



Township of Marple  
Planning Commission  
June 26, 2025

### 1. Pledge of Allegiance

Mike Noonan led the room for the Pledge of Allegiance

**Roll Call:** Mike Noonan, Nick Siano, Joe Morgan, Fran Leider, Dave Dezzi, Director of Code Enforcement Joe Romano, Assistant to the Director of Code Enforcement Amy Graziosi, Township Engineer Bridget Gillen  
Excused Absence: Michael Gowdy, Dan Frank

### 2. Approval of Minutes

Dave Dezzi made a motion to approve the minutes of November 19, 2024  
Seconded Joe Morgan  
Unanimous Approval.

### 3. Re-Organization

Nick Siano nominated Mike Noonan for Chair – unanimous  
Dave Dezzi nominated Nick Siano for Vice Chair - unanimous

### 4. Preliminary/Final Land Development – 136 4th Avenue, Broomall, PA - Patrick Cleary to subdivide 1 lot into 2 lots with the average size lot of 7,187 Square Feet (+/-) and construct a new duplex residence.

**Mike Noonan** – Invites the applicant to step up to the podium.

**Dominic Scrivano with Herbert E. MacCombie - Civil Engineer with MacCombie Consulting Engineers and Surveyors, Inc.** – Presenting the plan on behalf of the Applicant, Patrick Cleary.

The site is situated along the north-westerly corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Morton Avenue. The site currently has an existing dwelling, driveway, sidewalk, walls and shed. The lot is currently 14,375 sq ft, zoned R4 – Residential, which permits single family dwellings on 5,000 square foot lots and duplexes on 3,750 square foot lots. Mr. Cleary proposes to subdivide 14375 sq ft lot into two proposed lots.

Proposed Lot 1: 6,488 sq ft. will contain the existing dwelling, existing shed, portions of the walls and a new driveway.

Proposed Lot 2: 7,887 sq ft will contain the proposed duplex, with an associated driveway, SWM facilities and other related improvements.

Proposed SWM system captures runoff through the roof drains, a yard drain, a Type C Inlet located in the driveway and a trench drain at the foot of the driveway on proposed lot 2. All these facilities are drained into a subservice infiltration basin, located in the front yard of proposed lot 2. A portion of the basin is located under the driveway and a portion is located underneath the lawn. The subservice infiltration basin collects and infiltrates all run-off for all storm events up to and including the one-hundred-year storm, without allowing any discharge. So, we are essentially controlling peak rates and volume.

As a part of this project, we are requesting 5 waivers from the Sub-Division/Land Development Ordinance of the Township Code.

1. First Waiver Request: Chapter 265, section 9 of the Township Code to allow for Preliminary/Final review process, instead of undergoing separate review processes for both preliminary and final.
2. Second Waiver Request: Chapter 265-25A.1, regarding street right of way width. The street as it exists currently 40' right of way with a 24' cartway. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is considered a minor street – Minor Streets are required to have 50' right of way and 27' cartway, which is the reason for the waiver request.
3. Third Waiver Request: Chapter 265-25E – Additional right of way width is to be provided where a sub-division abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate right of way width. The reason for the waiver request is the code calls for a 50' right of way and the street has a 40' right of way, as well as keeping the lot the existing lots that are currently on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
4. Fourth Waiver Request: Chapter 265-32B, regarding private driveways to be located no less than 40' from an intersection corner for corner lots. Due to the irregular geometry of the street intersection at one corner this code is met and at the adjacent corner it would not be. A Traffic Engineer will be completing a warrant analysis for a 4 way stop at the intersection to support the waiver; the results should be received in the next couple of days.
5. Fifth and Final Waiver Request: Chapter 159-29, the grading and drainage and erosion control ordinance, to allow for steep and very steep slope disturbances above 15% of steep slopes and 5% of very steep slopes. Scheduled to appear at the upcoming Conditional Use hearing, on July 14<sup>th</sup>, to seek authorization to work on the steep slopes and very steep slopes.

**Mike Noonan:** Where are the steep slopes, are they in the back in the corner?

**Dominic Scrivano:** Near the retaining wall and proposed driveway.

**Mike Noonan:** Bridget, regarding the right of way, it is an unusual intersection to begin with, does it make sense keeping it 40'? If you are going to 50', how would that 5' impact the project going to 50'?

**Dominic Scrivano:** There is limited frontage on proposed lot 2 – it would cut the frontage back.

**Joe Romano:** Mr. Chairman, can I recommend that Bridget go through the Township Engineers Letter of Review?

**Bridget Gillen (Pennoni):**

ZONING

1. The proposed area of steep and very steep slope disturbance is to be provided on the plan. Conditional Use authorization from the Board of Commissioners may be required for construction – **Already addressed, will come for Conditional Use in July** of the proposed duplex and driveways in areas of steep and very steep slopes. (§300-62).
2. Two (2) off-street paved parking spaces per unit are required for the proposed duplex. (§300-84)  
Parking space locations are to be indicated on the plan and a separate parking plan provided. – **Just to clarify that they have this on the plan, looking at the revised plans that were just received, it looks like they have that delineated now.**
3. Two (2) 3-inch caliper replacement trees are required for each existing tree removed (§300-63.F).  
A landscape plan including a tabulation of trees to be removed and schedule of proposed plantings is required. – **Applicant is proposing 2 trees per lot, for a total of 4, along with a street tree, per lot.**
4. Additional information is to be provided regarding the proposed “protective fence”. No fence shall be beyond the front of the primary structure on a lot, with the exception of fences erected on residentially zoned properties, provided the fence does not exceed four (4) feet in height and has at least 50% of the area of the fence open. (§300-111.A) – **Per Applicant, the fence has been removed from the plan, along with the fence along the wall has been removed.**

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

5. Proposed driveways are to be located 40 feet from the nearest intersection. (§265-32.B). – **This has been addressed.**
6. Where a subdivision abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate right-of-way width, additional right-of-way width in accordance with §265-25.A(1) is required. (§265-25.E) Fourth Avenue is classified as a minor street. A 50-foot wide right-of-way (25 feet from centerline) is required for 4th Avenue. – **This has been addressed.**
7. Street trees are required to be planted for each proposed lot along 4th Avenue and are subject to review by the Shade Tree Commission. (§280-16) – **Per Applicant, each lot has a street tree proposed, and we understand that the Shade Tree Commission is going to have to review.**

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

8. Infiltration testing is to be conducted to confirm the design infiltration rate of one (1) inch per hour; and, to confirm a minimum depth of 24 inches between the bottom of the seepage beds and the top of the limiting zone. (§143-20.C(1)(a)) – **Infiltration Testing Completed**
9. Stormwater management facilities are to be located a minimum of 10 feet from building foundations and adjacent property boundaries. Dimensions are to be provided. – **Per Applicant, competed and dimensions are on the plan.**
10. Calculations are to be provided to verify that the proposed inlet and trench drain are adequately designed to collect runoff without bypass and discharge in a non-erosive condition. (§257-10.G) – **Per Applicant, the drainage area plan shows sub areas that go to each facility and then the calculations that support that.**
11. The municipal signature block consistent with §257-26.B(24) is required. – **Per Applicant, yes, sheet 3.**

GENERAL

12. The plans are to be reviewed by the Fire Marshal. – Per Applicant, will have to check into that.

13. Regarding the proposed driveways:

a. The maximum curb cut for a single-family driveway (Lot 1) is 15 feet. (§108-3.B(5)) The curb cuts for both driveways are to be dimensioned.

b. A stopping area measured 20 feet behind the right-of-way line is to be provided, not to exceed a four-percent grade, for each proposed driveway. (§108-3.B(5))

c. Clear sight distance for each proposed driveway is to be provided. (§108-3.B(5))

d. The slope of each proposed driveway is to be indicated to verify compliance with §108-3.B(5). – Per Applicant, this has all been included on the plan

14. Turning templates for emergency vehicles are to be submitted to verify adequate maneuverability through the site. – Per Applicant, template drafted, did not include it in the submission as we did not feel it was necessary, as any emergency vehicle access would be appropriate from the street as the structure is only 40' to the street.

**Joe Romano:** We will have the Fire Marshall review the plans, per Bridget's request. And you will address the rest of the comments in the letter?

**Dominic Scrivano:** Correct.

**Joe Romano:** And you are still waiting for your DEP approval?

**Dominic Scrivano:** We received a letter back from DEP; they are requiring us to submit sewage facilities planning modules – our office is currently in the process of doing that.

**Joe Romano:** Your client is aware that we cannot approve this in front of the Board of Commissioners until we have the DEP letter of approval?

**Dominic Scrivano:** Yes.

**Bridget Gillen:** Still have a few more comments to address.

15. A note is to be included on the plan indicating that substandard curb and sidewalk shall be replaced at the direction of the Township building inspector and/or engineer.

16. Additional information is to be provided regarding protection of the existing retaining wall during construction. – Per Applicant, a construction fence will be put up to prevent any construction vehicles from approaching and hitting into it; the distance in grade from the top of the wall to the bottom of the wall is about 4', so the fence will be 4' away from the existing retaining wall.

17. Design calculations are required for proposed retaining walls four (4) feet in height and greater. Fall protection is to be provided.

18. The proposed electric line conflicts with the location of the subsurface stormwater facility.

19. A warrant analysis is to be conducted to evaluate the necessity for a four-way stop at the intersection of Morton Street and 4th Avenue. – Per Applicant, in process. Asked to consider stop bars and ramps on the corners to be upgraded to current standards, contingent on traffic analysis results.

20. The proposed topsoil stockpile/staging area extends across both lots. Additional information should be provided regarding the proposed phasing for construction if the improvements are not constructed simultaneously. A temporary construction easement may be required.

21. The applicant is reminded that the following will be required prior to Final Plan approval:

a. Land Development/Improvement Securities Agreement, Deeds of Dedication of rights-of-way, legal descriptions for each proposed lot, and proposed utility and drainage

easements for approval by the Township Solicitor (300-32.B(7); §265-16.C and G; -32(C and E)).

- b. Approval by the Delaware County Planning Commission.
- c. Sewage Facilities Planning Module, or an exemption issued by DEP.
- d. Will-serve letters for domestic water service.
- e. A Township Road Opening Permit.
- f. A fee-in-lieu of recreation areas in the amount of \$4,400.00 (§265-18).
- g. An Operations and Maintenance Agreement with the Township covering stormwater controls and BMPs in accordance with §257-36.
- h. A contribution to the Township Stormwater Control and BMP Operation and Maintenance Fund to defray the cost of inspection for a 10-year period in accordance with §257-37.

**Mike Noonan:** We really don't have an architectural or historical review board, but the County has asked for it to be requested that an attempt be made for the proposed new duplex home keeps with the overall historic character of the block; existing home are 1 ½ story stone faced home with other similar homes on the block, some of which appear historic.

**David Porter (Professional Engineering):** Mr. Cleary does have an architect that he has been working with. We have some renderings /elevations of what the duplex will look like; unit 1 would be the basement and first floor, with unit 2 being the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The elevation will have a stone façade up to the first level, then a siding façade, with shingling to match the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Mr. Cleary would be willing to entertain feedback on the aesthetics of the building to appropriately fit in with the neighborhood.

**Joe Romano:** You will be here next month for your Conditional Use Hearing. Once you have the Conditional Use Hearing, we will wait for you to get your DEP approval, and then submit a revised set of plans.

**Mike Noonan:** Opened floor for Public Comment

**Mary Richmond:** 5 White Oak Road, Wilmington, DE; Mother owns neighboring property at 160 Morton. When you are referring to the retaining walls, were you referring to the one at the rear of the property, or the small one next to the existing driveway?

**David Porter:** The short answer is both. We do have proposed grading that is up to those retaining walls, but during construction, they will be protected until the project is ready for the final grading and will also ensure stabilization. The retaining walls will remain and will not be removed.

\*\*We have a letter of extension from the Applicant, good through 9/30/2025

**Motion: On a motion by Nick Siano and seconded by Mike Noonan to recommend the approval of Subdivision and Land Development @ 136 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Broomall, PA 19008, under the conditions that they follow and adhere to the Township Engineers comments around Storm Water Management, keep the property matching the neighbors historical look, and adhere to any comments of the Fire Marshall. – Unanimous**

- 5. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan** – 1600 S. Sproul, Broomall, PA - S.S. Peter & Paul Cemetery – The applicant, Matthews Gibraltar Mausoleum and Construction Company proposes to construct a Garden Mausoleum totaling 2,036 sq. ft. on the property known as St. Pater and Paul Cemetery.

**Michael Noonan** – Invites the applicant to step up to the podium.

**Marc Krichilsky, Civil Engineer, with McLaren Engineering Group** – Presenting the plan on behalf of Applicant [Megan Jones] w. Matthews Gibraltar Mausoleum

\*\*Handed to each member of the planning commission, per the roll call - plans and architectural drawings for each member in attendance

The first exhibit are the aerials to give reference to how massive the cemetery is, compared to what is being proposed – Cemetery is roughly 320 acres in size. The plans show the right side where there is a small white rectangle – this portrays the size of the mausoleum. The overall site has a ton of open grass and tree/wood area and looks exactly what you would expect a cemetery to look like. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> time appearing at a Planning Commission Meeting, as we were just here last year for the Small Reflection Suite at SS. Peter and Paul, which is about half of the size of the The Garden Mausoleum, which we are here for today.

Site Plan, sheet C 201 – Garden Mausoleum that is being proposed is a 1,978 sq. ft. mausoleum that is 27' height, and the overall footprint, including the roof overhang and everything else surrounding it is 5,876 sq. ft. Surrounding the mausoleum structure itself, there is a concrete sidewalk with broom finish that will range between 10-15' in width.

We have no waivers or variances associated with this application.

Grading/Drainage/Utilities –

No utilities in terms of water, sanitation, gas being proposed. The only utility being introduced is one new concrete pad with a transformer and electric line that will tie into a nearby utility pole right along Sproul Rd.

In terms of Grading/Drainage, we are limited to roof drains that are tied down into an above ground infiltration basin with a sand bottom. Storm water entering the basin is limited to the mausoleum structure, sidewalk and immediate surrounding grass areas; anything else will bypass the basin and continue to follow the natural drainage patterns in the area.

In terms of traffic, no increase in traffic anticipated; parking will remain the same as per typical cemetery operations, along the edge of the internal roadways; visitors are going to continue to come the standard 20-30 minute intervals.

**Megan Jones (Matthews Gibraltar Mausoleum):**

Difference between the previous mausoleum (Reflection Suite) and the proposed new mausoleum (Garden Mausoleum) is that the new one will also hold caskets, which is why it is larger than the previous [Reflection Suite]. There will be approximately 444 casket spaces, along with 128 niches behind granite and then glass front niches on the inside room, just like the reflection suite – total of approximately 304 niches total. The geometry of the building will

remain the same, however, the design may change ever so slightly with families requesting urns to be together.

In the mausoleum itself will be full size caskets, but all of these spaces are accessed along the exterior/sidewalk of the building. From an elevation standpoint, when you look at each of the rectangles, each of those indicates a casket space, or potentially two if you have a tandem, they are 6 levels high, to take you around 15'7".

Granite finishes (same as the Reflection Suite) on the exterior, columns will be stone veneer with a band of detail around them.

### **Bridget Gillen (Pennoni):**

#### SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

1. A waiver from the Preliminary Plan submission is necessary to allow for the submission of a Preliminary/Final Plan. (§265-9.A)
2. The following Preliminary/Final Plan information is to be provided:
  - a. Tract boundaries with bearings and distances. (§265-9.B(6))
  - b. Datum to which contour elevations refer. (§265-9.B(8))
  - c. Right-of-way and cartway width for Sproul Road (SR 0320). (§265-9.B(11))
  - d. A tabulation of existing and proposed impervious surface. (§265-9.B(19))
3. Each application for non-residential land development is to set aside 5% of the land in the tract to be developed for park or recreational purposes, or a fee-in-lieu provided unless waived by the Board of Commissioners. (§265-18.A(1), §265-20)

#### STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

4. A stormwater report addressing requirements for infiltration volume (§257-18), water quality volume (§257-19), stream bank erosion (§257-20) and peak rate control (§257-20) is to be provided. Drainage area maps, pre-development and post-development hydrographs for all storms up to and including the 100-year storm, routing calculations, and dewatering calculations are to be included in the report. (§257-26.A(3))
5. A sequence of construction is to be provided that includes installation of the proposed stormwater management facility and temporary erosion control features. Whether the proposed basin is intended to function as a sediment trap during construction remains unclear. (§257-26.A(2)) – **Per Applicant, not intended to be used during construction, it will be done at the end.**
6. Soil infiltration test results are required to be submitted. (§257-18.C(2))
7. The stormwater management basin details is to include typical design features to promote infiltration (i.e. amended soil, stone bed, etc.) to satisfy the required recharge volume. – **Per Applicant, 6" sand bottom**
8. Infiltration areas are to be protected from compaction during construction. (§257-16.F(1))
9. Storm sewer pipe capacity calculations are to be provided. (§257-23.D))
10. Calculations and construction detail are to be provided for the proposed diversion channel. (§257-26.A(3)) – **Per Applicant, can reach out via email regarding specific calculations**
11. The following are to be provided regarding the proposed basin:
  - a. Any stormwater basin requiring a berm or earthen embankment is to be designed to provide an emergency spillway to convey stormwater flow up-to and including the post development 100-year storm basin inflow rate. Emergency spillway calculations are to be provided indicating a minimum one (1) foot of freeboard above the 100-year water surface elevation through the spillway. Appropriate erosion control lining shall also be indicated on the detail. (§257-23.(B))

- b. The top width of the basin berm is to be a minimum of five (5) feet wide.
- c. An impervious core and key trench, as well as anti-seep collars, are to be provided for the embankment construction and installation of the outlet pipe barrel. – *Per Applicant, typically have not had to provide in the past, especially with a basin that as small as required by the township, first time encountering this; Per Bridget, this is a standard PA Engineering practice.*
- d. Calculations confirming the required loading ratio are required. (§257-26.A(3))
- e. Erosion control matting shall be provided to stabilize the basin side slopes. (§257-26.A(2))
- f. Calculations are required for the size and dimension of the proposed rip-rap aprons at the headwall into basin and basin outfall (§257-26.A(3))
- 12. The following erosion and sediment controls and associated details are to be provided:
  - a. A rock construction entrance. (§257-26.B(20))
  - b. Concrete washout. (§257-26.B(20))
  - c. Temporary and permanent seeding specifications. (§257-26.B(20))
- 13. Silt fence is to be indicated parallel to contours.
- 14. The location of the proposed electric line is to be revised to avoid conflicts with the stormwater management basin and earthen embankment.
- 15. The following are required prior to Final Plan approval:
  - a. Land Development/Improvement Securities Agreement, and any proposed utility and drainage easements for approval by the Township solicitor (§300-32.B(7); §265-16.C; - 32(C and E)).
  - b. An Operations and Maintenance Agreement with the Township covering stormwater controls and BMPs in accordance with §257-36.
  - c. A contribution to the Township Stormwater Control and BMP Operation and Maintenance Fund in the amount of \$4,000.00 to defray the cost of inspection for a 10-year period in accordance with §257-37.

**Mike Noonan:** This is the second one we are doing, is this the new preference than the old standard 6 feet under?

**Megan Jones:** Community Mausoleums for cemeteries are better use of the property, as you can get more people in a smaller space; some people don't like to go underground. The proposed mausoleum is rather small, as we have built 6,000 casket mausoleums.

**Mike Noonan:** Who is responsible for maintenance and security?

**Megan Jones:** During construction we will have a construction fence up to control the site, once it is built the maintenance and security will be the responsibility of the cemetery.

**Dave Dezzi:** What about Parking?

**Megan Jones:** Generally, with cemetery operations, parking takes place along the sides of the internal cemetery roadways; you will get a little bit of influx with funeral processions, but to have more than one visitor at the mausoleum at the same time is highly unlikely.

**Nick Siano:** What does the backside look like?

**Megan Jones:** The elevation that you see [on the plans] is the front of the mausoleum, the back will be almost the same, however, instead of a door, there will be a window (facing Sproul Rd.) The backside will also have casket spaced/niches.

**Joe Romano:** The last mausoleum you built did not need DEP approval, correct?

**Bridget Gillen:** Correct. Less than an acre of disturbance. We will confirm regarding sewage, but with the previous mausoleum there will not be any sewage generated and we did not need DEP approval.

**Joe Romano:** When do you think you will have the final plans done that address all the comments.

**Marc Krichilsky:** We can have it by August.

**Mike Noonan** – Opened floor to public comment; no public comments.

**Motion: On a motion by Nick Siano and seconded by Dave Dezzi to recommend the approval for the Preliminary/Final Land Development plan of the Garden Mausoleum @ St. Peter and Paul Cemetery, 1600 S. Sproul Road, Springfield, PA, under the conditions that they follow and adhere to the Township Engineers comments. - Unanimous**

**Motion to Adjourn by Mike Noonan and seconded by Dave Dezzi.**

Minutes taken by: Amy M. Graziosi  
Amy M. Graziosi