopping areas. Streetscape improvements are proposed for Market Street-Pennell Road, Chichester Avenue, Concord Road, and other main roads in the area to improve their appearance, appeal, and function. These streetscape components may include:
Street trees
- New and/or widened sidewalks
- Benches, street lights, trash receptacles, and other street furniture with a common design theme
- Plazas and small landscaped meeting places for social interaction
- Signage with a common theme
- Rehabilitated and upgraded façades
- Traffic calming measures such as curb bump-outs, street medians, and raised or textured crosswalks.

Since commercial corridors evolved to accommodate the automobile, it is not surprising that pedestrian amenities are virtually nonexistent within the typical roadway corridor. Although sidewalks do exist along portions of Route 452 and other main roads, there are large areas of unattractive streetscapes and inadequate pedestrian amenities. Multiple curb cuts, sidewalks in poor condition, lack of shade trees and landscaping, little or no street furniture, and deep building setbacks all contribute to an inhospitable pedestrian environment.

Streetscape improvements signal the business community that the governing body is serious about being a partner in sustaining the health of a downtown or commercial corridor. They also set the stage for private sector investment. An enhanced corridor will present a positive image to the thousands of commuters who pass through each day. As the symbolic heart of the three Townships, a renewed Market Street-Pennell Road could
become an important source of civic pride and heightened commercial activity. Locally, Route 452 is called Pennell Road in Aston and Market Street in Upper and Lower Chichester. The road’s character changes as it traverses the Townships. It has a somewhat rural feel in the northern portion of Aston, winding through woodlands, recreational areas, a mobile home park, occasional industrial and commercial establishments, and a few scattered residences. In this area there is little need for pedestrian-oriented streetscape improvements since destinations are far apart and not within reasonable walking distance.

Farther south, there are numerous businesses and other uses close to one another in the vicinity of the Five Points area (where Concord and Knowlton Roads intersect Pennell Road) and further south along Pennell Road. Streetscape improvements should be installed in this area to improve the roadway appearance, provide resting places, provide crosswalks, and improve or provide sidewalks. Although the Five Points area may be considered a center or node of commercial and civic activity, these improvements should be provided along nearly the entire length of Route 452 in Aston. Other areas in Aston suitable for streetscaping improvements are Concord Road at Duttons Mill Road, Duttons Mill Road from Pennell Road to Pancoast Avenue, Pennell Road at Weir Road, and the triangular parcel at Five Points (future site of a Township memorial park). Because of the varying types of development along Pennell Road, the Township should conduct an in-depth study of the road to determine the types of streetscape improvements suitable for the different sectors of the corridor.

There is no location of with a similarly high concentration of shopping centers and other commercial uses along Route 452 in Upper Chichester Township. Streetscape improvements there should be carried out mainly along Chichester Avenue. In November of 2003, Upper Chichester Township hired Thomas Comitta Associates, Inc., to prepare a Streetscape Enhancement Plan for a 1¼ mile segment of Chichester Avenue. The plan suggests improvements such as new street trees, new sidewalks and streetlights, improved crosswalks, and other streetscape improvements along this road segment.

In March of 2004, the Upper Chichester Township adopted amendments to its subdivision and land development ordinance, with provisions relating to a variety of streetscape components. Chapter 8 is titled Chichester Avenue Design Standards. The Township intends for improvements to be performed in an incremental fashion, beginning with the Chichester Avenue and Meetinghouse Road intersection. The goal is attracting developers to improve properties at given intersections within the streetscape area and, as part of this improvement, to construct the streetscape improvements noted in the Streetscape Enhancement Plan. In the summer of 2004, Task Force representatives from Upper Chichester advised the Delaware County Planning Department that the Township was considering extending its streetscaping efforts farther north along Chichester Avenue to the vicinity of Flora Lane.

In contrast to both Aston and Upper Chichester, in Lower Chichester a good number of commercial and residential uses front on Route 452. Civic and commercial activity is centered on or very near this road segment, which is relatively short compared to the
other two Townships. For these reasons, streetscape improvements are very appropriate here. In 2004, Lower Chichester Township applied for a $75,000 Revitalization Program planning grant to develop a plan for a wide variety of streetscape improvements. The Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan (2003) contains specific recommendations for streetscape improvements, outlines approaches to conduct this initiative, and identifies sources of funding to cover the costs. The Revitalization Plan’s recommendations are consistent with those in this plan.

It should also be noted that incompatible, poorly designed, and poorly placed signs along main roads are often eyesores. Many signs along Market Street-Pennell Road, Concord Road, Chichester Avenue, and portions of Concheste Road are garish and/or constructed from low-quality materials. Many of these signs do not comply with existing sign regulations. These conditions contribute to an unsightly appearance along the commercial corridors, making them less inviting to prospective customers. Part of the problem is that the existing sign provisions are not diligently enforced. Additional and/or stronger sign regulations are needed, particularly to require or encourage a common design theme for signs in a particular area or district. The provision of more harmonious signs along major roads is an important component in improving their streetscape.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Townships need different kinds of streetscape improvements along the major roadways. The character of Pennell Road varies in different sections, necessitating different kinds of treatments. In Upper Chichester, Chichester Avenue is characterized by pedestrian-oriented development, in contrast to the predominance of shopping centers in Aston. In Lower Chichester, Market Street exhibits a more dense and mixed pattern of development that includes residential uses.

The Townships should:

9-6 Provide unified streetscape improvements with a common design theme along Route 452 (Market Street/Pennell Road). This would both improve roadside appearance and help to establish a single identity. This can be accomplished by providing banners, streetlight poles, benches, signs, and other fixtures with a common color, design, outline, and/or logo.

**Funding Programs:**

- Federal
- Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)
- TE Program
- Transportation and Community and System Preservation (TCSP) pilot program
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
Aston and Upper Chichester should:

9-7 Cooperate in a study to determine specific streetscape enhancements needed along Route 452. These efforts should be coordinated with Lower Chichester’s Revitalization Program streetscape studies in order to achieve the unified theme noted in Recommendation 9-6. The Townships should also consider the streetscape improvements in neighboring Marcus Hook Borough.

Funding Programs: Federal
    ISTEA
    Transportation Enhancement (TE Program)
    TCSP pilot program
    CMAQ

State
    Communities of Opportunity Program
    Community Revitalization Program
    Infrastructure Development Program
    New Communities Program
    Home Town Streets/Safe Routes to School

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
    DCPD
    PennDOT

9-8 Develop landscaped gateway areas at each Township’s entrance points, with emphasis on those along major roads such as Route 452, Concord Road, Chichester Avenue, Ridge Road, and other important arteries.
Lower Chichester should:

9-9 Implement the streetscape-related recommendations of the Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan, which includes streetscape improvements and revitalization plans for Market Street, Ridge Road, and Township Line Road/Laughead Avenue.

Funding Programs: TE Program
CMAQ
Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program
Delaware County Revitalization program

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
DCPD
PennDOT

Upper Chichester should:

9-10 Apply for funding to expand streetscape improvement efforts beyond the Streetscape Enhancement Plan for Chichester Avenue, with particular emphasis on Route 452.

Funding Programs: Federal
ISTEA
TE Program
TCSP pilot program
CMAQ

State
Communities of Opportunity Program
Community Revitalization Program
Infrastructure Development Program
Civic Activity Centers

Objective 9-4: To develop a multi-purpose municipal/civic activity center in Lower Chichester Township and to further enhance existing civic activity centers in Upper Chichester and Aston Townships.

Frequently, the civic life of a community takes place in a small municipal building that is the site of official meetings and a few other events. However, municipalities can provide a wide variety of facilities and events in order to enhance livability and enrich the lives of residents. To that end, some communities provide multi-purpose centers/complexes with facilities to support civic, educational, recreational, cultural, and entertainment-centered activities, programs, and events. The case for developing full-service Civic Activity Centers is regarded as sufficiently compelling to merit its own future land use category, as noted above in this chapter.

Aston

Aston’s principal municipal facilities exist at two separate locations. The Pennell Road property consists of a renovated municipal building housing administrative and municipal offices, the police department, Township paramedics, and a public meeting room as well as the adjacent public works department garage, storage shed, and salt storage building. The Concord Road property, which opened in the fall of 1997, contains the Aston community center and library; it also houses the Township’s files. Additionally, there are outdoor sports and recreational fields and a tot lot for kids. Combined, these facilities can accommodate a wide variety of civic, educational, and cultural events.

Future plans for the municipal building site include the relocation of the public works garage and storage sheds, and the construction of a new municipal building set back farther from Pennell Road. The police department would operate out of an expanded facility located either in the new municipal building or on the community center site. The community center site is surrounded by open space that is owned by the Penn-Delco School District. The Township hopes to maintain this area as open space or a parks and recreation facility.

Upper Chichester

Upper Chichester Township’s government operations are located at the Township municipal complex on Furey Road. The complex comprises the municipal administration and community center building, the highway and sanitation department office building
and garage, the Township police station building, and a large landscaped outdoor recreational area that includes sports fields, a gazebo, tables, and seating. Completed in June of 2003, the new administration and community center building is the complex’s centerpiece. The facility contains the offices of the Township administration and support staff, two conference rooms, a public meeting hall, and a large gym with two basketball courts, a volleyball court, an indoor track, and an exercise and weight room. The gym, field house, and kitchen are used for a variety of Township functions and community events.

Along with the buildings at the municipal complex, there are athletic fields for baseball, football, soccer, tennis, and other activities. A pavilion with seating overlooks the fields. This complex affords local residents a very wide range of municipal, recreational, and related facilities.

**Lower Chichester**

The Lower Chichester municipal building is part of a cluster of Township buildings located at the intersection of Chichester Avenue and Market Street (Route 452). It includes the administrative offices, youth center, senior center, police station, and the vacant building formerly used by the Oddfellows fraternal group. Since the police department needs more space, it appears that a new facility at a different location is in order. The vacant Oddfellows building is situated south of the Township building at the northwest corner of Market Street and Ridge Road. As recommended in the Chapter 7 – Community Facilities and Services, the Township should study this entire parcel and create a plan for a unified, multi-purpose municipal complex at this location.

Task Force members representing Lower Chichester have discussed their ideas for a municipal complex/town center area. They would like to develop a town center complex that includes a refurbished municipal building, police department, youth center, and the Oddfellows building they purchased. The area could possibly include plazas and meeting places for residents, and would serve as a hub of community activity.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The character of each Township’s Civic Activity Centers is different from that of the others. For example, Upper Chichester has a large municipal complex devoted to these civic, recreational, and Township-related activities. In Aston, many of these activities take place on one of two separate but neighboring parcels. In Lower Chichester, these activities are housed on one parcel, but the facilities are older and their layout is not ideal. Therefore, the Township desires the creation of a more efficient design/layout of these facilities. (See also Chapter 7 – Community Facilities and Services.)

The Townships should:

9-11 Evaluate the extent to which the municipal complex provides the services and programs of a multi-purpose Civic Activity Center (described above); identify
shortcomings in services, facilities, and programs; and prepare plans to address these gaps.

Funding Programs:  Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP)

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers
Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)
DCPD

9-12 Implement the improvements identified in evaluations and plans, such as those in Recommendation 9-9 (above).

Funding Programs:  Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program
Keystone Historic Preservation Grant Program

Technical Assistance: Township Engineers

Aston Township should:

9-13 Investigate the feasibility of providing an identified walkway connecting the municipal building on Pennell Road with the community center on Concord Road.

Funding Programs:  TE Program
CMAQ

Technical Assistance: Township Engineer

DELWARE COUNTY REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

In the fall of 2002, Delaware County Council established the Delaware County Renaissance Program with the goal of revitalizing older communities by making them more livable, safe, attractive, and economically viable. The program was subsequently renamed the Delaware County Revitalization Program. The planning phase of the Revitalization Program provided funding for the development of Action Plans that address the economic development and revitalization needs of targeted Delaware County municipalities. These municipalities were grouped into five Revitalization Program Planning Areas. Of the three Townships in the study area, only Lower Chichester qualified for the Revitalization Program; thus, Lower Chichester Township is part of Area 1.

Delaware County Council selected a consultant for each of the five Revitalization Program Planning Areas to prepare an Action Plan for revitalization. The municipalities in each Planning Area appointed a Task Force to guide the consultant in developing the Action Plan. Each Action Plan’s objective was to formulate a five-year revitalization strategy by preparing a prioritized list of projects that could realistically be implemented. The Action Plans also identified anticipated project costs, responsible parties, and
potential funding sources. Delaware County Council has continued to allocate $1 million per fiscal year that the Revitalization Program has been in operation, to fund its projects.

**Relationship Between This Plan and the Action Plan Projects**

**Objective 9-5:** To coordinate the relevant Delaware County Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan projects with the objectives and recommendations of this comprehensive plan.

As noted in Chapter 1 – Introduction and throughout this document, the overall purpose of this plan is to provide a vision, goals, and general direction for the three Townships. The plan also sets forth recommendations for achieving these objectives. These recommendations are designed to lead the three Townships toward revitalization in the various areas discussed herein, e.g., housing, transportation, land use, and community facilities.

Ideally, this comprehensive plan would have been completed prior to the preparation of the Revitalization Program Action Plans. This would have been the logical progression because the comprehensive plan establishes the goals and fundamental direction for the Townships. Other studies should stem from and be consistent with the comprehensive plan. However, the Revitalization Program was initiated and the Action Plans were prepared before the comprehensive plan was completed. However, the Area 1 Action Plan identifies some of the same problems and recommendations that are indicated in this comprehensive plan. Though it has a different emphasis and level of specificity, the Action Plan offers fundamental methods and directions to revitalize older communities, as does this comprehensive plan. This connection will likely be strengthened with the submission of subsequent phases of Planning Area 1 implementation projects.

DCPD recommends that Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester (as well as the other municipalities in Planning Area 1) adopt the original Area 1 Action Plan as an element of this comprehensive plan.

**Area 1 Action Plan Projects**

In the spring of 2003, the consultant in each of the five Revitalization Program Planning Areas completed the Action Plan for that area. Lower Chichester Township is part of Revitalization Program Planning Area 1, which comprises three municipalities: Lower Chichester Township, Marcus Hook Borough, and Trainer Borough. The Planning Area 1 consultant (Heyer, Gruel & Associates) proposed a variety of long- and short-range projects. The Planning Area 1 Action Plan lists six projects located within or impacting Lower Chichester Township.

1. **Stormwater/Drainage Improvements**

   This project, which impacts Lower Chichester and Marcus Hook, would require the construction of a stormwater facility in Lower Chichester and additional
piping to connect with the existing stormwater system. This project will reduce or eliminate flooding as well as reducing nonpoint water pollution.

2. **Township Line Road/Laughead Avenue Pathways/Streetscape Improvements**

   This project, located in Lower Chichester and Trainer, involves the design of a 3,500-foot multi-use bicycle-pedestrian pathway. This pathway would provide an important connection along a stretch of road that is presently without sidewalks. The project will also include a streetscape improvement plan showing sidewalk enhancements and new lighting.

3. **Transit-Oriented Development Feasibility Study**

   This project will assess the feasibility of developing a mixed-use development on the Lower Chichester side of the rail corridor. The project would complement Marcus Hook’s on-going efforts to create a transit-oriented development (TOD) adjacent to the train station. A TOD project would revitalize this area by creating new housing and commercial development, increasing train ridership, and providing bicycle and pedestrian paths connecting with the train station.

4. **Ridge Road Corridor Study**

   This project would provide streetscape improvements along Ridge Road and connect Lower Chichester’s main commercial districts to those in Trainer. Improvements would include sidewalks, street trees, lighting, crosswalks, bike paths, landscaping, and traffic calming measures. The project would provide a connection to the proposed Marcus Hook Creek Greenway and proposed transit-oriented developments in Marcus Hook and Lower Chichester. Since Ridge Road is a major artery in both municipalities, its improved appearance would have a positive economic and aesthetic impact.

5. **Hewes Avenue Park Feasibility Analysis**

   This study would analyze the feasibility of providing a variety of improvements to Lower Chichester Township’s principal recreational facility. Physical improvements would include a new pavilion, lighting, and fountain; landscaping; and tree plantings. The project would improve the livability of the Township by significantly upgrading the park’s facilities, thereby improving local residents’ recreational opportunities.

6. **Market Street Corridor Improvements Plan**

   This project calls for the development of a detailed plan for streetscape improvements along Market Street in Lower Chichester. Improvements would include new curbs and sidewalks, a landscaped gateway with Marcus Hook, decorative lighting and banners where appropriate, new street trees, and
landscaped public areas. Since Market Street is a gateway to the Township’s commercial and civic areas, the creation of a pedestrian-oriented corridor and linkage with the planned streetscape improvements along Township Line Road will help to revitalize Lower Chichester and surrounding areas.

The projects set forth in the Area 1 Action Plan are consistent with the recommendations in this three-Township comprehensive plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to impart a framework and overall direction for these Revitalization Program projects, they should be coordinated with the objectives and recommendations of this comprehensive plan.

The Townships should:

9-14 Coordinate this comprehensive plan’s recommendations and funding programs with those of the projects in the Planning Area 1 Action Plan. This will provide a direction and funding sources for specific improvement activities. Although only Lower Chichester is eligible for Revitalization Program funding, both Aston and Upper Chichester should participate in any efforts, particularly those involving Route 452. This road traverses all three Townships and they are trying to create a unified design/appearance along it (see the Streetscape Improvements section above).

ZONING ORDINANCE REVISIONS

Objective 9-6: To implement the zoning revisions recommended here to bring about consistency between this plan and the provisions of the local zoning codes, and to better control land usage in the Townships.

The zoning ordinances of Aston (1992) and Upper Chichester (1991) are much more up-to-date than that of Lower Chichester, which was adopted in 1968. In the last several decades, Aston and Upper Chichester have felt more development pressure than Lower Chichester. As a result, they have updated their ordinances to help control the numerous proposals for residential subdivisions, nonresidential subdivisions, and land developments. Notwithstanding its lower development activity, Lower Chichester needs a complete update of its zoning code to control future development and redevelopment activity and to provide appropriate definitions and standards for parking, signs, and many other components that relate to existing conditions and/or new development.

Lower Chichester Township

The ordinance is inadequate, containing only about 20 pages, and needs to be revised. Some of the principal deficiencies and omissions are:
- Districts do not contain an objective statement
- Definitions are few, outdated, and/or extraneous
- Contrary to current practice, the ordinance contains a long list of prohibited uses
- There is little connection between the ordinance and the existing comprehensive plan

With regard to residential districts, the R-1 district classification requires a minimum lot area of 16,000 square feet, which appears out-of-character for this densely populated community. The R-2 and R-3 district classifications do not require a minimum lot area. Very few uses are permitted by special exception or conditional use, and those that do not include express standards, as required by the Municipal Planning Code (MPC). Dimensional requirements are not sufficient and do not contain impervious surface provisions. Areas of rowhouses with small lot sizes of approximately 2,000 square feet (e.g., the vicinity of Chadwick, Irwin, and Fronefield Avenues) are zoned the same as areas with single-family detached units on lots of approximately 7,500 square feet (e.g., the vicinity of Hewes Avenue and Edwards Street).

The main commercial district appears to be zoned as a GC-General Commercial district. Although this district allows retail, service, and other commercial uses, it contains virtually no other standards. At less than one page in length, it is simply inadequate and should be completely revised.

In 1991, the Township added a Business Park district that is much more extensive and well-developed than the other commercial or industrial districts. It provides for commercial, business, and industrial uses on lots between 30,000 square feet (commercial) and 40,000 square feet (industrial) and provides numerous dimensional requirements. Other districts should be modeled after the Business Park district.

Industrial districts are also inadequate, with both the GI-General Industrial and the LI-Limited Industrial districts only about one-half page in length and lacking many of the provisions that should be contained therein.

The ordinance is also deficient in terms of provisions relating to parking, signs, landscaping/screening, and performance standards (which are especially important in view of the large industrial areas near residential and commercial uses). In short, the Township needs a completely revised zoning ordinance that is consistent with this comprehensive plan and contains provisions consistent with modern principles and needs.

Discussions between DCPD and Lower Chichester Township have identified some areas as suitable for rezoning. The areas and proposed rezoning classifications are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed Rezoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vicinity of Chadwick, Irwin, and Fronefield Avenues</td>
<td>Revised R-3 district that allows twins and rowhouses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A narrow area west of Market Street and south of Ridge Road From R-2 to General Commercial

**Aston Township**

The Aston Zoning Ordinance, adopted in 1992, appears to be well crafted. It provides for a variety of uses, both by right and special exception, and includes standards for those permitted by special exception. Each zoning district contains an opening statement of intent to advise the ordinance user of the types of uses intended in the district.

Discussions between DCPD and Aston Township have identified some areas as suitable for rezoning. The areas and proposed rezoning classifications are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed Rezoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester Creek area of northern Aston</td>
<td>From Limited Industrial to Open Space/Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Road near Elm Avenue</td>
<td>From R-1 to Open Space/Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duttons Mill Road (near Old Mill Road)</td>
<td>From Limited Industrial to Open Space/Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birney Highway (at Rolling Hills Park)</td>
<td>From Residential to Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upper Chichester Township**

The Upper Chichester Township Zoning Ordinance, adopted in 1991, appears to be well crafted. It generally complies with sound zoning principles and most of the requirements of the MPC. It provides for a variety of uses, both by right and special exception, and includes standards for those permitted by special exception. Each zoning district contains an opening statement of intent to advise the ordinance user of the types of uses intended in the district.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

As noted in Chapter 12 – Implementation, the zoning ordinance is generally the principal document that guides the implementation of this comprehensive plan’s recommendations. For this reason, the Townships need to seriously consider adopting the zoning revisions discussed in this section and the specific proposals recommended below. Section 1104 of the MPC requires that the Townships bring their zoning ordinances in line with the proposals of this plan within two years of its adoption, if they enter into an implementation agreement after adoption. While rezoning specific parcels is a local matter, the preparation of a revised zoning ordinance is ordinarily not done by the municipality alone, but rather with the assistance of DCPD or a private consultant.
The Townships should:

9-15 Review their zoning ordinances and revise them to ensure compliance with the MPC, as amended.

Funding Programs: CDBG Program
LUPTAP
Delaware County Revitalization Program (Lower Chichester)
Township funds
Technical Assistance: DCPD

Aston Township should:

9-16 Evaluate and consider rezoning the areas specified above.

Technical Assistance: DCPD

Lower Chichester Township should:

9-17 Revise and update zoning codes to remove out-of-date zoning ordinances, make them fully compliant with the MPC, and incorporate modern planning and zoning approaches and concepts.

Funding Programs: LUPTAP
CDBG Program
Technical Assistance: DCPD

REGIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The three-Township area shares common boundaries with ten municipalities: Middletown, Concord, Bethel, and Chester Townships; Chester Heights, Marcus Hook, Trainer, Brookhaven, and Upland Boroughs; and the City of Chester.

None of this comprehensive plan’s proposals would create a negative impact on uses in adjacent communities. The uses and proposals along the boundaries are, therefore, compatible with the existing and proposed development in surrounding communities. Although the Delaware County comprehensive plan has not been adopted to date, DCPD (which is preparing that plan) expects adoption in 2005. However, since most of the conclusions of the County-wide plan are already in place, it appears that existing and proposed development in the Townships is generally consistent with the objectives and proposals of Delaware County’s comprehensive plan.
LAND USE MAP AND ZONING MAP RELATIONSHIP

Frequently, discussions of planning and zoning reveal confusion between a future land use map (FLUM) and a zoning map. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that the FLUM is not a zoning map. The FLUM is a generalized statement of reasonable and appropriate future uses. For example, the FLUM may propose one general use for an area, e.g., commercial. The zoning map may divide this same area into several different commercial districts that allow very different types of commercial establishments with varied dimensional requirements. FLUMs are more general, while zoning maps are very specific.

The FLUM and this document also serve as the basis for any zoning ordinance and zoning map amendments prepared after this plan. The zoning map is, of course, part of the zoning code and is not part of this plan.
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LIVABILITY OF THE TOWNSHIPS

In the late 1980s, a new approach emerged for the creation, design, and revitalization of regions, communities, and neighborhoods. Originally called the “neo-traditional” development, the ideas and principles were refined and renamed “New Urbanism,” and later Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). The main purpose of these approaches was to change development practices by designing more compact and walkable communities. These communities are characterized by a mix of uses and a variety of building densities around a focal point consisting of civic buildings, green areas, and/or commercial mixed-use centers. The goal was creating neighborhoods and communities with residences located a short distance from and accessible to shopping, employment, schools, churches, recreation, and civic and cultural buildings and facilities. This design approach remedied some of the problems created by the post-World War II suburban sprawl style of development, such as traffic congestion; excessive travel time to work, school, and shopping; air pollution; and a decrease in personal interaction.

Another term related to the concept of New Urbanism is Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). TND emphasizes the design and development of communities based on a master plan that is supported by codes rooted in New Urbanist principles. TOD, on the other hand, is based on the presence of a major transit route (bus or train) and/or a major highway that (a) provides access to rail stations near the roadway and/or (b) serves as a road carrying an important bus route(s). Typical uses encouraged in TODs include high-density apartments or mixed-use developments located near public transit stops. TOD also encourages sidewalks and trails to support pedestrian and bicycle usage, and plazas and open spaces to promote the development’s livability.

The remainder of this chapter lists and describes the features of a “livable” community, lists and describes those components that presently exist in the three-Township area, and discusses those that can be added or enhanced to make the area even more livable and desirable.

PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The main elements of a model “livable” community designed along the lines of a TND are listed here. There should be a town center, with an open space or an institutional use such as a government building, library, or post office. The approximate width of the TND should be
no greater than ¼ mile from the center to all edges. There should be mixed uses throughout and buildings designed to allow for future change. Efforts should be made to build on a “human scale” rather than one designed for the automobile. Trees should be established to benefit pedestrians by providing a canopy of shade and an established neighborhood feeling. Vertical infrastructure, such as street lamps, hedges, fences, walls, and benches that create a structured feeling while providing pedestrian amenities should also be provided. Some components of livable communities include:

**Residential**

- Shallow setbacks and yards, especially front yards
- Front porches creating a transition from and connection between the house and street
- Garages accessed by mutual alleyways placed in the rear of properties
- Mix of housing types such as single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, and apartments
- Differences in housing size, amenities, and materials to accommodate different income groups

**Commercial**

- Mixed uses such as the corner grocery store near the town center or in residential areas
- Façade improvement, often involving restoration and preservation of original architectural features
- Street furniture such as distinctive benches and trash receptacles
- Plazas and small green spaces where possible
- Parking areas in front of stores, shops, and offices, or behind these establishments

**Pedestrian**

- Sidewalks, crosswalks, walkways, and trails
- Benches, street lamps, and bus shelters
- Multiple destinations within walking distance

**Streets, Alleys, and Parking**

- A grid street system, with multiple options for ingress and egress
- Alleys and service lanes
- On-street parking
- Narrow streets, tight corners, and no cul-de-sacs

**Recreation**

- Parks, play fields, and natural open space areas
- Scenic views
• Concerts, festivals, picnics, sports leagues, team contests, dramatic plays, and other presentations

**Psychological/Intangible**

• Sense of place
• Pride in community, neighborhood, and/or home evidenced by performing needed maintenance and repairs
• Neighborliness
• Appreciation and celebration of local history
• Civic events, cultural programs, and recreational activities

Where possible, the Townships should require or encourage developers of new building projects to incorporate as many of the above features as appropriate for the type of development.

**Features of Livability Present in the Townships**

As previously noted, the study area consists of two different types of municipalities. Aston and Upper Chichester are relatively large, have grown substantially in the recent past, and are still undergoing some limited growth. In contrast, Lower Chichester is an older, more compact community that is developed, except for some limited nonresidential parcels. Lower Chichester’s residential areas have been laid out as small, compact lots with a high density. In contrast, those in Aston and Upper Chichester have been developed in a more suburban fashion with larger lots on curvilinear streets and houses set back farther from streets than in Lower Chichester.

This section will illustrate that Lower Chichester contains different livability features from those found in the other Townships. Also, because of its more compact development, Lower Chichester has more such features than the two larger, more suburban Townships.

**Small Scale**

Because Lower Chichester’s stores, residential neighborhoods, community facilities, and recreational areas are within a short distance of one another, residents can walk or bicycle to most of these places in less than ten minutes, making the automobile unnecessary for many local trips. This accessibility is further aided by the fact that there are sidewalks along most streets, and the Township has received funding to extend sidewalks to the few major streets where they do not presently exist (see also Pedestrian Facilities section on page 10-5).

In contrast, Aston and Upper Chichester are larger, more sprawling communities. As they approach full build-out, little can be done to change their basic character. The Townships should, however, encourage developers of new projects to make them compact and walkable to the greatest extent possible.
**Variety of Uses**

The plan area contains a wide variety of uses and activities. People can live, shop, work, play, worship, study, and create here. This assortment of uses enables residents to partake in various facets of the human experience without having to travel beyond the area. Long car trips are required less frequently than in other communities where only one or two different uses are found close to one another. This variety of uses in proximity is especially evident in Lower Chichester, where various residential housing types are situated close to commercial, industrial, institutional, recreational, and other uses and activities.

Although there are also a wide variety of uses in Aston and Upper Chichester, developments of single-family detached dwellings are prevalent and comprise a large portion of the Townships. Other single use developments (e.g., townhouses) are also situated throughout these two Townships. The best examples of a variety of uses in relative proximity is along Chichester Avenue in Upper Chichester, the Five Points area in Aston, and a few “village type” areas along Mount and Crozerville Roads in Aston.

**Front Porches and Houses Near Streets**

The majority of dwellings and commercial establishments in Lower Chichester are located on relatively small lots with small front yards of a depth usually not more than 15 to 20 feet. Also, a very large percentage of the houses have front porches. These features promote interaction between the residents on their porches, and between neighbors and pedestrians passing along the sidewalks. This interaction fosters a sense of familiarity, neighborhood security, and cohesiveness.

These features of Lower Chichester stand in contrast to the prevailing suburban development pattern in Aston and Upper Chichester, where houses are commonly located 50 to 75 feet from the street and public sidewalks are lacking. The garage and the driveway often occupy a significant and prominent part of the property. It is apparent that this type of development, although it accommodates automobiles very well, deters interaction among residents and in many cases contributes to feelings of personal isolation.

**Pedestrian Facilities**

As noted in Chapter 8 – Transportation, a system of sidewalks and trails can improve livability and walkability by reducing the need for automobile use, thereby encouraging exercise, recreation, and social interaction; improving health; and reducing air pollution. Encouraging students to walk to school can also reduce school busing costs.

Pedestrian-friendly Lower Chichester has compact blocks, sidewalks along streets, good pedestrian connectivity, and low vehicle speeds and volumes on most of its streets. Many of the sidewalks are old and in need of repair or replacement, however. The Township should pay close attention to the condition of its sidewalks and make improvements as
needed. Walkability will be further enhanced by the completion of several pedestrian, bicycle, and streetscape projects as part of the Delaware County Revitalization Program.

Although destinations in Aston and Upper Chichester are more distant from one another, most of the streets do have sidewalks.

The walkability of Aston Township, and the area in general, would be notably improved by the construction of the proposed Chester Creek Branch Rail-Trail. This 6.7-mile multi-use trail would extend through Aston Township along Chester Creek from the former Wawa train station to Upland Borough. Once finished, it will be a truly regional recreational trail, with value to commuters. The trail will provide a useful link between varied recreational, historic, transportation, and business resources through scenic, rolling, forested woodland. The Friends of the Chester Creek Branch are negotiating to obtain an easement from SEPTA, which owns the railroad right-of-way. Chapter 8 – Transportation, which discusses pedestrian and bicycle facilities, also specifies some areas where sidewalks are still needed.

**Meeting Places**

Although the Townships have some areas that are considered good meeting places for social interaction (places where people gravitate to meet, socialize, etc.), these areas are limited. One exception is the municipal complex on Furey Road in Upper Chichester. This complex provides facilities for civic and recreational activity, but additional places are needed that are more geographically central to the community, i.e., places to which people can walk or bike. Each Township needs to develop additional places of this nature.

**Trees**

Trees serve a number of important functions. A tree canopy cools the neighborhood. Buildings shaded by trees require less energy to cool. People walking along a shady street stay cooler and enjoy the experience more, as do bicyclists. Trees are also an important traffic-calming tool, and slower traffic saves lives. Research shows that drivers on otherwise comparable streets drive more slowly on streets with a tree canopy than on treeless streets. Trees do not need a great deal of land; they can be planted in the sidewalk area, a median buffer, or the parking lane. Deciduous trees are preferable to evergreens, since the latter darken the street on winter days when more light would be welcome. The maintenance costs associated with trees include trimming leaves, removing debris, repairing damage from fallen trees, and repairing the buckling of streets and sidewalks. The amenity and property value benefits of trees, however, are well worth the expense.

**Programs and Events**

As noted in Chapter 5 – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, the Townships offer a wide range of events and programs for the civic, cultural, and recreational enrichment of their residents. Where possible, these programs and events should be reviewed to ensure that
they target a variety of age groups. A rich array of such age-specific opportunities would further enhance the area’s livability.

FEATURES THAT SHOULD BE PROVIDED OR UPGRADED

Objective 10-1: To provide the components noted below and in the Delaware County Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan by obtaining funding and executing the steps to complete projects designed to upgrade livability.

Meeting Places

Meeting places such as plazas or squares for people to meet and interact are an important component that enhances a community’s livability. Municipal Civic Activity Centers are important meeting places (as described more fully in Chapter 7 – Community Facilities and Chapter 9 – Land Use). For example, Upper Chichester’s activity center provides many opportunities for personal interaction in addition to being a forum for civic activity and recreation.

Effective centers of community activity may be characterized by improvements such as benches, period lighting, landscaping, distinctive paving, freestanding clocks, and/or sculptures or artifacts relating to the history and economic activity of the area. These features could be provided in a variety of locations such as parks, plazas, significant intersections, and portions of municipal complexes. Some of these places should serve as sites for civic gatherings, holiday commemorations, festivals, fairs, etc. Frequently, these improvements encourage residents and local merchants to make improvements to their own properties. Combined, these activities tend to attract economic development and improve the overall quality of life in the region.

Housing Variety

There are a variety of housing types in the area, as noted in Chapter 6 – Housing. However, the housing stock is frequently old (particularly in Lower Chichester) and lacks modern amenities such as large kitchens and closets. New housing construction should emphasize single-family dwellings with the conveniences and amenities of modern housing.

Walkways and Trails

As mentioned in this chapter, Chapter 5 – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, and Chapter 8 – Transportation, the Townships should develop a system of multi-use trails serving pedestrians, joggers, bikers, skateboarders, etc. These trails should generally follow creek valleys and, where possible, connect with important destinations and other trails to create a meaningful network of open space and walkways.

Upper Chichester Township is currently working on a planned network of shared-use paths that will link destinations within the Township. These trails are recommended in the route...
322 Land Use Strategies Study produced by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). Future developments should be encouraged, or even required, to link directly to this trail network, and connections should also be made to nearby communities. Trail system links have been shown to increase the desirability of nearby residential developments.1

This project exemplifies many important features of this kind of trail network, and the Townships should support it.

**Gateway Signage and Landscaping**

Professionally prepared “WELCOME” signs and appropriate landscaping should mark the major road entrances to each Township. Such signs and landscaping advise motorists and pedestrians that they are entering a particular Township. Attractive gateways make a positive statement about the community. Of course, this initial impression needs to be reinforced via features the visitors find throughout the Townships, by introducing a measure of uniformity in signs throughout the area, as noted below.

**Common Theme**

There is generally no order or aesthetic unity to commercial signs in the planning area. Commercial areas, particularly those along Pennell and Ridge Roads, and Chichester Avenue, would be made more attractive and desirable through an overall signage system that requires a common theme, logos, color, and/or other identifying features to unify signage and identify business centers. This would be a great improvement over the inconsistent and generally unattractive signs found at present.

**Traffic Calming Measures**

As noted in Chapter 8 – Transportation, Pennell Road/Market Street, Conchester Highway, Chichester Avenue, and other roads in the study area carry high traffic volumes, even during off-peak hours. Throughout the study area, high traffic volumes and speeds (particularly on Conchester and Pennell Roads) create traffic hazards for both motorists and pedestrians, including those who wish to patronize local businesses. The lack of marked pedestrian crossings, coupled with the width of some roadways, intensifies the hazards facing pedestrians who wish to cross these roads. In order to reduce speeds and other hazards and to make roadways more attractive to bikers and pedestrians, the Townships should implement several traffic calming measures. These include the construction of bump-outs at selected intersections and critical areas; installation of pedestrian crossings using different materials, textures, and colors; provision of bike lanes; and installation of updated traffic signals.

These measures, combined with the recommended streetscape improvements, would substantially enhance the appearance, safety, and overall shopping experience in the three

---

1 Source: Rails-to-Trails Conservancy
Townships. They would also serve to upgrade the area’s livability markedly. For further traffic calming recommendations, please refer to Chapter 8 – Transportation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consolidates components and recommendations from several other chapters of this comprehensive plan, including parks and recreation, housing, community facilities, transportation, and land use. Improving the area’s livability requires solutions to problems in all areas of community life.

None of the Townships can incorporate all of the features of livable and walkable communities as listed above. The Townships can, however, select those features that will best advance livability. Because of its different development character, in many cases Lower Chichester will need to introduce or upgrade different features than those needed in the other Townships.

As noted above, the Townships possess some of the features of livable communities, but these physical components are aging and may no longer function properly. The recommendations below are designed to upgrade aging facilities and/or suggest new facilities where needed.

The Townships should:

10-1 Provide or improve parks, plazas, and other public gathering places to function as meeting places for residents and sites for community events.

10-2 Provide streetscape improvements such as sidewalk repair, tree planting, pedestrian lighting, benches, trash receptacles, enhanced crosswalks, and gateway improvements (e.g., development of a municipal design theme, provision of entrance signage, and entrance landscaping). Where applicable, these improvements should be provided within the scope of the Delaware County Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan.

Funding Programs: Transportation Enhancement (TE Program)
Home Town Streets Program

Technical Assistance: Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)

10-3 Using this comprehensive plan as a reference, identify the components that make each Township a livable community. List where repair or replacement is needed to maintain or enhance these features and perform any actions needed to upgrade overall livability and walkability.

10-4 Review the Township-sponsored or Township-related events and programs to ensure that they are geared toward a variety of ages, cultural groups, and interests.
Provide pedestrian and biking trails and, where possible, link them with important community features, proposed trails, or greenway systems as recommended in Chapter 5 – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space and Chapter 8 – Transportation.

Funding Programs: 
- TE Program
- Safe Routes to School

Technical Assistance: DCPD

Coordinate this comprehensive plan’s proposals with the more specific project recommendations of the Delaware County Revitalization Program Planning Area 1 Action Plan.

Technical Assistance: DCPD
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TWO-YEAR ACTION AGENDA

After the comprehensive plan is adopted, municipalities sometimes find it difficult to decide which recommendations should be implemented first. Also, because a modern comprehensive plan usually encompasses a timeline of about ten years, its recommendations may seem remote. There is often no “blueprint” or schedule for action. Therefore, action on the plan tends to be delayed repeatedly.

For these reasons, this chapter’s Two-Year Action Agenda identifies the recommendations that should be enacted or substantially in progress within two years of this plan’s adoption. Recommendations are grouped into action categories. They are listed in the approximate order of priority for the most effective implementation of the comprehensive plan.

The short-term actions identified in this section are essentially stepping stones that will lay the foundation for the successful implementation of the comprehensive plan. The Townships should track their progress annually and develop a revised agenda every two years as implementation moves forward.

This sequence is intended only as a guideline. Realistically, municipal agendas are affected by a variety of factors, including previous commitments, the actors involved, funding considerations, and contractual obligations. However, to the greatest extent possible given these limitations, the Townships should strive to adhere to this Two-Year Action Agenda.

In some instances, the recommendations entered below have been abbreviated. To see the full text of the recommendations, please refer to the chapter in which it appears. These recommendations pertain to Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester Townships unless otherwise noted.

ESTABLISH BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, AND PARTNERSHIPS

3-8 Consider creating an official joint historic preservation advisory body such as an Historical Commission.

4-2 Aston and Lower Chichester should consider creating a Shade Tree Commission for the installation and protection of street trees. Upper Chichester should continue with plans to install and preserve shade trees along its streets.

4-18 Aston and Upper Chichester should participate in the Chester-Ridley-Crum (CRC) Watersheds Association and coordinate municipal watershed activities.
4-19 Aston and Upper Chichester should consider either forming their own Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) or joining an existing joint EAC to address issues relating to environmental protection and to foster inter-municipal cooperation. Lower Chichester should continue current activities underway with its joint EAC with Marcus Hook Borough.

5-19 Organize a citizens association to identify the community’s recreational needs and provide volunteer support for the various recreational programs.

6-6 Investigate the feasibility of establishing an area Community Development Corporation (CDC) that would acquire vacant or blighted properties, rehabilitate them, and re-sell them to interested homebuyers who would agree to live in them for a specified minimum period of time.

**REVISE AND ENFORCE ORDINANCES**

4-5 Aston and Lower Chichester should consider adopting new floodplain ordinances that comply with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) requirements. All three Townships should consider adopting consistent floodplain ordinances with slightly more stringent management standards.

8-8 Enact an ordinance identifying streets on which heavy trucks are prohibited and including fines, which would help pay for damage caused by trucks.

8-17 Update zoning codes to include parking maximums as well as minimums to protect against excessive parking area.

8-18 Update zoning to reflect the findings of the *Route 322 Land Use Strategies Study* (Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, 2002).

8-23 Develop and adopt traditional neighborhood development (TND) and transit-oriented development (TOD) codes where appropriate and desired by residents.

8-25 Revise zoning codes to require developers to bury power lines at their expense as part of any large-scale new development.

9-4 Review zoning ordinances to determine what revisions are needed to minimize the negative impact of existing incompatible uses, and prevent new incompatibilities by ensuring that the permitted uses in a given district are such that new incompatibilities are avoided.

9-17 Lower Chichester should revise and update zoning codes to remove out-of-date zoning ordinances, make them fully compliant with the Municipal Planning Code (MPC), and incorporate modern planning and zoning approaches and concepts.
MAINTAIN AND UPGRADE RESIDENTIAL AREAS

6-14 Advise the Delaware County Housing Authority (DCHA) of specific problems and complaints concerning Section 8 units.

6-18 Request regular inspection of Section 8 properties to be conducted jointly by Township code officials and inspectors from DCHA.

6-19 Publicize Delaware County’s Homeownership First Program, with particular emphasis on encouraging renters to purchase the properties that they are presently renting.

IMPROVE COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

7-1 Aston should consider constructing a new municipal building or expanding the present one to provide needed additional space for the Township’s expanding municipal operations.

7-3 Lower Chichester should consider hiring a consultant to design a unified municipal complex and/or town center at the intersection of Market Street, Chichester Avenue, and Ridge Road.

7-8 Aston should examine the cost and feasibility of combining the Township’s two fire companies in one new, centrally located facility.

7-11 Lower Chichester should Study the costs and benefits of building a new Township fire department station on vacant sites at Ridge Road and Blueball Avenue, or Ridge Road and Baker Street.

7-12 Upper Chichester should examine the feasibility of consolidating the Township’s three fire companies into one combined unit.

IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW, PROVIDE STREETSCAPING, AND PROVIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

8-2 Work with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) and provide input during efforts to reconstruct Conchester Road (U.S. 322).

8-3 Study dangerous intersections to see if sight restrictions are seriously hindering motorist operations, and remedy those deemed problematic.

8-4 Properly stripe multiple lane roads and intersections to alleviate confusion and optimize the flow of traffic.
Encourage shoulder striping during road repainting and resurfacing where speeding traffic is an issue.

Provide decorative welcome signs at Township boundaries to encourage a sense of place. These signs serve the dual function of increasing civic pride among residents and increasing visitor awareness of the Townships.

Aston and Upper Chichester should construct missing links in the sidewalk system, especially in the vicinity of schools, shopping centers, employment sites, community facilities, and Township buildings.

Aston and Upper Chichester should install crosswalks for pedestrians near schools, shopping centers, employment sites, community facilities, municipal buildings, and bus stops.

Aston and Lower Chichester should install bus shelters at routes 114 and 119 bus stops to provide riders with a dry waiting area.

**Maintain and Upgrade Nonresidential Areas**

Aston and Upper Chichester should cooperate in a study to determine specific streetscape enhancements needed along Route 452. These efforts should be coordinated with Lower Chichester’s Delaware County Revitalization Program streetscape studies in order to achieve a unified theme. The Townships should also consider the streetscape improvements in neighboring Marcus Hook Borough.

Aston and Upper Chichester should develop landscaped gateway areas at each Township’s entrance points, with emphasis on those along major roads such as Route 452, Concord Road, Chichester Avenue, Ridge Road, and other important arteries.

Evaluate the extent to which the municipal complex provides the services and programs of a multi-purpose Civic Activity Center (described above); identify shortcomings in services, facilities, and programs; and prepare plans to address these gaps.

Aston should investigate the feasibility of providing an identified walkway connecting the municipal building on Pennell Road with the community center on Concord Road.
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IMPLEMENTATION

This multi-municipal comprehensive plan is a policy document intended to guide the three Townships’ ongoing development, land use decisions, and policies. It outlines the Townships’ vision and develops goals, objectives, and recommendations to achieve that vision. However, the plan is not a regulatory document. It only serves as a guide for managing growth and development within the area. The comprehensive plan should be the foundation for most other plans, programs, ordinances, and regulations. Subdivision, land development, and zoning ordinances should reflect the goals, objectives, and recommendations contained herein.

Furthermore, officials of the three Townships should consult this plan when confronted with new problems and decisions. In particular, decisions regarding land use, transportation, and community facilities should be made only after consulting this plan. In compliance with amendments to the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) made in 2000, proposals for amendments to the subdivision, land development, and zoning ordinances must also be evaluated in terms of their consistency with this plan.

There are four critical components in attaining this multi-municipal plan’s objectives and recommendations:

1) Utilization and revision of principal implementation tools such as the zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance, capital improvements program, and other implementation tools.

2) Selection and designation of an Implementation Task Force responsible for overseeing implementation activities.

3) Preparation and adoption of a joint Implementation Agreement by all three of the Townships.

4) Regular consultation and use of this plan by Township Commissioners, Township administrators, and other Boards.

PRINCIPAL IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS

It can be very difficult to achieve agreement on implementation activities when a plan involves several municipalities. Therefore, the selection of effective, dedicated representatives from each participating jurisdiction is vital to the ultimate success of the plan. Common ground can be reached through discussions of issues among the Task Force members. The MPC provides direction for the participating municipalities by authorizing and setting forth details for the Implementation Agreement that will become
the legal document establishing and guiding implementation activities. Before discussing the Implementation Agreement, we will briefly discuss some of the basic methods and documents for implementing comprehensive plans.

**Zoning Ordinance**

The zoning ordinance is the principal tool for implementing the comprehensive plan and regulating the use of land. As noted in Chapter 9 – Land Use, the Townships’ zoning ordinances are deficient in several areas. A definite need for revised zoning codes exists. The revised ordinances must be prepared in accordance with this plan, modern zoning principles, and the MPC provisions. All revisions, including zoning map changes, must comply with MPC consistency requirements, as discussed in Chapter 9 – Land Use.

By basing a zoning ordinance on a comprehensive plan, its provisions and districts will tend to be based on a carefully devised map that shows the proposed future uses of land, as opposed to a more haphazard preparation. It will also require fewer amendments, meet general consistency requirements, and be more legally defensible.

The existing zoning codes of the Townships need to be revised so that they better reflect modern zoning principles, the recommendations of this plan, and the findings of the Delaware County Revitalization Program (formerly the Delaware County Renaissance Program) Planning Area 1 Action Plan.

**Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)**

A subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), used in concert with the zoning ordinance, ensures that development occurs in a manner that allows for the maximum protection of the environment, adjacent uses, and the public. A SALDO would be applicable when dividing land into two or more parcels, developing property, and laying out streets and utilities. The ordinance would also apply in cases of improvement of land with a nonresidential building, or the division of land among two or more prospective occupants. As such, it applies to single office buildings, apartment buildings, and multiple-unit structures. This ordinance controls development features such as street widths, grades and curves, driveways, sight distances, lot design, sewage disposal, storm drainage, recreational areas for new developments, and additions or revisions to existing development.

Aston and Upper Chichester Townships have their own subdivision and land development ordinances (1990 and 1994, respectively). Lower Chichester Township does not have its own ordinance and consequently uses the Delaware County SALDO of 1981 as its governing ordinance. The County is approaching completion of a new model ordinance. It will not be adopted as an official document; rather, it will serve as a model code containing provisions the municipalities may adopt either in whole or in part. It should also be noted that the County will probably repeal the existing 1981 SALDO. Therefore, municipalities that use the County ordinance (including Lower Chichester) will need to adopt either the new model ordinance or another ordinance in order to regulate proposed subdivisions and
land developments. Delaware County’s model ordinance is expected to be complete and available for review and adoption in 2010.

**Official Map**

Article IV of the MPC enables municipalities to prepare an official map that shows the location of public lands and facilities, including:

- Public streets, watercourses, and grounds (including widenings, extensions, openings, or closing of such)
- Existing and proposed public parks, playgrounds, and open space reservations
- Pedestrian ways and easements
- Railroad and transit rights-of-way and easements
- Flood control basins, floodways and floodplains, stormwater management areas, and drainage easements
- Support facilities, easements, and other properties

When a municipality creates an official map showing location of existing and future streets and public areas, it reserves this land for future public use. If by virtue of the official map a landowner is denied reasonable use of his/her property, s/he can apply for a special encroachment permit that would allow him/her to build on the site. If a landowner notifies the municipality of this intention to develop a site identified on the official map, the municipality has one year to acquire the site. After one year, the reservation of that land becomes invalid. The official map is, therefore, an important tool that can help municipalities plan the location and layout of future roads and public areas.

When combined and made consistent with a municipal SALDO, zoning ordinance, and comprehensive plan, an official map can strengthen and validate the Townships’ plans for future growth.

Although largely developed, the Townships might consider preparing an official map that locates existing and future streets and public areas, including parks and trails. By doing so, the Townships could proactively shape important components of their future development, instead of merely reacting to developers’ proposals.

**Capital Improvements Program (CIP)**

The capital improvements program (CIP) and capital budget are another useful method to implement the comprehensive plan. The CIP provides a multi-year schedule for capital projects and purchases. These items include outlays for purchase of land, buildings, major equipment, and renovations for large, relatively expensive items or projects. Capital improvement project examples include storm and sanitary sewers, street improvements, recreational projects, construction or substantial building renovations, and the purchase of equipment such as fire trucks and police vehicles. Items designated in the first of a six or more year period become the capital budget for that year.
The ranking of a given project should be based upon the following criteria:

- Consistency with the comprehensive plan recommendations
- Fulfillment of a pressing need
- Extent of service provided
- Urgency of the project, i.e., how many citizens would be inconvenienced if the project is not completed
- Savings that will accrue as a result of the project
- Relationship with other projects in the Township or abutting municipalities
- Economic impact
- Public support

Capital programming is a process designed to anticipate what community projects are needed over several years. Projects may be completed in phases over the course of this timeframe. The Townships must determine what projects should begin immediately, which should begin the following year, and which may commence in two or three years. In setting these priorities, it is important to remember that many projects take several years to complete. By ranking projects, the Townships can budget money to distribute the cost over a number of years, or to make large purchases (e.g., real estate) in advance of actual use to avoid higher costs later. In short, this process lends a large degree of flexibility to purchasing and budgeting.

Another benefit of establishing a formal CIP is that demonstrating this planning and budgeting process improves a municipality’s chances to obtain federal and state funding. Funding agencies are more likely to loan or grant money to a community that has documented its needs and carefully planned for future improvements.

In order to establish a capital programming process, the Townships should appoint a committee responsible for the evaluation and prioritization of capital projects. Township Commissioners, managers, engineers, and members of other local boards should work together to select and prioritize projects for the CIP.

Many of the policies established in the comprehensive plan need to be considered in the operating budget. The Townships’ operating budgets annually fund facility maintenance, code enforcement, housing rehabilitation, traffic control, zoning administration, and other processes required to achieve this plan’s goals and objectives. Presently, the Townships do not have a formal, documented CIP and budget. They simply consider mid- and long-range projects in the course of formulating the annual budget. In order to improve planning for municipal projects and purchases, and to improve local financial conditions, the Townships should take the following steps:

1) Implement a formal CIP and budget designed to establish a long-range program to select, prioritize, schedule, and budget major capital projects.
2) Form a committee responsible for the prioritization, planning, and evaluation of capital projects. This group should include members of the Board of Commissioners, Planning Commission, engineers, managers, and other appropriate officials.

3) Promote multi-municipal cooperation, coordination, and purchase of services, products, and capital improvements to reduce costs.

**Code Enforcement Program**

Code enforcement programs and initiatives are also methods that can be used to implement this plan. The Townships’ various codes play an important role in assuring that development, redevelopment, and rehabilitation activities employ proper materials and construction methods, do not fall below industry standards, and do not create safety hazards.

All three Townships employ local code enforcement officers (CEO) whose primary responsibilities are to inspect the building components of new construction, additions, alterations, and repair of structures. This includes:

- Reviewing construction plans for compliance with Township codes and ordinances
- Explaining building and plumbing code requirements to contractors and homeowners to assist them in complying with the code requirements
- Issuing a certificate of occupancy on all residential, commercial, and industrial projects once they have satisfactorily met all codes

**Citizen Involvement**

Shaping a community’s growth requires active citizen participation. The Townships should, therefore, place great importance on the opinions of their residents, civic groups, and business community. The development of this comprehensive plan is a step in that direction.

The United States system of law emphasizes private rights. Therefore, it is the duty of citizens and private groups to act constructively in community affairs. Participation in local governmental issues, including the planning process, must be a positive effort; criticism alone is not sufficient. Citizens who offer constructive alternatives to local proposals are vital to a municipal government’s effective operation. Persons concerned with the future of the Townships should educate themselves about the problems and challenges facing both the Township and the overall project area. This comprehensive plan should be used in this informational process. It provides background studies that contain important statistical data. It also makes recommendations for land use, transportation, and community facilities based on the data.

The comprehensive plan is, however, only a tool to guide development policy. To be successfully implemented, this plan must have the support of the area residents.
IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

Due to the complexity of coordinating activities and reaching consensus among three municipalities, one of this plan’s principal conclusions is that there should be a specific group whose primary mission is the implementation of the three-Township comprehensive plan (once it has been officially adopted).

Because there exists a long (too often unsuccessful) track record of implementing comprehensive municipal plans, it is vital that a permanent group be established to coordinate, oversee, and maintain the process of implementing this plan. This will ensure that it continues to be a dynamic and useful document, and that it will not languish after completion. Its policies and recommendations should be carried out, and this requires an Implementation Task Force created solely for this purpose.

This Implementation Task Force would serve as the “keeper of the plan.” Its sole purpose would be to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in this plan. The Task Force’s first job would be to thoroughly review the comprehensive plan – with special attention Chapter 11 – Two-Year Action Agenda – to prioritize the activities and programs recommended for the first two years after adoption. The Task Force would also present these selected tasks to the Township Commissioners and other stakeholders in order to gain their support. The respective governing bodies, developers, nonprofits, and other stakeholders would then execute the implementing actions.

Examples of these actions include the adoption of recommended ordinances; the formation of new boards and commissions; the submission of applications for funding to local, state, and federal agencies; and the awarding of contracts for specific projects. At the end of each year, the Task Force would issue a report on the progress being made towards implementing the various plan recommendations. The group would also be responsible for reviewing and updating the plan at regular intervals, as recommended herein. The Task Force would consist of representatives from all three participating Townships. These representatives would include municipal officials and might also include members of the business community, community organizations, civic organizations, and citizen representatives.

After completion of the plan, a Community Assistance Planner from the Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) will be available to work with the Townships to facilitate the start-up and ongoing operation of an Implementation Task Force (if the Townships desire such assistance). In its role as a facilitator, DCPD would also be able to identify funding sources and apply for funding to help pay for the implementation of specific components of this plan.

IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT

Article XI of the MPC, Intergovernmental Cooperative Planning and Implementation Agreements, states that municipalities’ governing bodies may enter into intergovernmental cooperative agreements in accord with Pennsylvania law to develop,
adopt, and implement a comprehensive plan. **One of the principal benefits of an implementation agreement for an adopted multi-municipal comprehensive plan is that it grants the authority to distribute land uses among the entire plan area so that each individual municipality is not required to provide zoning for all legally allowable uses.** For instance, if the three Townships adopted an implementation agreement, only one of the Townships would be required to zone for industrial and other heavy uses. Without an adopted implementation agreement, distributing land uses among multiple jurisdictions is not allowed. Prior to amendments made to the MPC in 2000, municipalities participating in a joint comprehensive plan were required to adopt a joint zoning ordinance before all uses could be distributed within the area covered by the joint plan. The MPC no longer requires a joint zoning ordinance to enable such distribution, although the participating municipalities may still adopt such an ordinance if they desire.

There are additional benefits to adopting an implementation agreement. In the process of preparing and adopting an agreement, the Townships will naturally determine which plan recommendations are of the highest priority for both joint and individual municipal implementation. The adoption of an implementation agreement also establishes a structure and process to assist the Townships in continuing to work together in a cooperative fashion. Additionally, Pennsylvania state agencies are required to consider, and may give priority to, applications for funding for multi-municipal planning entities with adopted implementation agreements.

Pennsylvania’s *Intergovernmental Cooperation Law* and the MPC govern the content of intergovernmental cooperation agreements such as an Implementation Agreement. The *Intergovernmental Cooperation Law* requires that intergovernmental cooperation agreements contain the following:

1) Conditions of the agreement.

2) Duration of the agreement term.

3) Purpose and objectives of the agreement.

4) Manner and extent of financing the agreement.

5) Organizational structure necessary to implement the agreement.

6) Manner in which personal or real property shall be acquired, managed, licensed, or disposed of in the implementation of the agreement.

In addition, the MPC states that implementation agreements shall:

1) Establish a process by which participating municipalities will achieve general consistency between the comprehensive plan and their various ordinances within two years.
2) Establish a process for review and approval of regionally significant developments proposed within participating municipalities.

3) Establish the roles and responsibilities of participating municipalities in implementing the plan, including provision of infrastructure services and affordable housing.

The formulation of the specific implementation agreement for the three Townships, were they to enter into one, would be decided upon over the course of several meetings of the Implementation Task Force and a DCPD Community Assistance Planner who, as noted above, would be available to work with the Task Force. If an agreement were to be formally adopted by the respective Townships, then the Implementation Task Force, along with the DCPD liaison, would continue to meet on a monthly or bimonthly basis to ensure that the various procedural requirements of the agreement were being met. The acceptance of the implementation agreement and the adoption of consistent ordinances and actions would lend legitimacy to an adopted comprehensive plan to which the Townships and the County had contributed. As part of the implementation of this plan, DCPD recommends that Aston, Upper Chichester, and Lower Chichester Townships enter into a multi-municipal implementation agreement.

**USE OF THE PLAN BY TOWNSHIP GOVERNING BODIES AND OTHER BOARDS**

As previously noted, the comprehensive plan is designed to serve as the foundation for most other plans, programs, ordinances, and regulations. Thus the SALDO and the zoning ordinance should reflect the goals, objectives, and recommendations contained in this plan. That is, all other ordinances and plans should align with the comprehensive plan, and the application of their provisions should make its recommendations a reality. Therefore, each Township’s Commissioners should review the plan to familiarize themselves with its objectives and recommendations. In this fashion, the Commissioners, together with the Implementation Task Force, can make this plan a useful, dynamic tool that guides the development and revitalization of the area.

Furthermore, Township officials should consult this plan when confronted with problems and issues that are discussed and analyzed herein. It is likely that the plan contains specific recommendations regarding the issue or problem in question. In particular, decisions regarding land use, transportation, and community facilities should be made only after consulting this plan. Accordingly, this plan should be a constant companion at meetings and executive sessions of the Commissioners, Planning Commissions, and other local bodies.
Please note, on an ongoing basis programs at the federal, state and local level receive reductions in funding or are discontinued altogether while at other times new funding programs may be created.

For the most current and accurate information on available funding and technical assistance sources please consult the online version of the Delaware County Urban Revitalization Resource Guide at:

http://www.co.delaware.pa.us/planning/countryregionalplanning/urbanresouceguide.html
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FUNDING PROGRAMS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Listed below are funding programs and technical assistance sources for the recommendations discussed throughout the plan.

FUNDING PROGRAMS

Act 167 Stormwater Management Program - Chapter 111 Funding

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Southeast Regional Office

Jenifer Fields
2 E. Main Street
Norristown, PA 19401
Tel: 484-250-5900
Email: jefields@state.pa.us
Website: www.dep.state.pa.us

The program offers grants to municipalities for the implementation of the county Act 167 stormwater management plans for the local watershed, including costs associated with technical and legal services for the administration and enforcement of Act 167 plans. The program may also fund a municipality’s NPDES Phase II implementation if it coincides with Act 167 activities. Contact DEP for eligibility requirements.

Certified Local Government (CLG) Program

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)

Bureau for Historic Preservation
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093
Tel: 717-787-0771
Email: mlefevre@state.pa.us
Website: www.artsnet.org/phmc/grants_certified_local_govern.htm

The Bureau helps local governments strengthen their local historic preservation efforts and expand their preservation activities by achieving CLG status from the National Park Service (NPS). The National Historic Preservation Act established the CLG program, which authorizes local governments to participate in the national historic preservation program. Responsibilities of a CLG include maintaining an historic preservation commission, surveying local historic properties, enforcing local preservation laws, and providing for public participation in preservation activities. The Bureau provides valuable technical assistance and matching grants to participating communities throughout Pennsylvania whose local governments operate and manage comprehensive preservation programs.

Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)

Gary Obleski
Coastal Resources Program Manager
Coastal Zone Management Program
P.O. Box 2063

The CZM Program is coordinated by the Water Planning Office within DEP and implements a federally approved management program for Pennsylvania’s two coastal areas, the Delaware Estuary and Lake Erie, ensuring that federal and state agencies act consistently with program goals as individual projects and permits are pursued. Through annual
Communities of Opportunity Program

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 717-787-8158
Fax: 717-783-1402
Website: www.inventpa.com/default.aspx?id=320

The program is designed to help communities succeed in making their vision a reality, encouraging the creation of local community partnerships among municipal agencies, financial communities, and for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. It supports local initiatives that promote the stability of neighborhoods and communities, assists communities in achieving and maintaining social and economic diversity, ensures a productive tax base in a community, and assists in approving a community’s quality of life.

Community Conservation Partnerships Program (C2P2)

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)
Southeast Regional Field Office
Carolyn Wallis
908 State Office Building, Suite 207
1400 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130
Tel: 215-560-1183
Fax: 215-560-6722
Email: cwallis@state.pa.us
Website: http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/brc/grants/general02.aspx

This program is a combination of several funding sources and grant programs: the Commonwealth’s Keystone Recreation, Park, and Conservation Fund (Key 93), the Environmental Stewardship and Watershed Protection Act (Growing Greener), and Act 68 Snowmobile and ATV Trails Fund. The Program also includes federal funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and the Recreational Trails component of TEA-21.

This initiative joins DCNR with communities, nonprofit groups, and the private sector in conserving Pennsylvania’s valuable natural and cultural heritage. DCNR partnerships involve greenways, open spaces, community parks, rail-trails, river corridors, natural areas, indoor and outdoor recreation, environmental education, tourism, and community development.

The C2P2 contains the following grant components: Community Recreation, Land Trusts, Rails-to-Trails, Rivers Conservation, Snowmobile/ATV, Heritage Parks, LWCF, and Recreational Trails. Except for the Heritage Parks grants, all other components have been combined into one annual application cycle (generally late summer/early fall) and use a single application format and process with one grant manual and one set of application forms. Applications
selected for federal LWCF funding require some supplemental information to enable submission of the application to the National Park Service (NPS). Generally, all components require a match, usually 50%, of cash or in-kind contributions.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program**

Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)

600 N. Jackson Street
Room 101
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-891-5131
Fax: 610-566-0532
Email: wessonj@co.delaware.pa.us
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/

Delaware County is entitled to receive an annual grant from the CDBG Program operated by HUD. CDBG funds enable local governments to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. The County and participating municipalities are free to determine how the money is to be spent based on individual community development needs. Eligible projects include construction of public improvements, such as streets, curbs, sidewalks, and water and sewer facilities, and historic preservation.

**Community Improvement Grant**

Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council

Montgomery County Cooperative Extension Office
1015 Bridge Road, Suite H
Collegeville, PA 19426-1176
Tel: 610-489-4315
Fax: 610-489-9277
Email: jxs51@psu.edu
Website: www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/pucfc/

The Council will consider requests for funds ranging from $500 - $3,000. Grant requests must be matched dollar for dollar with cash and/or in-kind contributions by the applicant. The main purpose of this grant is to foster stewardship of trees and the environment and partnerships by bringing together resource experts with volunteers and others who care about trees and their communities. The grant will support education and training opportunities for the general public and professionals, grassroots tree planting projects, and partnerships at the local level.

**Community Recreation Grants**

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) Southeast Regional Field Offices
Carolyn Wallis
908 State Office Building, Suite 207
1400 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130
Tel: 215-560-1183
Fax: 215-560-6722
Email: cwallis@state.pa.us
Website: www.dcnr.state.pa.us

Community recreation grants are awarded to municipalities for recreation, park, and conservation projects. These include the rehabilitation and development of parks and recreational facilities; acquisition of land for park and conservation purposes; and technical assistance for feasibility studies, trails studies, and site development planning. Grants require a 50% match except for some technical assistance grants and small community projects.
**Community Revitalization Program**

**Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)**

Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 800-379-7448
866-466-3972
Website: www.newpa.com/program

This DCED funded grant program supports local initiatives that improve the stability of communities and enhance local economic conditions. Fund uses are community development activities that are necessary for a community to enhance quality of life and/or become competitive for business retention, expansion, and attraction.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)**

**Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)**

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
The ACP Building
190 N. Independence Mall West, 8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520
Tel: 215-238-2863
Fax: 215-592-9125
Email: cdougherty@dvrpc.org
Website: http://www.dvrpc.org/transportation/capital/cmaq.htm

This program funds transportation projects that reduce congestion and improve air quality. Eligible projects include transit improvements, shared-ride services, traffic flow improvements, demand management strategies, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs, inspection and maintenance programs, and alternative fuel projects.

**Conservation District Mini-Grants**

**Delaware County Conservation District**

Rose Tree Park - Hunt Club
1521 N. Providence Road
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-892-9484
Fax: 610-892-9489
Email: info@delcocd.org
Website: http://delcocd.org/mini-grant_program.htm

The County Conservation District awards competitive grants to locally-based environmental organizations, school-based environmental clubs, homeowners associations, scouting organizations, civic associations, and sportsman’s groups. Grant requests should not exceed $500.00. The Conservation District Board annually allocates a sum of money to this program based on the prior year’s excess of income over expenses.

Examples of eligible projects include:
- Stream bank stabilization
- Riparian forest buffer plantings
- Storm sewer stenciling/disks
- Wildlife habitat improvements
- Workshops/seminars for the general public on local environmental issues
- Stream monitoring – water quality testing programs
• Nature trails

Application deadlines are April 1st and October 30th.

**Delaware County Renaissance (now Revitalization) Program**

**Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)**

600 N. Jackson Street
Room 101
Media, PA 19063-2561
Tel: 610-891-5131
Fax: 610-566-0532
Email: wessonj@co.delaware.pa.us
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/

This program provides grant money for revitalization-oriented projects identified in Renaissance Program Action Plans prepared for 29 municipalities in the County. Funds are intended to be used as leverage/matching funds with other public or private dollars. Applications are accepted yearly, following the same timeframe and process as that of the CDBG Program, administered by the County’s OHCD.

**Demolition Fund**

**Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)**

600 N. Jackson Street
Room 101
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-891-5425
Fax: 610-566-0532
Email: wessonj@co.delaware.pa.us
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/index.html

Delaware County has established a municipal Countywide Demolition Fund through the CDBG Program. Applications for funding demolition projects are accepted on an ongoing basis. Only properties that are vacant at the time of application will be considered. Call OHCD for a separate application form.

**Earmarked Funds**

**Pennsylvania General Assembly**
www.legis.state.pa.us
www.house.state.pa.us/
Tel: 717-787-2372
www.pasen.gov/
Tel: 717-787-7163

**U.S. Congressional Representatives**
www.house.gov
www.senate.gov

**United States Capitol switchboard:**
202-224-3121

Pennsylvania’s United States Senators and Representatives earmark funding for specific projects in federal authorization and appropriations bills. Earmarked funds set aside funding to be used for those projects only. Delaware County is represented by two members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Pennsylvania Districts 1 and 7 and two Senators statewide. The County is represented in the Pennsylvania General Assembly by eleven (2003) State Representatives and three (2003) State Senators. Norwood is located in state Senate District 8 and House District 162. Representatives can be found on-line at the addresses noted by entering zip codes, county name, or district numbers in the appropriate search boxes.
**Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund**

Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)

600 N. Jackson Street
Room 101
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-891-5425
Fax: 610-566-0532
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/index.html

Delaware County has established this Countywide economic development direct loan program funded through the CDBG Program. Funding is available to eligible businesses for the provision of working capital, equipment and supplies, employee training, facility rehabilitation and modernization, land and building acquisition, and construction activities. For program specifics, contact the Delaware County Economic Development Oversight Board at 610-566-2225.

**Elm Street Program**

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Targeted Development Division
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 717-720-1424
Fax: 717-214-5416
Website: www.newpa.com/programDetail.aspx?id=74

The Elm Street Component of the New Communities Program will allow communities to integrate a Main Street or downtown revitalization program with a neighborhood renewal strategy. The Elm Street Program is designed to provide assistance and resources to those mixed use and residential areas in proximity to central business districts, to further enhance the downtown area, and to improve the viability of older neighborhoods.

The Elm Street Program incorporates volunteer support, leveraging of private dollars, strategic planning, rehabilitation/reuse of existing buildings, and streetscape improvements. Neighborhood involvement and a visible programmatic connection to an existing downtown revitalization program are required and must be demonstrated.

Through the Elm Street Program, grants will be available for planning, technical assistance, and physical improvements.

**Eligible Applicants**

Eligible applicants include local governments, redevelopment authorities, nonprofit Main Street and economic development organizations, neighborhood improvement district (NID) authorities, and business district authorities (BDAs). Nonprofits, NID authorities, and BDAs are eligible to apply directly only if they have at least two years of satisfactory operational experience as evidenced by satisfactory audits and evidence of municipal support through an executed cooperation agreement. Preference will be given to local governments and redevelopment authorities.

**Eligible Activities**

Eligible activities are primarily for the preparation of a five-year Elm Street plan as outlined in the five point Elm Street
elements. Other eligible planning activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Establishment of a neighborhood improvement district as defined in the Act of December 20, 2000 (P.L. 949, No. 130) known as the Neighborhood Improvement District Act.
- The review of local comprehensive plans and zoning and other land use ordinances to foster the viability of established residential neighborhoods, with a balanced mix of commercial, civic, employment, and residential uses, with particular attention to diversity of housing options.
- The review of educational and recreational opportunities and facilities.
- The marketing and promoting of urban residential living.
- The establishment of a deliberate connection to the Main Street/downtown revitalization effort.
- Preparation of a map that clearly identifies the established residential neighborhood and demonstrates its proximity to a commercial district.

**Amounts**
A one-time planning grant of up to $25,000 is available. A 10% match from local private or public sources is required. Matching funds can be cash and/or documented in-kind services.

**Federal Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit (RITC)**

The Bureau administers the federal Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit (RITC) program in partnership with NPS. The tax credit program is one of the most successful and cost-effective programs that encourages private investment in rehabilitating historic properties such as office buildings, rental housing, hotels, and retail stores. Since its inception in 1976, Pennsylvania has been a national leader in certified tax credit projects, completing over 1,800 projects and generating over $2.6 billion in private reinvestment back into Pennsylvania communities.

The Bureau administers the federal Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit (RITC) program in partnership with NPS. The tax credit program is one of the most successful and cost-effective programs that encourages private investment in
rehabilitating historic properties such as office buildings, rental housing, hotels, and retail stores. Since its inception in 1976, Pennsylvania has been a national leader in certified tax credit projects, completing over 1,800 projects and generating over $2.6 billion in private reinvestment back into Pennsylvania communities.

There are two federal tax incentive programs; a 20% tax credit is available to owners and some long-term leases of income-producing properties that will be rehabilitated, and a 10% tax credit is available for any nonresidential building not on the National Register but built before 1936.

FHA 203(k) Program

The Section 203(k) program is HUD’s primary program for the rehabilitation and repair of single-family properties. As such, it is an important tool for community and neighborhood revitalization and for expanding homeownership opportunities. This program can be used to accomplish rehabilitation and/or improvement of an existing one to four unit dwelling in one of three ways:

- To purchase a dwelling and the land on which the dwelling is located and rehabilitate it.
- To purchase a dwelling on another site, move it onto a new foundation on the mortgaged property, and rehabilitate it.
- To refinance existing indebtedness and rehabilitate such a dwelling.

Eligible improvements include:
Structural alterations and reconstruction, changes for improved function and modernization, elimination of health and safety hazards, changes for aesthetic appeal and elimination of obsolescence, reconditioning or replacement of plumbing, installation of a well and/or septic system, roofing, gutters and downspouts, flooring, tiling and carpeting, energy conservation improvements, major landscape work and site improvements, and improvements for accessibility by a disabled person.
Floodplain Land Use Assistance Program

This program provides grants and technical assistance to municipalities to comply with the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and the Pennsylvania Flood Plain Management Act (Act 166 of 1978). Grants can be a maximum of 50% of the eligible costs with no maximum dollar limit. Funds cover ordinance revision only.

Growing Greener Watershed Program

This DEP program provides three kinds of grants:

- Watershed – aimed at cleaning up nonpoint sources of pollution through acid mine drainage abatement, mine clean-up efforts, abandoned oil and gas well plugging, and local watershed-based conservation projects to eligible counties, authorities, municipalities, county conservation districts, watershed organizations, and others involved in the restoration and protection of Pennsylvania’s environment.
- Technical Assistance - a network of assistance providers to help watershed organizations effectively and efficiently achieve their watershed protection goals, providing legal, engineering, data management, program management, science mentoring, and technical services at no cost to eligible organizations.
- New/Innovative Technology - for improving existing drinking water and sewage treatment facilities through the use of new or innovative technology, going beyond what is needed to maintain compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Historic Preservation Grants

These grants are available to support projects in the categories of cultural resource surveys, National Register nominations, planning and development assistance, educational and interpretive programs, and archaeology. The grants are administered on a competitive basis and are available in two different amounts: no match required to
$5,000 and matching to $15,000. The maximum award is $15,000, and the awards are made annually based on a peer review process.

### Home Improvement Loan Program (HIL)

**Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)**

Chester Community Improvement Project  
412 Avenue of the States  
P.O. Box 541  
Chester, PA 19016-0541  
Tel: 610-876-8663  
Fax: 610-876-3449  
Email: www.co.delaware.pa.us.hcd/

Delaware County has established the Home Improvement Loan (HIL) Program, which provides low-interest loans to homeowners who need rehabilitation work performed on their properties. The maximum loan for this program is $25,000 with a maximum term of 20 years. The interest-bearing loans are made through either Citizens Bank or PNC Bank to eligible homeowners at 5.75%. Interested homeowners should contact either Chester Community Improvement Project (CCIP) or Media Fellowship House to apply.

**Media Fellowship House**  
302 S. Jackson Street  
Media, PA 19063  
Tel: 610-565-0434  
Fax: 610-565-8567  
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/

### HOME Investment Partnership Program

**Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)**

Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 4th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225  
Tel: 717-787-8158  
888-223-6837  
Fax: 717-783-1402  
Website: www.inventpa.com

This DCED funding program can be used for housing rehabilitation, public services, community facilities, infrastructure improvement, development, and planning.

### Home Modification and Repair Program

**Delaware County Office of Services for the Aging (COSA)**

206 Eddystone Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Eddystone, PA 19022-1594  
Tel: 610-872-1316  
Fax: 610-490-1500  
Email: cosa@co.delaware.pa.us  
Website: www.delcosa.org

The program provides assistance to eligible low-income adults (aged 60 or older) or COSA consumers living in Delaware County with minor repairs, weatherization, and handicapped accessibility assistance.
Home Weatherization Program

Community Action Agency of Delaware County (CAADC), Inc.

Colony Building
511-513 Welsh Street
Chester, PA 19013
Tel: 610-874-8451
Fax: 610-565-9332
Email: info@caadc.org
Website: www.caadc.org

This program provides eligible households with weatherization assistance such as caulking, insulation of hot water tanks, attic ventilation, primary windows, oil and gas heater repair, and weather-stripping.

CAADC offers assistance to families and individuals to promote economic self-sufficiency, thus reducing dependence on public support through innovative approaches to programs including provision of professional case management services, life skills and employment training, and housing rehabilitation and community development.

Homeowner’s Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program (HEMAP)

Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency

Media Fellowship House
302 S. Jackson Street
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-565-0434
Fax: 610-565-8567
Website: www.phfa.org/consumers/homeowners/hemap.aspx

HEMAP is a Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency program that provides short-term, temporary funding to cure loan delinquencies. The program makes mortgage payments to lenders on behalf of qualifying homeowners for up to 24 months. Recipients must meet the eligibility guidelines defined in state law (Act 91), and repayment of the assistance is required. To apply, contact the Media Fellowship House.

Housing Development Fund (HDF)

Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)

600 N. Jackson Street
Room 101
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-891-4949
Fax: 610-566-0532
Email: collinsd@co.delaware.pa.us
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/index.html

This initiative of Delaware County Council and OHCD intends to promote the production and improvement of affordable rental and homeowner housing. Delaware County utilizes the federal HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program and CDBG Program funds in combination with its Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) to maximize the funds available in the HDF. OHCD is responsible for distributing applications, handling all correspondence, evaluating proposals, making recommendations to County Council, and coordinating the award of HDFs. OHCD accepts applications
for funding from nonprofit organizations, for-profit corporations, limited partnerships, and governmental agencies.

Keystone Historic Preservation Grant Program

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

Bureau for Historic Preservation
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093
Tel: 717-783-6012
Fax: 717-772-0920
Website: www.artsnet.org/phmc/grants_key
stone_historic_preservation.htm

Funding under this state program is available to nonprofit organizations and local governments for capital improvements on historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Funding is available in the categories of Preservation, Restoration, and Rehabilitation.

Land Use Planning and Technical Assistance Program (LUPTAP)

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Southeast Regional Office
908 State Office Building
Broad and Spring Garden Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19130
Tel: 215-560-2259
Email: rbednar@state.pa.us
Website: www.newpa.com/program
Detail.aspx?id=100

Grants and technical assistance are provided for local governments to prepare comprehensive plans and strategies, as well as the ordinances to implement their plans. One of its main objectives is to promote and encourage the sharing of municipal services, joint planning and zoning, and the application of advanced technology at the local level. Grants require a 50% local match.

Liquid Fuels Tax Program

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)

PennDOT District 6
7000 Geerdes Boulevard
King of Prussia, PA 19406-1525
Tel: 610-205-6541
Fax: 610-205-6910
Email: vtenimo@state.pa.us
Website: www.dot.state.pa.us/Internet/Bureaus/pdBMS.nsf/BMSHomePage?OpenFrameSet

Dennis Carey, Director
Public Works Department
Government Center, Room 207
201 W. Front Street
Media, PA 19063

This state program provides for a permanent allocation to municipalities (determined by population and local road mileage) of part of the liquid fuels taxes on motor vehicle fuels that are collected at the pump. Liquid fuels allocations may be used for any road-related activity including maintenance, repair, construction, or reconstruction of public roads or streets. Road machinery and equipment are also eligible expenditures, as are traffic signs and signals. In any given year, at least a portion of the money could be used for transportation facility projects.

PennDOT’s Municipal Services group oversees the allocation of Pennsylvania’s liquid fuels funds to 238 municipalities and the five counties in District 6. Representatives work with the cities, boroughs, and townships across the region to ensure that each receives its
proper annual allocation of state funds and spends it properly by reviewing and overseeing local highway and bridge construction projects where these funds are utilized.

This group also oversees the Road Turnback Program, where sections of the state highway system are turned over to local municipalities, who are then paid an annual maintenance fee for their continued upkeep.

**Local Government Capital Projects Loan Program**

**Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)**

Governor’s Center for Local Government Services
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 888-223-6837
Fax: 717-783-1402
E-mail: ra-dcedclgs@state.pa.us
Website: www.newpa.com/programDetail.aspx?id=96

This program is administered by the Governor’s Center for Local Government Services (CLGS) of the Pennsylvania DCED. It was established to provide low-interest loans to municipalities with populations of 12,000 or less for the purchase of equipment and the purchase, construction, renovation, or rehabilitation of municipal facilities. The program offers small local governments who find the cost of borrowing at conventional rates to be prohibitive an opportunity to secure needed funds at an interest rate of 2.0% per annum. Requests for assistance may be submitted any time throughout the year.

**Main Street Program**

**Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)**

Office of Community Development
Center for Community Building
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 717-720-7409
Fax: 717-214-5416
Website: www.newpa.com/programDetail.aspx?id=79

This funding and business assistance program targets development opportunities into downtown areas of municipalities and provides five-year assistance for the hiring of a full-time coordinator to oversee a comprehensive revitalization program.

**MTRP Electric Utility Grant Program**

**Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council**

Montgomery County Cooperative Extension Office
1015 Bridge Road, Suite H
Collegeville, PA 19426-1179
Tel: 610-489-4315
Fax: 610-489-9277
Email: jsx51@psu.edu

Funding matches from $1,000 - $5,000 designed to stimulate communities to choose the appropriate trees for planting locations under or near utility wires and improve municipal tree programs. Trees may also be planted on private property in the absence of an adequate tree lawn, provided that the municipality obtains a written easement from the landowner and the trees are planted within six feet of the sidewalk or right-of-way. Planting and maintenance of these trees shall
be the responsibility of the municipalities in accordance with their regulations.

Municipal Bus Shelter Partnership

Delaware County Transportation Management Association (TMA)

102 W. Front Street, 1st Floor
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-892-9440
Fax: 610-892-9460
Email: dctma@libertynet.org
Website: www.dctma.org

The TMA administers its Municipal Bus Shelter Partnership to provide for bus rider passenger shelters. The TMA brokers with a private company that provides shelters, with the revenue from advertising being split between the TMA and the municipality.

Municipal Challenge Grants Program

Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council

Montgomery County Cooperative Extension Office
1015 Bridge Road, Suite H
Collegeville, PA 19426-1179
Tel: 610-489-4315
Fax: 610-489-9277
Email: jsx51@psu.edu
Website: www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/pucfc

Challenge grants will be made available to Pennsylvania municipalities (or municipal tree commissions) to stimulate and assist them in developing a comprehensive urban and community forestry program. Trees can be planted on public lands as street trees in the tree lawn or public right-of-way, in parks, and in greenbelts. Trees may also be planted on private property in the absence of an adequate tree lawn, provided that the municipality obtains a written easement from the landowner and the trees are planted within six feet of the sidewalk or right-of-way. Planting and maintenance of trees shall be the responsibility of the municipalities. Applications can be downloaded through the website.

National Trust for Historic Preservation Main Street Program

The National Trust Main Street Center of the National Trust for Historic Preservation

1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: 202-588-6219
Fax: 202-588-6050
Email: mainstreet@ntrhp.org
Website: www.mainstreet.org

The National Main Street Center works with communities across the nation to revitalize their historic or traditional commercial areas. Based in historic preservation, the Main Street approach was developed to save historic commercial architecture and the fabric of American communities’ built environment, but has become a powerful economic development tool as well. The program is designed to improve all aspects of the downtown or central business district, producing both tangible and intangible benefits.
Improving economic management, strengthening public participation, and making downtown a fun place to visit are as critical to Main Street’s future as recruiting new businesses, rehabilitating buildings, and expanding parking.

New Communities Program

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 717-787-8158
888-223-6837
Fax: 717-783-1402
Website: www.newpa.com
www.newpa.com/default.aspx?id=326

The New Communities Program, an innovative blend of the Enterprise Zone Program and Main Street Program, will allow DCED to integrate revitalization of downtowns with that of industrial/manufacturing areas. Complementary elements of each program can assist municipalities in bringing together a comprehensive approach to promote both sound land use and revitalization.

Owner-occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program

Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)

Delaware County Housing Rehabilitation Department
Walter Omlor
1600 Calcon Hook Road
Sharon Hill, PA 19079
Tel: 610-583-4481
Fax: 610-583-8402
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/housingrehab.html

Delaware County’s Countywide Owner-occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program (excluding Chester City, Haverford Township, and Upper Darby Township) provides low- and moderate-income homeowners with financial assistance for home repairs. This program addresses major system repairs (such as roofs, HVAC systems, plumbing, and electrical) and weatherization improvements (door and window repair or replacement) with loans of up to $25,000. The form of assistance is a 0% deferred payment loan that is not payable until the house is sold or transferred. For more information, contact the Delaware County Housing Rehabilitation Department.

Pennsylvania Access Program

Freedom Valley Disability Center

Chris Zinszer
3607 Chapel Road
Newtown Square, PA 19063
Tel: 610-353-6640
TDD: 610-353-8900
Fax: 610-353-6753
Website: www.fvdc.info

The PA Access Program for Delaware County provides grants of up to $25,000 for removing architectural barriers and installing modifications and/or adaptations for persons with disabilities. This program serves income-eligible renters and homeowners in all 49 municipalities of Delaware County. The purpose of this grant is to provide modifications that allow persons with disabilities to better perform daily chores and to live more independently. Under this program, HUD Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and major systems problems are not addressed; thus, a property that requires repairs to major systems and/or has HQS violations would require assistance from another source.
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)

**PennDOT District 6**

7000 Geerdes Boulevard  
King of Prussia, PA 19406-1525  
Tel: 610-205-6700  
Fax: 610-205-6910  
Email: penndot6@roadwatch.org  
Website: www.dot.state.pa.us/penndot/districts/district6.nsf/main?readform

District 6 is the regional office of PennDOT, which offers many funding streams for road improvements. Municipalities can also contact DCPD for information concerning transportation projects, such as getting a project on the TIP.

Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (PHFA)

Stony Creek Office Center  
151 W. Marshall Street  
Building #3, Suite 300  
Norristown, PA 19401  
Tel: 610-270-1999  
Fax: 610-270-1355  
2101 N. Front Street  
P.O. Box 8029  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8029  
Tel: 717-780-3800  
Fax: 717-780-3905  
Website: www.phfa.org/

PHFA is Pennsylvania’s leading provider of capital for affordable homes and apartments. In order to make the Commonwealth a better place to live while fostering community and economic development, PHFA provides capital for decent, safe, and affordable homes and apartments for older adults, persons of modest means, and those persons with special housing needs. PHFA offers the following programs:

- Future Home Buyer
- Homeownership Choice
- Homeowner’s Emergency Mortgage Assistance
- Multi-family Rental Housing Development
- PENNVEST On-lot Sewage System loans
- Single Family Homeownership

Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB)

**Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)**

James A. Smedley  
Center for Program Development and Management  
P.O. Box 3365  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3365  
Tel: 717-772-1772  
Fax: 717-787-5247  
Email: jsmedley@dot.state.pa.us  
Website: www.dot.state.pa.us/penndot/bureaus/pib.nsf/homepagepib?readform

The PIB is a revolving loan fund administered by PennDOT that offers flexible financing opportunities for eligible highway, transit, and bridge projects. It has two accounts (highway/bridge and transit) that seek to leverage private and local revenues. The end results are acceleration of project implementation, spurring economic development, facilitating nontraditional projects, and responding to emergencies/natural disasters.

Eligible projects include transit improvements, shared-ride services, traffic flow improvements, demand management strategies, pedestrian/bicycle facilities and programs, inspection and maintenance programs, and alternative fuel projects. Loan amounts vary, the interest rate is one half the prime lending rate, and the maximum loan term is ten years.
Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority (PENNVEST)

PENNVEST is a low-interest revolving loan program administered by the State to assist municipalities with installation of new, or the repair and replacement of existing, water, sewer, and stormwater management infrastructure. In order to be eligible for PENNVEST, a municipality will be required to show evidence of need in the form of water or sewer studies and adopted stormwater management regulations and/or that the municipality is implementing its respective Act 167 plans.

Private Improvements

Property owners can be encouraged to construct public improvements on their property, with the incentive that these improvements will improve access to their business. For example, property owners could construct sidewalks on their property along a public roadway, help to pay for bus shelters, or provide bicycle parking for their customers and employees. Large employers can make donations for municipal transportation projects. For example, donations for road maintenance, police funds for traffic law enforcement, bus shelters, and bicycle parking can be made.

Public Works Department

The County Department of Public Works is responsible for the development, engineering design, and administration of construction projects for physical structures and facilities owned and maintained by the County. Its duties include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Administration of Liquid Fuels Tax Fund distributions to County municipalities as well as maintenance and capital repairs to County bridges
- Planning, development, and implementation of short-term and long-term capital improvements
- Analysis of requests for improvements and determination of necessity, validity, and cost-effective means for solution
- Supervision of preparation of construction bidding documents and cost estimates by design professionals
- Inspection of construction projects in progress to ensure compliance with design concepts and schedules
• Development of chronology required for distribution from capital monies

Recreational Trails Program

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)
Southeast Regional Field Office
Carolyn Wallis
908 State Office Building, Suite 207
1400 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130-4088
Tel: 215-560-1183
Fax: 215-560-6722
Email: cwallis@state.pa.us
Website: www.dcnr.state.pa.us/bcr/grants/rectrails.aspx

This program, operating under the larger C2P2 Program, awards grants for projects such as maintenance and restoration of existing trails, development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages, purchase and lease of recreational trail construction and maintenance equipment, construction of new recreational trails, and acquisition of easements or property for recreational trails or recreational trail corridors. Match requirements for this program are 80% grant money and 20% project applicant money.

Regional Police Assistance Grant Program

Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 888-223-6837
Fax: 717-783-1402
Website: www.newpa.com/programDetail.aspx?id=83

The program provides grants of up to $99,000 for a period of up to three years for the start-up of consolidated police departments. Any two or more municipalities who agree to regionalize their police forces are eligible, and grant monies may be used to pay for the regional police chief salary and other related expenses.

Renaissance Revitalization Homeownership First Program

Delaware County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD)
Chester Community Improvement Project
412 Avenue of the States
P.O. Box 541
Chester, PA 19016-0541
Tel: 610-876-8663
Fax: 610-876-3449
Email: ccip.info@verizon.net
Website: www.co.delaware.pa.us/hcd/

Media Fellowship House
302 S. Jackson Street
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-565-0434

The Renaissance Revitalization Homeownership First Program provides up to $5,000 in down payment and closing costs to qualifying first-time home buyers purchasing a property within Renaissance revitalization municipalities - Aldan Borough, Chester Township, Clifton Heights Borough, Collingdale Borough, Colwyn Borough, Darby Borough, Darby Township, East Lansdowne Borough, Eddystone Borough, Folcroft Borough, Glenolden Borough, Lansdowne Borough, Lower Chichester Township, Marcus Hook Borough, Millbourne Borough, Morton Borough, Norwood Borough, Parkside Borough, Prospect Park Borough, Ridley Township, Ridley Park Borough, Rutledge Borough, Sharon Hill Borough, Tinicum Township, Trainer Borough, Upland Borough, and Yeadon Borough. The assistance takes the form of a 0% interest forgivable loan
that is only repayable upon sale or transfer of the property and is forgiven after seven years.

**Shared Municipal Services Grant Program**

**Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)**

Governor’s Center for Local Government Services
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 888-223-6837
Fax: 717-783-1402
Website: www.newpa.com/programDetail.aspx?id=101

The purpose of the program, administered by CLGs, is to promote cooperation among municipalities to foster increased efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of municipal services at the local level. Any group of two or more municipalities, or a body authorized to act on behalf of two or more municipalities, is eligible to apply for funds. Municipalities must be non-entitlement boroughs or townships as per the Commonwealth’s CDBG Program. HUD federal entitlement municipalities and Commonwealth Act 179 entitlement municipalities are not eligible applicants. A multi-municipal code enforcement program is a typical eligible activity. Application is through the DCED Single Application process.

**Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA)**

1234 Market Street, 9th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Tel: 215-580-4000
Website: www.septa.org

SEPTA is the Philadelphia region’s public transportation provider and the point of contact for bus and rail service in the County. SEPTA maintains an on-going capital program, improving its existing infrastructure and designing new routes to meet the needs of its riders. Municipalities should contact SEPTA if they desire changes in service or cooperation on transportation-related projects.

**Surface Transportation Program**

**Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), District 6**

7000 Geerdes Boulevard
King of Prussia, PA 19406-1525
Tel: 610-205-6539
Fax: 610-205-6910
Website: www.dot.state.pa.us/penndot/districts/district6.nsf/main?readform

This program provides funding for transportation improvements on the federal-aid highway system (other than the National Highway System), the public transportation system, or for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Transportation Community Development Initiative (TCDI)**

**Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)**

190 N. Independence Mall West
8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1572

The TCDI program is intended to assist in reversing the trends of disinvestment and decline in many of the region’s core cities and first generation suburbs by:

- Supporting local planning projects that will lead to
more residential, employment, or retail opportunities;
• Improving the overall character and quality of life within these communities to retain and attract businesses and residents, which will help to reduce pressure for further sprawl and expansion into the growing suburbs;
• Enhancing and utilizing the existing transportation infrastructure capacity in these areas to reduce the demands on the region’s transportation network; and
• Reducing congestion and improving the transportation system’s efficiency.

Transportation Enhancements Program (PennDOT)

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)

190 N. Independence Mall West
8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1572
Tel: 215-238-2881
Fax: 215-592-9125
Email: rgallagher@dvrpc.org
Website:
http://www.dvrpc.org/transportation/capital/te/pa.htm

This program provides funding for activities such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities and educational activities, landscaping or scenic beautification, historic preservation of transportation-related resources, rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation resources, control and removal of outdoor advertising, and establishment of transportation museums.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission

Delaware County Planning Department
Transportation Planning Section
201 W. Front Street
Media, PA 19063-2751
Tel: 610-891-5217
Fax: 610-891-5203
Website:
www.co.delaware.pa.us/planning/transportation.html/

The TIP is a federally required, detailed list of the region’s prioritized transportation improvement projects. The TIP is the authorization to seek funding for the projects on it, but does not represent a commitment, obligation, or granting of funds. It is multi-modal, meaning in addition to the more traditional highway and public transit projects, it includes bicycle, pedestrian, and freight related projects as well. The TIP covers four years in Pennsylvania and is updated every other year. Because the TIP is financially constrained, projects compete against one another.

Municipalities interested in getting a project on the TIP should first go to DCPD, who will then work with the municipality to properly organize the project. The project will then go on the County’s list of desired projects, which is presented to DVRPC each year. DVRPC then goes through a review process and makes its determination in June/July of each even-numbered year.
Tree Maintenance Grant

Grants up to $5,000 with a 50% match requirement. The main objective of this grant is to stimulate communities to initiate systematic maintenance programs for public trees which are not receiving regular care and to develop local resources for continuing tree care, especially periodic pruning. Grants will be made available to Pennsylvania municipalities to assist them in implementing a tree care program for street and park trees including trees growing in greenways. Use of grant funds for removal of dead or dying trees is not allowed. Grants will be made available as funding becomes available to the Council. Municipalities will be expected to rely on their own resources to continue pruning of public trees at regular intervals after grants have been completed. Applications can be downloaded through the website.

U.S. Communities Government Purchasing Alliance

The U.S. Communities program provides all local agencies in the U.S. with publicly competitively bid contracts for various products and services through the buying power of large purchasers. Most local agencies may piggyback on a contract competitively solicited by another public agency, thereby eliminating the need to re-solicit.

U.S. Communities offers local agencies:

- Competitively bid contracts by a lead local agency
- Most favorable local agency pricing
- No cost to participate
- National sponsorship by leading associations and purchasing organizations
- A broad range of high quality products such as office/school supplies, office furniture, industrial supplies, electrical and data communication supplies, janitorial supplies, computer hardware/software, and procurement card.
- The aggregate purchasing power of public agencies nationwide
- Management by public purchasing professionals
The Environmental Stewardship and Watershed Protection Act authorizes DEP to allocate nearly $240 million in grants for acid mine drainage abatement, mine clean-up efforts, abandoned oil and gas well plugging, and local watershed-based conservation projects. These projects can include watershed assessments and development of watershed restoration or protection plans; implementation of watershed restoration or protection projects (stormwater management wetlands, riparian buffer fencing and planting, stream bank restoration (especially fluvial geomorphology (FGM), agricultural BMPs); construction of mine drainage remediation systems; reclamation of previously mined lands; and demonstration/educational projects and outreach activities.

These grants are available to a variety of eligible applicants, including counties, authorities, and municipalities; county conservation districts; watershed organizations; and other organizations involved in the restoration and protection of Pennsylvania’s environment. These grants will support local projects to clean up nonpoint sources of pollution throughout Pennsylvania.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Act 167 Program – Chapter 111 Funding

Along with providing grant funding for stormwater management projects, DEP can provide technical assistance with any stormwater-related issue or problem a municipality should have.

Act 2 Land Recycling Program

Staff of the DEP Bureau of Land Recycling and Waste Management can provide technical assistance to municipalities or landowners seeking information on contaminated lands and their options and requirements for remediation under state and federal law.
Email: landrecycling@state.pa.us
Website:
www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/airwaste/wm/landrecy/default.htm

Bureau of Parks

Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), State Park Region 4 (Eastern)

Dave Kemmerer
Regional Park Manager
2808 Three Mile Run Road
Perkasie, PA 18944-2065
Tel: 215-453-5000
Email: parkregion4sp@state.pa.us
Website:
www.dcnr.state.pa.us/stateparks

The Bureau of Parks can provide technical assistance to municipalities seeking aid in researching or completing parks and recreation projects, including grant writing.

Chester Community Improvement Project (CCIP)

412 Avenue of the States
P.O. Box 541
Chester, PA 19016-0541
Tel: 610-876-8663
Fax: 610-876-3449
Email: ccip.info@verizon.net

CCIP can aid municipalities in preparing applications for the County Home Improvement Loan (HIL) and Renaissance Revitalization Homeownership First Programs, which provide low-interest loans and money for down payments and closing costs to qualifying first-time home buyers.

Community Service Program

Delaware County Department of Community Service

Toal Building, Ground Floor
201 W. Front Street
Media, PA 19063
Tel: 610-891-4461
Fax: 610-891-5304
Website:
www.co.delaware.pa.us/depts/ccorrections.html

The Department of Community Service carries out the orders of the Court of Common Pleas that pertain to community service obligations and weekend highway clean-up. Municipalities may seek the program’s services for local improvement projects that match the Department’s normal workload.

“Creating Transit-Supportive Land Use Regulations”

American Planning Association (APA)

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Email: pasreport@planning.org
Website: www.planning.org

This report pulls together the codes, standards, and designs that forward-looking communities of all sizes have used to create more balanced transportation systems. It addresses a wide array of topics, including transit- and pedestrian-friendly design, parking, mixed use development, and support densities and incentives. Contains many drawings to explain transit-friendly planning options.
Crum Creek Watershed Partnership

Arthur McGarity  
Department of English, Hicks Hall  
Swarthmore College  
500 College Avenue  
Swarthmore, PA 19081  
Tel: 610-328-8077  
Fax: 610-328-8082  
Email: amcgarity@swarthmore.edu  
Website: http://watershed.swarthmore.edu/crum_partnership/index.html

The Crum Creek Watershed Partnership is a coalition of governmental and private organizations that are working to develop a management plan for the Crum Creek watershed. It is supported by a project currently underway at Swarthmore College and funded by DEP under Section 319 of the federal Clean Water Act.

CSX

Regional Office

Rick Nevinger  
One Bell Crossing Road  
Selkirk, NY 12158  
Tel: 518-767-6037  
Fax: 518-767-6468  
Website: www.csx.com

CSX strives to be a good corporate citizen in all of the communities through which it travels. Municipalities or local government officials with property code compliance or safety issues can contact CSX to discuss possible solutions.

Darby-Cobbs Watershed Partnership

Pennsylvania Environmental Council (PEC), Southeast Regional Office

Michael Leff  
Director, Watershed Programs  
117 S. 17th Street, Suite 2300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-5022  
Tel: 215-563-0250  
Fax: 215-563-0528  
Email: mleff@pecphila.org  
Website: www.phillywater.org/Darby-Cobbs/

The Darby-Cobbs Watershed Partnership is a consortium of proactive environmental groups, community groups, governmental agencies, residents, and other watershed stakeholders. Its mission is to improve the environmental health and safe enjoyment of the Darby-Cobbs watershed by sharing resources through cooperation of the residents and other stakeholders in the watershed.

Darby Creek Valley Association (DCVA)

P.O. Box 732  
Drexel Hill, PA 19026  
Tel: 610-789-1814  
Email: info@dcva.org  
Website: www.dcva.org

The DCVA is an all volunteer, nonprofit organization dedicated to the protection and enhancement through public education of all of the Darby Creek watershed’s resources, including water, wildlife, historic sites, and the floodplain. Municipalities may seek its assistance and expertise in projects relating to streams.
Delaware County Commerce Center (DCCC)

Laura Goodrich  
200 E. State Street  
Media, PA 19063  
Tel: 610-566-2225  
Fax: 610-566-7337  
E-mail: info@delcopa.org  
Website: www.delcopa.org

DCCC is the centralized one-stop shop for all economic development programs in Delaware County. As the economic development agency for the County, the Center manages the Economic Development Oversight Board (EDOB), Industrial Development Authority (IDA), Industrial Development Corporation (IDC), and the Redevelopment Authority (RDA).

DCCC can assist municipalities by providing information essential to the locational decision process, administering all available federal, state, and local incentive programs, helping to tackle workforce development issues, and acting as a liaison between municipalities and companies in working through the various local planning commissions, zoning hearing boards, and related state agencies.

The RDA acts as the vehicle for condemnation and development within the County. In certain circumstances, it has the power of eminent domain for private development. It also administers the County Brownfield’s pilot program.

Delaware County Conservation District

Rose Tree Park - Hunt Club  
1521 N. Providence Road  
Media, PA 19063  
Tel: 610-892-9484  
Fax: 610-892-9489  
Email: info@delcocd.org  
Website: http://delcocd.org

The Delaware County Conservation District provides technical assistance for activities relating to erosion/sedimentation, stormwater management, stream restoration, floodplain management, and storm drain stenciling.

Delaware County Housing Authority (DCHA)

1855 Constitution Avenue  
P.O. Box 100  
Woodlyn, PA 19094  
Tel: 610-490-3301  
Website: www.dcha1.org

DCHA’s mission is to provide well-maintained, safe housing while honoring a commitment to enhance the quality of life within the community and for its clients. DCHA operates the Housing Choice Voucher, Section 8, and low rent public housing programs. Municipalities should contact DCHA with any low-income housing projects, improvements ideas, or concerns.

Delaware County Library System (DCLS)

DCLS Administrative Headquarters  
340 N. Middletown Road  
Fair Acres, Building 19  
Media, PA 19063-5597

DCLS can aid municipalities and local libraries, including grant applications.
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Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD)

DCPD provides technical assistance in the following areas:
- Community Assistance
- Environmental Planning
- GIS & Information Services
- County & Regional Planning
- Historic Preservation
- Plan & Ordinance Review
- Transportation Planning

Delaware County Solid Waste Authority (DCSWA)

DCSWA is responsible for the operation of solid waste transfer and disposal facilities and recycling drop-off centers in the County and can provide technical assistance in these areas.

Delaware County Transportation Management Association (TMA)

The Delaware County TMA is a County-level advocate for business or municipal transportation needs, communicating with transportation agencies and providers by serving on key committees of SEPTA, PennDOT, and DVRPC. The TMA sponsors the Municipal Construction Coordination Program, designed to promote cooperation among municipalities and utility companies for local road and other construction projects.

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)

DVRPC is the regional metropolitan planning organization (MPO) serving five Pennsylvania and four New Jersey counties and their municipalities, offering planning analysis, data collection, mapping services, aerial photographs, and a variety of publications to the public and private sectors. Municipalities should work through DCPD for assistance on DVRPC programs.
Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED)

Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 4th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225
Tel: 717-787-8158
888-223-6837
Fax: 717-783-1402
Website: www.newpa.com

DCED offers services and programs meant to spur economic development throughout the state. Municipalities should contact the representative identified with each program offered or contact DCPD for assistance.

Department of Education (DOE)

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126
Tel: 717-783-6788
Email: 00plink@psupen.psu.edu
Website: www.pde.state.pa.us

The Pennsylvania DOE provides resources, data, and information on all of the state’s school districts and the state’s educational programs and expectations.

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
451 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410
Tel: 202-708-1112
TTY: 202-708-1455
Website: www.hud.gov

Philadelphia Regional Office
The Wanamaker Building
100 Penn Square East
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3380
Tel: 215-656-0500
TTY: 215-656-3452
Fax: 215-656-3445

HUD is the federal agency responsible for national policy and programs that address America’s housing needs, that improve and develop the nation’s communities, and for enforcing fair housing laws. HUD plays a major role in supporting homeownership by underwriting homeownership for low- and moderate-income families through its mortgage insurance programs.

The primary programs administered by HUD include mortgage and loan insurance through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA); CDBG to help communities with economic development, infrastructure improvement, job opportunities, and housing rehabilitation; HOME Investment Partnership Act block grants to develop and support affordable housing for low-income residents; rental assistance in the form of Section 8 certificates or vouchers for low-income households; public or subsidized housing for low-income individuals and families; homeless assistance provided through local communities and faith-based and other nonprofit organizations; and fair housing public education and enforcement.
The Emergency Services Department has the responsibility for emergency communications and management. Communications operates the County’s Enhanced 911 system and dispatches the majority of police, fire, and ambulance services in the County. Management is responsible for the planning and coordinating of County resources in response to emergencies when they occur, assisting local municipalities in their emergency planning preparedness, providing municipal level training, dispatching the Hazardous Material Response team, and serves as the focal point for the collection of information pertaining to hazardous materials.

This program is intended to provide useful resources to borough officials who are pursuing funding for their communities. The program offers three levels of support: general grant information, a quarterly newsletter called “A Borough’s Guide to Grants,” and workshops and training. The quarterly newsletter focuses entirely on grant opportunities for boroughs and includes specific and critical information such as deadlines and contacts. The workshops and training include courses designed to prepare and train officials for successful development of grant proposals.

The Growing Greener Program was created to preserve farmland and protect open space, eliminate the maintenance backlog in state parks, clean up abandoned mines, restore watersheds, and provide new and upgraded water and sewer systems. DEP established this network of technical assistance providers to help watershed organizations effectively and efficiently achieve their watershed protection goals. These providers offer legal, engineering, data management, program management, science mentoring, and technical services at no cost to eligible organizations for Growing Greener type projects.
**“Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities”**

**American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)**

444 N. Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: 202-624-5800
Fax: 202-624-5806
Email: aashto@normas.com
Website: www.aashto.org

This guide looks at ways to make bicycle use safer and more convenient for not only bicyclists, but pedestrians and motorists as well. Included are planning considerations, design and construction guidelines, and operation and maintenance recommendations. The 1999 edition has been expanded with a look at accessibility issues on shared use paths.

**Habitat for Humanity (H4H)**

**Delaware Valley Habitat for Humanity**

100 S. Broad Street, Suite 1331
Philadelphia, PA 19110-1028
Tel: 215-564-2102
Fax: 215-564-2103
Email: buildahouse@dvhabitat.org
Website: www.dvhabitat.org

The Delaware County chapter of H4H, in partnership with the families that will become homeowners, constructs or rehabilites homes through volunteer labor and tax-deductible donations of money and materials. These houses are sold to the families for the cost of the materials with a mortgage that does not include interest or profit. Small monthly mortgage payments, including taxes and insurance, are repaid over an average of 20 years. These payments support the construction of more houses. H4H has a default ratio of less than 1% internationally. After an extensive application process, each partner family is required to invest 300-500 hours of “sweat equity” (volunteer time) in the building of their home.

**Housing Association of Delaware Valley (HADV)**

1500 Walnut Street, Suite 601
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Tel: 215-545-6010
Fax: 215-790-9132
Website: www.hadv.org

The primary purpose of the HADV is to secure decent housing for all people and the elimination of racism and discrimination in housing. The Association acts as a watchdog of governmental programs and policies, as an advocate for alternatives for low- and moderate-income citizens, conducts research, engages in educational activities, provides technical assistance to organizations, and operates programs to help low-income families gain, maintain, or retain decent and affordable housing.

The HADV was founded in 1909 as the nation’s first citizens’ housing organization. While the focus of the Association’s work is on the Delaware Valley, the intended impact is for the entire nation. HADV assists families and individuals without regard for race, creed, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, disability, family size, or source of income. However, the agency does have a particular commitment to reach out to the poor, minorities, those who do not speak English, the disabled, children, and the elderly.
International Code Council (ICC)

Roland Hall - Regional Manager
Norma Jean Gaudet - Secretary
One Neshaminy Interplex, Suite 201
Trevose, PA 19053
Tel: 800-323-1103, Ext. 6
Tel: 215-638-0554
Fax: 215-638-4438
www.iccsafe.org

The International Code Council (ICC) was established in 1994 as a nonprofit organization dedicated to developing a single set of comprehensive and coordinated national model construction codes. The founders of the ICC are Building Officials and Code Administrators International, Inc. (BOCA), International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), and Southern Building Code Congress International, Inc. (SBCCI).

The organizations that comprise the ICC offer unmatched technical, educational, and informational products and services in support of the International Codes, with more than 250 highly qualified staff members at 16 offices throughout the United States and in Latin America. Some of the products and services readily available to code users include:

- Code application assistance
- Educational programs
- Certification programs
- Technical handbooks and workbooks
- Plan reviews
- Automated products
- Monthly magazines and newsletters
- Publication of proposed code changes
- Training and informational videos

John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum

International Plaza 2, Suite 104
Philadelphia, PA 19113
Tel: 610-521-0662
Fax: 610-521-0611
Email: fw5 rw_jhtnwr@fws.gov
Website: http://heinz.fws.gov/
Cusano Environmental Education Center (CEEC)
8601 Lindbergh Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19153
Tel: 215-365-3118

The Heinz Refuge, approximately 1,200 acres, is what is left of the historic Tinicum Marsh, and is the largest freshwater tidal marsh in the state. Through the CEEC, educational programs are offered to the public. Municipalities can also use the CEEC as a resource when creating or enhancing existing parks and recreational areas.
The National Association of Town Watch (NATW) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the development and promotion of organized, law enforcement-affiliated crime and drug prevention programs. Members include neighborhood, crime, community, town, and block watch groups; law enforcement agencies; state and regional crime prevention associations; and a variety of businesses, civic groups, and concerned individuals working to make their communities safer places in which to live and work.

NCPC is a national educational nonprofit, acting as the nation’s focal point for crime prevention information. Its mission is to enable people to create safer and more caring communities by addressing the causes of crime and violence and reducing the opportunities for crime to occur. McGruff the Crime Dog, who helped people change their minds and take charge of crime prevention themselves, has been the national spokesdog since 1980.

This technical memorandum describes the results of an effort to accelerate the implementation of the Year 2020 Regional Long-Range Plan Bicycle Element (Southeastern Pennsylvania Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan, Direction 2020 Report No. 28, September 1995) through the generation of high-priority independent roadway retrofit projects designed to improve the level of service for bicycling. The 22 miles of Delaware County roads selected for study represent the highest priority for implementation, as determined through a process involving County Planning staff, the bicycling community, and the public. Service to key trip generators (including rail stations) and connectivity with existing and proposed off-road trails figured prominently in the selection.

The mission of the PDC is to promote and support the vitality of Pennsylvania’s downtowns and traditional neighborhood business districts. PDC offers a
comprehensive field outreach program to assist members with training and technical assistance tailored to a community’s unique needs, providing them with a broad menu of tools, training, and workshops to revitalize their downtown. Participants in the Pennsylvania Main Street Program are trained throughout their five-year state funding cycle. PDC also offers regional professional development workshops, a biannual newsletter, and an advocacy committee.

Pennsylvania Environmental Council (PEC)

Southeast Regional Office
117 S. 17th Street
Suite 2300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-563-0250
Fax: 215-563-0528
Website: www.pecpa.org

PEC improves the quality of life for Pennsylvanians by enhancing the Commonwealth’s rural and built environments by integrating advocacy, education, and implementation of community and regional action projects. The Council values reasoned and long-term approaches that include the interests of all stakeholders to accomplish its goals.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)

Bureau for Historic Preservation
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093
Tel: 717-787-0771
Fax: 717-772-0920
Website: www.phmc.state.pa.us

PHMC is the official history agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with the mission of preserving the Commonwealth’s past through leadership, stewardship, and service. It provides a variety of grant programs and technical assistance in seeking, applying for, and implementing these and other grants for historic preservation purposes.

Pennsylvania Horticultural Society

100 N. 20th Street, 5th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103-1495
Tel: 215-988-8800
Fax: 215-988-8810
Email: programreg@pennhort.org
Website: www.pennsylvaniahorticulturalsociety.com

The Pennsylvania Horticultural Society provides technical assistance to urban park restoration programs throughout southeastern Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs (PSAB)

2941 N. Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Tel: 717-236-9526
Fax: 717-236-8164
Email: general@boroughs.org
Website: www.boroughs.org/index.stm

PSAB is the primary resource for all information pertaining to borough government. PSAB can provide technical assistance in virtually any arena related to local municipal government.
“Pennsylvania Traffic Calming Handbook”

Published by PennDOT, this publication outlines a recommended process for implementing traffic calming in a neighborhood. Included is an outline summary of the preliminary traffic calming process and the study and approval process sections of Pennsylvania’s Guide to Traffic Calming. Municipalities or their engineers should consult this handbook when considering implementing traffic calming measures.

PRWA Training and Technical Assistance Program

Unique as a member-supported, nonprofit, nongovernmental organization, the PRWA has established and maintains a reputation for integrity and technical excellence by providing leadership in the operation, maintenance, and management of systems responsible for providing safe drinking water and wastewater management -- community, industrial, or commercially operated. Training sessions are offered throughout Pennsylvania covering a wide variety of water and wastewater issues. Training is hands-on and geared to day-to-day operation and maintenance of water and wastewater systems.

Small Water Systems Outreach Program

The outreach program is conducted by DEP to provide on-site education and assistance for small community water systems experiencing current or potential difficulties in areas relating to system operation, maintenance, or management. Assistance is provided in the areas of groundwater treatment, surface water treatment, distribution and storage, process laboratory, and management; however, each outreach effort is flexible and tailored to the individual needs of the system. This program offers on-site technical and management-related assistance and training. Outreach assistance is conducted in an interactive peer-based format at no cost to the system owner and is nonregulatory in nature. Site visits are scheduled at the mutual convenience of system personnel and the instructor. Telephone-based contacts and action planning supplement site visits to gauge understanding and advance activity.
“Traffic Calming: State of the Practice”

This report contains a synthesis of traffic calming experiences to date in the United States and Canada. It includes information on traffic calming in residential areas and in areas where high-speed rural highways transition into rural communities. The report draws from detailed information collected on traffic calming programs in 20 featured communities, another 30 communities surveyed less extensively, and a parallel Canadian effort by the Canadian ITE (CITE) and the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC).

“Transit-Oriented Development for Southeastern Pennsylvania”

The purpose of this handbook is to provide municipal officials and development professionals in southeastern Pennsylvania with a resource that explains the concept of TOD and describes how it can be achieved in this region. The first section of the handbook contains textual and graphic descriptions of the elements of TOD and charts summarizing recommended policy changes needed to achieve them. The second section provides examples of TODs that have been proposed or are now being built in this region and elsewhere. Finally, the third section of the book gives a brief overview of the potential roles public agencies, private firms, and individuals from the community may play. Sources of additional information are given in the final pages of the book.

Wastewater Operator Outreach Program

This program provides hands-on, on-site technical assistance and training to publicly owned wastewater treatment plants across Pennsylvania at no charge. The program can provide assistance in laboratory procedures, process control, utility management, financial management, collection systems, maintenance, computerization, and safety. A series of videotapes on wastewater treatment and laboratory procedures is also available free of charge.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

HISTORIC PRESERVATION TOOLBOX

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLANNING

Local historic preservation measures help a community’s efforts to increase the quality of life for its citizens and can offer methods to assist in the community revitalization. These measures can create a desirable and interesting area for heritage trails and tourist destinations. These “tools” for preservation can also improve the environmental, economic, educational, and social aspects of the municipality, while saving our heritage.

LEGAL BASIS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Preservation at the Federal Level

Historic preservation is accomplished through a variety of different tools that are permitted under both federal and state law. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 created an extensive framework within which preservation could take place. It established programs and opportunities for preservation activities from the federal government to the local level. Among other programs, the Act created the National Register of Historic Places as well as State Historical Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the Certified Local Government Program (CLG).

Preservation at the State Level (SHPO)

Federal law mandates that states have a State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO). The Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Act of 1978 (Act 273) recognizes the role of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), which is the Pennsylvania SHPO, as having general responsibility for overseeing and advising all levels of government on historic preservation within the state.

Preservation on the Municipal Level

The Pennsylvania state laws which specifically enable local regulation for preservation are Historic District Act, Act 167 (1961 P. L. 282) and Article IV (Section 604 (1) and 605(2)) in the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC). Specifically, the MCP (Article IV) allows the municipality to use zoning to protect historic sites, whereas the Historic District Act is the specific legislation authorizing municipalities to create local historic districts and to establish an Historical and Architectural Review Board (HARB) to oversee architectural activity within the district.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Goals and Objectives

The legal basis for historic preservation, as described above, assumes that preservation is a goal of the community. It is important to clearly establish preservation-related goals in the comprehensive plan. A section in the plan should clearly indicate that the Townships value their historic and cultural resources and that their preservation and maintenance are goals for the future. This provides the basis for any preservation-related land use provisions that the Townships might want to establish, such as an historic district ordinance.

The Inventory of Cultural Resources

In addition to specifying local preservation goals, a municipal comprehensive plan should also contain a mapped inventory or survey of the historic and archaeological resources intended for protection/preservation. This inventory or survey provides the groundwork upon which the preservation policies of a municipality should rest.

A simple inventory, otherwise known as a “windshield survey,” consists of a listing all of the historic resources within a municipality. A more complete survey containing information on the historic significance of each resource would be of even greater value as it could serve as a basis for determining the type and level of protection that is needed. For legal purposes, it is extremely important to establish criteria for determining how sites are chosen to be in the survey. This list is then the defining base for additional controls through local regulation. It is also critical that the survey or inventory be kept up to date to protect those resources that may have just "come of age" and are now officially considered "historic," i.e., they are fifty (50) years or older.

Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) can act in an advisory capacity to those communities who wish to begin a survey. In a comprehensive survey, each historic resource is documented on a form provided by PHMC. Each site is visited, photographed, and a site plan drawn. A narrative is included for both the history of the structure and the architectural description. All the historic resources should then be identified on a municipal map. The areas believed or known to contain sensitive archaeological resources should also be defined and included in the listing of historic resources. DCPD maintains a database on the potential archaeologically sensitive areas in the County. This completed survey of all the resources and an accompanying map should then be adopted into the comprehensive plan.
TOOLS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The following is a description of various tools that can be used to preserve historic and archaeological resources. They can be used alone or together to best satisfy the needs of the community. For example, a municipality with both clustered and scattered sites may wish to enact both an historic district ordinance and an overlay ordinance (refer to subsequent sections on these types of ordinances). Although many municipalities will have sites on the National Register of Historic Places, they may also want to protect valuable community resources that do not meet the criteria of the National Register. The Local Landmark designation (also discussed below) can be used for the one or two scattered sites, while the core of an historic area is protected by the historic district ordinance.

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places is the official source for federally recognized historic resources of value. It lists those places deemed significant due to their history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture. Eligibility of buildings, sites, districts or objects is based on specific criteria defined by the National Register. A description of the types of resources, the criteria used in evaluating resources, and the process steps for placing a resource on the National Register is available from the National Park Service.

It is important to note that PHMC is the agency responsible for determining whether the nominated resource is eligible for the National Register. This Determination of Eligibility (DOE) carries with it the same advantages as those resources that are actually listed on the National Register. These advantages consist of the following:

1. Recognition of the historic significance of the resource
2. Special consideration if a federally funded project is found to affect the resource in any way
3. Eligibility for federal tax credits
4. Qualification for special funding from state or federal sources

Districts or clusters of historic buildings or resources (such as an industrial complex or a village of residences) may also be placed on the National Register as a district. In this case, each building contributing to the district’s historic significance is considered to have the same benefits of an individual building on the National Register.

It should also be stressed the National Register designation places absolutely no obligations on the property owner. The owner is free to do whatever he wishes to his property. In extreme cases, the only penalty would be having the National Register designation removed.
Advantages:

- A good first step toward recognition of the community’s goals
- Prestige and status is given to the resource and community
- Special consideration on the effect of a project funded by state or federal funds
- Special funding opportunities

Disadvantage:

- No protection from any private or local project

**Local Historic Districts (Act 167 Historic District Ordinance)**

Adoption of a Local Historic District through an Act 167 historic district ordinance is the most important tool for protection of clusters of historic resources in a municipality. It essentially allows for the creation of a district that, after certification by PHMC, provides local review of changes in the district. It places another layer of regulations upon the base zoning of the district whether it is commercial, residential, or industrial. The district need not be on the National Register. Act 167 (1961 P.L. 282) authorizes the local government to:

- Delineate an historic district
- Establish an Historical and Architectural Review Board (HARB) which is advisory to the municipal governing officials
- Determine guidelines to regulate physical changes within the district
- Create a review process leading to granting or not granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes within the district

Many misconceptions exist about an Act 167 district. It is true that the design guidelines could place limits on many homeowners’ exterior alterations. However, the guidelines should reflect community values relative to the district and can be created to be as strict or as lenient as desired. In some cases, they may only affect new construction or any additions (not alterations) made to existing buildings within the district. Some municipalities’ districts may regulate all changes. Examples of elements that can be regulated by design guidelines are height, bulk, roof line, proportions, façade openings, compatibility with architectural detail, building materials, color, fences, walls, and exterior lighting. It is strongly advised that residents of the proposed district be included in the planning process very early to elicit their cooperation. The steps for establishing an historic district ordinance and examples of model historic district ordinances prepared by PHMC are available at the Delaware County Planning Department. A booklet on historic district designation is available online through PHMC’s website.

There are only three municipalities in Delaware County with Act 167 Local Historic Districts and HARBs: Chadds Ford, Media, and Ridley Park.
Advantages:

- A prescribed process for review is mandated by the Act
- The guidelines are customized to the locality
- It is the most effective way to preserve the character as well as the buildings

Disadvantages:

- Residents of the district must be involved from the very beginning of the decision-making process to create a district which is acceptable to all, which often means a lengthy process
- HARB members must be knowledgeable about architectural styles and interpretation of the guidelines, or enforcement becomes inconsistent
- A community must have a local district approved by the governing body, which may become an obstacle.

**Historic Zoning Overlay**

The Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), specifically Article IV, allows the municipality to use zoning and/or subdivision/land development ordinances to protect historic resources. This can be accomplished by including historic preservation language in amendments to the existing codes.

Whether the surveyed historic resources in a municipality are clustered or widely scattered, a zoning overlay that includes the resources identified in the municipal survey can be adopted into the zoning ordinance. This overlay can apply regulations and incentives in addition to those of the base zoning. These regulations can address such issues as:

- Requiring an historic impact study as part of the existing land development process
- Demolition of historic structures
- Design guidelines
- Buffering or visual protection
- Protection for archaeological sites
- Additional or conditional uses

Additional incentives, such as special and conditional use opportunities, can be given to the property owners of these identified resources. A developer of a property that contains an historic building can be offered incentives to retain the building and reuse it. The incentives could include an expansion in uses, increased density, and parking bonuses. These are all especially valuable in encouraging the reuse of some of the larger, late 19th century homes now too large for a single family. For instance, an historic home in the overlay zone could be used for a flower shop even though it is in a residential zone on the base-zoning map. Concord Township, for example, has enacted an historic zoning overlay with incentives.
To preserve the historical integrity, controls can also be included within these regulations to protect resources. Buffering requirements are invaluable in maintaining the historic setting of some of the resources. Also helpful are the retention of landscaping and outbuildings. Archaeological sites are especially vulnerable to land development projects. Therefore, developers should be required to submit an archaeological assessment plan describing the measures that will be taken to minimize the impact of the project on these resources.

The review body for activities that take place within an historic overlay district is generally an historical commission (described in detail elsewhere). This is an appointed advisory board, but its general responsibilities can consist of more than its review function. Like an historical architectural review board or HARB, the historical commission can review for appropriate treatment within the overlay zones, but it may also become the “keeper” of the history of the municipality and be in charge of updating the survey, providing information distributions to the citizens, and National Register nominations.

The historic resources protected by a zoning overlay must be in the official survey of historical sites adopted into the comprehensive plan. They are usually classified by their level of significance; many municipalities use three classifications:

- Class I - Resources listed in or eligible for the National Register
- Class II - Resources significant to local history
- Class III - All other resources of a certain age

In this manner, a greater degree of control can be given to the higher classifications, and minimal control can be placed on Class III resources.

Advantages:

- It provides flexibility of restrictions and incentives
- Areas with a high archaeological potential can be included with protective measures directed toward ground disturbances
- It encourages reuse of historic structures

Disadvantage:

- The criteria for the classification of the historical and archaeological sites must be precise and thorough to be effective

**Demolition Ordinance**

In order to provide a minimum level of protection for historic resources, a municipality should adopt an ordinance governing demolition of historic structures, either as a freestanding ordinance or as part of the zoning ordinance. These provisions would specify that all demolition permit applications be reviewed in accordance with a specific procedure. The ordinance provisions could stipulate a delay period or “stay of
demolition” for issuing a demolition permit (e.g., 90 to 120 days). During this period, the local review board would be given an opportunity to seek alternative uses and/or buyers for the building. A report on the findings developed during that period could indicate that alternative scenarios for the resource are economically feasible and/or acceptable to the applicant. Although legally untested, it may be possible to deny a demolition permit in the case of an extremely significant building.

Demolition by neglect (the gradual deterioration of a building over time) is a difficult situation to address and control. However, maintenance standards can be enforced to help control this type of “demolition.” The Concord Township Historic Preservation Ordinance gives the Township the authority to determine if a structure is being demolished by neglect and to require the owner to apply for a demolition permit, thus setting in motion the review procedure for demolition.

If the end result of a stay of demolition is ultimately granting the demolition permit, then the municipality may require that adequate time be added to the stay period for documenting the building. Such documentation involves photographs, measurements, and site plans being placed with the local historical group or the Township for future reference.

**Local Landmark Designations**

A municipality can adopt a “landmark ordinance” to protect a specific structure that has special significance to the municipality. St. Martins Church in Marcus Hook is protected by just such an ordinance.

A landmark ordinance has two parts. The first part demonstrates the significance of the structure. The second part lists actions permitted or not permitted (such as the removal of an architectural detail) and/or any incentives for preservation activities associated with the structure.

**Advantage:**

- The façade for one structure of outstanding significance is protected

**Disadvantages:**

- The structure’s significance must be substantiated
- The owner must give consent

**Historic Conservation Districts**

Neighborhoods with a special architectural character can be preserved without putting a financial burden onto the homeowner through a conservation district ordinance. This is similar to an Act 67 historic district ordinance, but with less stringent requirements in retaining the authentic historic fabric. For example, in a conservation district where porches are a prolific visual element, homeowners may use aluminum siding but may not
enclose their front porches because that would undermine a defining feature of the neighborhood.

A conservation district ordinance may also offer the homeowners a financial incentive by making low-interest revolving loans available to them from the municipality. In addition, the review board established with the district would also serve as an advisory group offering construction and architectural expertise and advice. An example of a conservation district can be found in the Pottstown, Pennsylvania, zoning ordinance.

Advantages:

- Minimum design control
- Financial incentives
- Expert consultations

Disadvantages:

- Destruction of some of the historical fabric of the buildings
- Needs consent of most of the homeowners involved
- Establishing the financial base for the loans

**Development and Subdivision Regulations**

An historic preservation section could be adopted into the municipal ordinance regulating land development and subdivisions. A developer of a property that contains an historic building can be offered incentives to retain and reuse the building. One incentive could provide for density and parking bonuses, which is especially valuable in encouraging the reuse of some of the larger late 19th century homes now too large for a single family.

To preserve historical integrity, controls can also be included within these regulations. Buffering requirements are invaluable in maintaining the historic setting of some of the resources. The retention of landscaping and outbuildings are also helpful.

Archaeological sites are especially vulnerable to subdivision and land development projects. Requiring the developer to submit an archaeological assessment plan describing the measures that will be taken to minimize the impact of the project can protect these areas.

**Building Code Exceptions**

The recently adopted Uniform Construction Code for Pennsylvania (2003) municipalities includes the International Existing Building Code. This code is intended to encourage the reuse of existing buildings while still requiring reasonable upgrades and improvements. In general, if there is no change in the use of an existing building, then only those portions to be altered must meet the requirements for new structures.
Historical Commissions and Historical and Architectural Review Boards

In the previous paragraphs we have mentioned two different review boards that a municipality may establish. The following better explains how each is used:

HARB – This is the appointed Board mandated by the Historic District Act (Act 167). The Act specifies that this Board will have not less than five members and describes these members’ qualifications. The primary duty of this HARB is to review changes within an historic district and to recommend (or not recommend) that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Historical Commission – This Board is not mandated by law but, like a HARB, its members are appointed by the municipal officials. The duties of an Historical Commission can range from simply being the keepers of the municipal history to overseeing the municipal historic resource survey, from acting as a formal review board for historic overlays to archaeological assessment, or any other advisory function regarding the historic fabric of the community.

Façade Easements/Dedications

The municipality can create an easement on a building façade or accept dedication of an area or structure. The owner of the property can then take a federal tax deduction for a charitable donation. This mechanism can monitor the future changes on structures or areas and is usually done through a nonprofit agency such as Natural Lands Trust or the Preservation Alliance of Philadelphia. Some municipalities have established their own nonprofit group to accept and monitor easements.

Reuse and Revitalization

The reuse of existing buildings can revitalize a community. In most cases, the buildings that are intact can be less expensively rehabilitated than creating new structures.

Using the tools described above will help to preserve the historic fabric of a community, but adaptive reuse is the core of revitalization. The key to continued preservation is the active use of a structure. Once a resource is identified as historic, and special to the community, the action can then begin to encourage its reuse.

In most cases, an historic building is adaptable to reuse. However, if federal funding or federal tax incentives are involved with the reuse, it is strongly advised and often enforced that the ”Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation” be used as a guideline for improving and changing the structure. These guidelines encourage the reuse of original materials or replacement in kind. A summary of these guidelines is can be obtained from the National Park Service of Delaware County Planning Department.
**Tax Incentives**

Federal Tax Credits – Sites on the National Register of Historic Places (or those in a National Register Historic District) are eligible for federal tax credits for rehabilitation. This applies only to income-producing structures but can be an incentive for revitalization of an area.

Property Tax Abatement and Freeze – The municipality has the authority to develop its own incentive for preservation. The municipal tax is lowered or frozen for a period of time for those historic structures undergoing a rehabilitation or reuse.

**Community Development Block Grants**

Another source of funds for the rehabilitation of historic resources is the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). These federally sponsored funds are awarded each year by the Delaware County Planning Department to low- and moderate-income areas, and there is also a provision for funding historic rehabilitation.

**Public/Private Cooperation**

Not all projects can be funded by one source, especially in revitalization areas. Many projects, usually the those involving more than one building or an extremely large structure, are accomplished using funds from public sources such as state or federal preservation grants as well as foundation and corporate grants and local financial institutions.

**Certified Local Government Program**

The Certified Local Government (CLG) program is a cost-effective local, state and federal partnership. The initiative provides valuable technical assistance and small grants to local governments seeking to keep for future generations what is important and significant from their past. Funds are appropriated annually by the U.S. Congress and distributed from the Historic Preservation Fund, which is administered by the National Park Service and State Historic Preservation Offices in each state.

The more than 1,100 local governments that participate in the program are eligible to apply to their SHPO for grants representing a minimum of ten percent of the federal funds allocated to their State. Projects eligible for funding and the criteria used to select them are developed annually by the SHPO. The State, not National Park Service, makes funding decisions.
The Need for Land Recycling

Past Pennsylvania environmental policies have been disincentives for the private cleanup of old industrial sites. Since both state and federal cleanup laws can impose full responsibility for a site cleanup on new buyers, even though they may have had no involvement in contamination of the property, state policies that promoted never-ending liability discouraged private firms, lenders, and even public redevelopment authorities from getting involved.

The positive aspects of an old industrial site, such as its location or the availability of electric, water and sewer utilities, were frequently negated by the threat of huge, unknown cost and never-ending liability for an environmental cleanup of the site. Lenders were reluctant to invest in the purchase of such property if they became exposed to perpetual liability. Innocent buyers particularly shunned sites where those persons who were responsible for causing the contamination were bankrupt, insolvent or couldn’t be identified. Too often, developers have chosen virgin properties as an alternative to old industrial sites with contamination problems.

The Land Recycling Program will encourage, not discourage, the recycling and redevelopment of old industrial sites. It sets standards, by law for the first time, that are protective of human health and the environment, but which consider future use. It provides potential developers with clear cleanup standards based on risk, not a moving target in a negotiated agreement, and provides an end to liability when that cleanup standard is accomplished.

These changes should make many old industrial sites more attractive to potential developers. As a result, many sites should be converted from vacant eyesores to productive use, helping many of the Commonwealth’s urban and rural municipalities to provide jobs through economic growth.

Benefits of Land Recycling —
- Encourages private-sector cleanups and productive use of now vacant industrial sites;
- Stimulates economic growth, particularly in urban areas;
- Encourages local government partnerships with business and saves the; Commonwealth millions of dollars in cleanup costs it would otherwise pay
- Reduces the pressure to develop prime farmland, open areas and forests.

Regulatory Basis

The Land Recycling Program includes three bills - Acts 2, 3 and 4 - that Governor Tom Ridge signed into law May 19, 1995.

Act 2 of 1995 (previously Senate Bill 1) is the Land Recycling and Environmental Remediation Standards Act. This act is the primary law establishing the Land Recycling Program. It creates a realistic framework for setting cleanup standards, provides special incentives for developing abandoned sites, releases responsible parties from liability when cleanup standards are met, sets deadlines for Department actions and provides funding for environmental studies and cleanups.

Act 3 (previously Senate Bill 11) is the Economic Development Agency, Fiduciary and Lender Environmental Liability Protection Act. This act limits the environmental liability of those involved in redeveloping and financing a recycled industrial site.

Act 4 (previously Senate Bill 12) is the Industrial Sites Environmental Assessment Act. This act provides up to $2 million for environmental assessments in certain communities and for cleanups in certain cities through the Department of Commerce.
**Basic Elements of Land Recycling**

The four cornerstones of the land recycling program are uniform cleanup standards based on health and environmental risks, standardized review procedures, releases from liability, and financial assistance.

**Uniform cleanup standards**

Act 2 establishes environmental remediation standards to provide a uniform framework for cleanups. The standards established under Act 2 will be used for most voluntary or mandatory cleanups conducted in Pennsylvania. The three types of cleanup standards are background, statewide health standards, and site-specific standards.

**Standardized review procedures**

Act 2 describes the submission and review procedures to be used at sites using each of the three types of cleanup standard, thus providing a uniform process for all sites statewide. Uniformity will make it easier for companies and consultants to prepare submissions and follow through the steps necessary to remediate a site.

**Releases from liability**

Act 2 provides releases from liability for owners or developers of a site that has been remediated according to the standards and procedures in the Act. Act 3 extends liability protection to financiers, such as economic development agencies, lenders, and fiduciaries. (Fiduciaries are those who act as a trustee, executor, or administrator for the benefit of another person.) These provisions are intended to reduce the liability concerns that may inhibit involvement with contaminated or abandoned sites.

**Financial assistance**

Act 2 establishes the Industrial Sites Cleanup Fund that is designed to help innocent persons conduct voluntary cleanups. Grants or low-interest loans are provided to cover up to 75 percent of the cost of completing an environmental study and implementing a cleanup plan. The Department of Commerce will administer this program.

Act 4 allows the Department of Commerce to make grants to municipalities, municipal or local authorities, nonprofit economic development agencies, and similar agencies. The grants are to conduct environmental assessments of industrial sites located in municipalities that the Department of Commerce has designated as distressed communities. Certain cities are eligible for grants to conduct environmental assessments and remediation activities.

**Relationship to Other State and Federal Programs**

- The cleanup standards developed under Act 2 apply to all cleanups.
- State and local permits are not required for remediation activities conducted under Act 2 if they are undertaken entirely on the site unless the federal government requires that permits be issued in federally funded state programs.
- The cleanup standards developed under Act 2 will apply to Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act (HSCA) sites, although the HSCA procedures for remedy selection will continue for listed sites.

The Department of Agriculture will develop regulations providing for the reuse of soil and groundwater contaminated with agricultural chemicals resulting from cleanups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast Regional Office</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lee Park, Suite 6010&lt;br&gt;355 North Lane&lt;br&gt;Conshohocken, PA 19428&lt;br&gt;610-832-6213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast Regional Office</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 Public Square&lt;br&gt;Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711-0790&lt;br&gt;717-826-2511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southcentral Regional Office</strong>&lt;br&gt;One Ararat Boulevard&lt;br&gt;Harrisburg, PA 17110&lt;br&gt;717-657-4592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Recycling Program Fact Sheet 2
Summary of Act 2 of 1995: The Land Recycling and Environmental Remediations Standards Act

General Provisions

The primary goal of Act 2 is to encourage the voluntary cleanup and reuse of contaminated commercial and industrial sites. This strategy of encouraging the redevelopment of sites with existing roads, sewers, water lines and utilities is often more cost-efficient than providing this infrastructure at virgin sites. The strategy also helps to preserve prime farmland, forests and open areas from development.

Act 2 provides incentives to promote the voluntary development and implementation of cleanup plans. Clear, uniform cleanup standards and standardized review procedures promote the voluntary elimination of public health and environmental hazards. Cleanup plans will be based on the actual risk that contamination on a site may pose to public health and the environment.

Other general provisions:
- Act 2 establishes a 13-member Cleanup Standards Scientific Advisory Board to help DEP’s Environmental Quality Board develop statewide health standards and provide advice on other technical and scientific matters.
- The environmental remediation standards established under Act 2 are to be used when any site is remediated either voluntarily or remediation is required under the Clean Streams Law, the Air Pollution Control Act, the Solid Waste Management Act, the Infectious and Chemotherapeutic Waste Law, the Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act and the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Act.
- Existing cleanup standards can continue to be used for up to three years.
- Certain standards and procedures provided in the Act are available on the effective date. Specifically, the background standard and site-specific standards are immediately available. Also, certain existing standards, such as MCLs, are available for use under the statewide standard.

Remediation Standards and Review Procedures

Anyone who wants to or is required to clean up a site and wants to take advantage of the liability protection provided in Act 2 must select and attain compliance with one or any combination of the following three environmental standards:
- Background standard
- Statewide health standard
- Site-specific standard.

Background Standard
A person choosing to clean up a site to background must document that the concentrations of any contaminants remaining are at a level not related to any release of contaminants at the site.

Statewide Health Standard
Regulations will be developed to establish statewide health standards for contaminants for each environmental medium. Existing state and federal standards will be compiled and augmented by proposing new medium-specific concentrations within one year. A special 13-member Cleanup Standards Scientific Advisory Board will help set standards based on a range of excess cancer risk of between one in 10,000 to one in 1 million.

Site Specific Health Standard
Cleanup levels can be developed specifically for a site. This approach is a more detailed process that involves developing a risk assessment based on the conditions and
human exposures at the site. The surrounding community may be involved in each step of this cleanup process by request of the host municipality.

Special Industrial Areas

Sites that are abandoned or are located in enterprise zones are eligible for special remediation requirements. Qualifying sites have limited requirements to perform a baseline environmental investigation and remediate any direct and imminent threats to public health or the environment, such as drummed waste.

Public Involvement

For background and statewide health standard cleanups, notices must be submitted to DEP and the municipality and published in a local newspaper when the responsible person intends to clean up a site and when they believe the cleanup is complete.

For site-specific cleanups, a detailed public involvement program must be developed if requested by the municipality. People doing cleanups are encouraged to develop a proactive approach to working with the municipality in developing and implementing remediation and reuse plans.

Cleanup Liability Protection

The owner or developer of a site is relieved of liability for further cleanup of the site's contamination when the remediation standard is attained. The owner or developer of a special industrial area has limited liability and is only responsible for remediation of imminent threats. They are not responsible for remediation of any other contamination.

Industrial Land Recycling Fund

The Industrial Land Recycling Fund includes general appropriations, fees, Federal Funds, and fines and penalties that are assessed under the act. Money in the fund can be used for the purposes of the act.

The Industrial Sites Cleanup Fund is designed to help "innocent" people conduct voluntary cleanups. Grants or low-interest loans are provided to cover up to 75 percent of the cost of completing an environmental study and implementing a cleanup plan. The Department of Commerce administers this program.

Miscellaneous Provisions

- Submissions under the act must include a plain language description of the information in the submission. This requirement is to improve the opportunity for public involvement and understanding of the remediation process.
- State or local permits are not required for remediation activities undertaken on site under the requirements of this act although the federal government could require permits in federally funded state programs.
- Changing land use from nonresidential to residential may require further cleanup and Department concurrence that the site has been rendered safe for residential use.
**APPENDIX C**

**HOW TO CREATE A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CDC)**

The steps in forming a CDC could be as follows:

1. Identify individuals who are interested, motivated, and committed to working as a Board member for the organization. Members could include a lawyer, accountant, business representative, fundraiser/grant writer, management executive, community activist, Township official, etc. This commitment requires both time (5-6 hours per month minimum) and energy (ability to carry out tasks and assignments).

2. File Articles of Incorporation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of State - Corporation Bureau. This is a fairly simple procedure that the lawyer on the Board can do. Two advertisements stating the creation of the organization must be published.

3. Functional by-laws must be developed to create the structure and procedures for running the organization. Structuring the Board to allow for designation as a Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) should be considered, as this opens up more avenues for funding housing-related projects (contact OHCD for details on becoming a CHDO).

4. Solicitor/lawyer should file the IRS forms to create a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization. This designation can take up to one year (without any political pressure/U.S. Representative support to move it through faster).

5. Assess the need for a part- or full-time Executive Director to manage operations and to pursue funding and activities for the organization. Identify a dependable funding source (e.g., Township budget line item) to support this position. Conduct a search for the Executive Director.

6. File appropriate IRS forms for the organization to have employees. Board accountant (or possibly community accountants) should set up appropriate accounting systems for the organization and file necessary tax forms.

7. Develop a strategic plan for the organization – include realistic projects, programs, and activities that the organization wants to pursue, including steps and assignments that need to be accomplished. Need to identify organizations with whom to partner. Include scope of work and assignments for specific committees of the Board, e.g., Finance, Fundraising, etc.

8. Hold regularly scheduled meetings to keep activities moving and in order.
## APPENDIX D
### Traffic Calming Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Traffic Reduction</th>
<th>Speed Reduction</th>
<th>Noise and Pollution</th>
<th>Loss of Parking</th>
<th>Traffic Access Restrictions</th>
<th>Emergency Vehicle Access</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Education Campaign</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Display</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$250/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Sign</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$200/sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Visibility Crosswalks</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1K-$5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Enforcement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing Lanes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1K-$3K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit Signing</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$200/sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$200/sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$25K-$75K/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$20-$30/foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Island</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$10K-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$10K-$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10K-$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>$5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Crosswalk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>$5-$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Intersection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$25K-$50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$15-$25K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Channelizing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>$15-$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>$20K-$40K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek bridge (short)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$50K-$100K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement Barrier</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Barrier</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$15-$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way Streets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal Diverter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$15-$35K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Closure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$20-$35K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov
# APPENDIX E
## BRIDGE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Carried</th>
<th>Features Intersected</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston Mill Road</td>
<td>West Branch of Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Road</td>
<td>Branch Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Road</td>
<td>Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Road</td>
<td>East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>Amtrak Main Line</td>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueball Avenue</td>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>CSX Railroad</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Avenue</td>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Chichester Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>CSX Railroad</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchester Highway</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Road</td>
<td>Baldwin Run</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convent Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>Sun Oil Utility</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>West Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(NB)</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(SB)</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(NB)</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(SB)</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(NB)</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95(SB)</td>
<td>Naamans Creek Road</td>
<td>Lower Chichester</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowlton Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Road</td>
<td>Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenni Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>CSX Railroad</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting House Road</td>
<td>Branch Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting House Road</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>East Branch of Naamans Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Alverno Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>West Branch of Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Branch Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Branch Chester Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTA (Chester Br)</td>
<td>Pennell Road</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Oil Company Road</td>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Line Road</td>
<td>Marcus Hook Creek</td>
<td>Upper Chichester</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleybrook Road</td>
<td>West Branch of Chester Creek</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, 2004
NOTES:
1. USGS - Municipal Boundaries
2. Delaware County Board of Assessment - Parcels
3. Delaware County Planning Department - Existing Land Use

Disclaimer: This map and associated materials are for informational purposes only. The accuracy of the underlying data and the reliability of this map depends on the accuracy of the underlying data sources which have not been verified.
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