

March 2019

FINAL REPORT

Key Recommendations of the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Task Force



Philadelphia
Historic
Preservation
Task Force

Table of Contents

Letter from the Chair	2
State of Historic Preservation	3
Acronym Guide	6
 Key Recommendations	
1. Plan for Success	8
2. Create a Historic Resource Inventory	13
3. Modify Historical Commission Processes	19
4. Reduce Historic Building Demolition and Broaden Neighborhood Preservation	25
5. Clarify the Designation Process.....	32
6. Incentivize Historic Preservation.....	35
7. Support Archaeology.....	44
8. Activate Education and Outreach.....	47
 Next Steps	 52
Glossary of Terms	55
Acknowledgements	63
Philadelphia Task Force Members	64

Letter from the Chair

Philadelphians are justifiably proud of the role that our city has played for more than three centuries of American history. From our founding in 1681 to today, the city's development reads as a veritable history book chronicling the story of the American city.

Over the past decade, Philadelphia's economic fortunes have improved following a nearly-50-year decline. For the first time in more than a generation we are confronted with the impact of significant new development on historic building fabric as new construction in parts of the city is often testing the relationship between the character of the new and the preservation of the old Philadelphia.

To help understand the dynamics of the relationship between historic preservation and new construction in Philadelphia today, Mayor Jim Kenney convened the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Task Force in 2017 and charged it with offering actionable recommendations to help balance preservation and new construction.

Herein, we present the fruit of our efforts. Arrived at by acclimation, these recommendations were deftly crafted by the task force to build upon Philadelphia's preservation strengths – our preservation ordinance itself being among the strongest in the country – and pave a way towards a more inclusive preservation landscape. It should be noted that only a little more than 2% of buildings in Philadelphia are currently protected. Our goal was to encourage many more Philadelphians to participate in preservation – to democratize preservation - while encouraging the creation of new landmarks.

This set of recommendations is only the beginning of a process that will require further research, analysis and joint action. Much work lies ahead in order to enact, implement and operationalize the recommendations. It will take everyone from the mayor, to City Council to the advocacy community and the city writ large to ensure that we organize for success.

Projects such as this are truly team efforts. Vice Chair Dominique Hawkins provided gracious and informed leadership. Elizabeth Okeke-Von Batten brought both exceptional administrative support and preservation knowledge to the endeavor. The National Trust for Historic Preservation offered a national perspective and the gift of research. The William Penn Foundation graciously helped underwrite the efforts. And PennPraxis created a citizens' preservation toolkit as a corollary to our activities. But it was the labor of the 33 task force members themselves who gave generously of their time, their talents, and their wisdom to whom we are most grateful. The work is enriched by all of these contributions.

Preservation as a right has been affirmed by the Supreme Court – as with clean air and clean water – as vital to the public interest and to the health and well-being of the nation. We are proud to uphold this tradition and humbly offer these recommendations to the mayor, City Council, and to the citizens of Philadelphia as a road map to preserving our past while ensuring the future health and prosperity of the city we love.

Harris Steinberg, FAIA, Chair
Philadelphia Historic Preservation Task Force

State of Historic Preservation

Our city.

We protect what we love.

Shared love and passion for Philadelphia and its rich interplay between people and physical character has driven the work of the Mayor’s Task Force on Historic Preservation. The city we experience together, where space, daily life, and historical and personal memory interact at all levels and scales, is an endless source of fascination, connection, orientation, and, with gratifying frequency, awe. So many places throughout Philadelphia – buildings, streets, corners, neighborhoods, open space, and parks – exert powerful holds on us all.

We have one of the strongest historic preservation ordinances in the United States. When the Task Force was assembled in summer 2017, we were well aware of this, and our work together has confirmed it, repeatedly. Whether this powerful tool for protection and change management is used to its maximum potential is one of many questions we have addressed. But we are fortunate to start our work from a position of such strength.

Philadelphia has more than 600,000 buildings. Of these, only about 12,000 are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and therefore subject to the controls established in the Ordinance. This designation enhances our certainty about their protection, through which we share our collective connection to their meaning. There’s no doubt that those 12,000 properties exemplify much of the city’s rich history—and there’s no doubt that 12,000 is nowhere near enough.

Indeed, we have confirmed through the Task Force’s work that Philadelphia’s overall percentage of protected properties trails that of peer cities by a factor of at least two. An obvious goal in response is to get more properties under the Ordinance’s protection, and to do so through a process that is quick, appropriate, and comprehensive.

But the Task Force also knows that satisfying that particular goal, while completely necessary, is also completely insufficient. We must rise to the challenge and provide our city with a broader and nimbler array of tools that are responsive to what it will take to protect the multiple strands of its physical character.

In and of itself, the certainty that additional types and quantities of protections are merited demonstrates that a strong and diverse historic preservation ethic with multiple strands permeates the city, revealing in so many ways the need for responsive protection and management that will go well beyond what our ordinance alone can do. The sheer diversity, richness, and associative power of what is not designated is a remarkable collective treasure.

Our current ordinance was written in 1985. Although the threatened and narrowly averted demolition of Lit Brothers¹ certainly triggered its enactment, its introductory foundation

¹ <https://www.nytimes.com/1986/01/19/us/supporters-save-historic-building-in-philadelphia.html>

language focused entirely on development. That language accurately and explicitly predicted a particular kind of development, enabled by the federal legislation that, for qualifying historic properties, unleashed the power of the Historic Tax Credit in Philadelphia – as much as, if not more than, any other city in the country. From a purely preservation viewpoint, the multiple associated levels of historic review of such projects ensured, as the emerging process in fact had intended, that preservation and economic impact were not sacrificed to each other, but rather were mutually reinforcing.

Things are now quite different. The long-awaited and welcome period of real estate development that Philadelphia is experiencing, and which we fervently hope will be sustained, is, in many parts of the city, unaccompanied by the means to ensure appropriate levels of historic preservation. We have worked hard to provide the public and city government a suite of recommended tools and policies that will establish an appropriate balance between new real estate development and historic preservation. To do so, the Task Force recognizes the need to manage change with an array of both enriched and new tools, accompanied by a suite of associated incentives, that are all commensurate with the character, needs, and desires of our diverse neighborhoods, as well as with the City's broad goals for reasonable and consistent planning.

To bolster all of this, we have the strong and clear safeguard of public law and policy at local, state, and federal levels which cumulatively underscores historic preservation as a public right and benefit.

From our 1985 ordinance's introductory statement of Public Policy and Purpose²:

It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the preservation and protection of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts of historic, architectural, cultural, archaeological, educational, and aesthetic merit are public necessities and are in the interests of the health, prosperity, and welfare of the people of Philadelphia.

From our Pennsylvania Constitution's recitation of the inherent rights of all citizens of the Commonwealth³:

The people have a right to clean air, pure water, and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and esthetic values of the environment. Pennsylvania's public natural resources are the common property of all the people, including generations yet to come...

And our Pennsylvania History Code⁴ similarly declares that:

The irreplaceable historical, architectural, archaeological and cultural heritage of this Commonwealth should be preserved and protected for the benefit of all the people, including future generations.

² <https://www.phila.gov/historical/pdf/historic%20preservation%20code%208-22-2012.pdf>

³ <https://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/legis/LI/consCheck.cfm?txtType=HTM&ttl=00&div=0&chpt=1>

⁴ http://media.pennlive.com/midstate_impact/other/History_Code_Title37.pdf

...The preservation and protection of historic resources in this Commonwealth promotes the public health, prosperity and general welfare.

...The rapid social and economic development of our contemporary society threatens to destroy the remaining vestiges of our historic heritage.

...It is in the public interest for the Commonwealth, its citizens and its political subdivisions to engage in comprehensive programs of historic preservation for the enjoyment, education and inspiration of all the people, including future generations.

And, from the remarkable introductory words of our National Historic Preservation Act of 1966⁵:

The U.S. Congress finds and declares that

(1) the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;

(2) the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(3) historic properties significant to the Nation's heritage are being lost or substantially altered, often inadvertently, with increasing frequency;

(4) the preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans;

In such stirring language, historic preservation is intended as a core public benefit, for all citizens, and most assuredly not the province of a special interest group. Philadelphia, in the rich character of its multiple zones of wonderfulness, its community of places, both extraordinary and ordinary, demonstrates that this is so.

The Task Force has done its best to honor these important public obligations, on behalf of the city we all love and treasure.

We protect what we love.

Our city.

⁵ <https://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/nhpa1966.htm>

Acronym Guide

ADA: American Disabilities Act

ADU: accessory dwelling unit

ARO: adaptive reuse ordinances

CD: Existing Conservation District in Philadelphia

CD-1: New enhanced Conservation District type, as being proposed by the Task Force

CLG: certified local government

CMX1, CMX2, CMX 2.5, CMX 3: Refers to specific commercial zoning district types in Philadelphia; Types 1, 2, and 2.5 are neighborhood commercial mixed-use districts while Type 3 is a community and Center City mixed-use district

CPI: Citizens Planning Institute

DPD: Department of Planning and Development

FAR: floor area ratio

GIS: Geographic Information Systems

HPLP: Housing Preservation Loan Program

HUD: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

IT: information technology

L&I: Department of Licenses and Inspections

NCO: Neighborhood Conservation Overlay

NHPA: National Historic Preservation Act

OPA: Office of Property Assessment

oTIS: Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, and Sustainability

PA SHPO: Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

PCPC: Philadelphia City Planning Commission

PHC: Philadelphia Historical Commission

PHC-1: Existing historic district type in Philadelphia

PHC-2: New historic district type, as being proposed by the Task Force

PIDC: Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation

RACP: Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program

RMX-3: A residential, mixed-use zoning type for high-density areas in Philadelphia (such as Center City)

SEPTA: Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority

TDR: transfer of development rights

V2V: Vacants-to-Value, an incentive program in Baltimore, MD

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Plan for Success

Some of the most important changes that Philadelphia can make to ensure a balance between historic preservation and development are within its own practices, agencies, and legislative priorities. From the assets it owns, to the policies and laws it passes, the City has many opportunities to affect historic preservation. Currently, the Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC) is the only city agency specifically charged with monitoring and advising on historic preservation issues. However, its authority is only for Philadelphia Register of Historic Places – listed buildings, sites, and objects (approximately 12,000). **Many other city agencies deal with historic resources on a daily basis, whether local register listed or not.** Additionally, the City’s zoning designations can influence the likelihood of historic preservation of undesignated buildings.

Through the best practice research conducted by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, we learned about efforts in Washington D.C., Atlanta, GA, and New Orleans, LA, to include historic preservation experts on city boards and commissions. These cities incorporate historic preservation across department policies to improve equity and mitigate displacement. We feel that Philadelphia should aggressively incorporate historic preservation into its policies, practices, and legislation.

Most of the following recommendations are low- to no-cost opportunities that incorporate organizing existing activities, or focusing legislative actions, around prioritizing historic preservation. The recommendations focus on coordinating historic preservation across City agencies, including boards and commissions, assisting developers with complex building projects that include historic preservation, introducing “preservation-first” policies in City agencies, using planning processes to collect data, and aligning zoning with historic preservation goals.

The Federal Preservation Officer model informed our recommendation to create a Historic Preservation Policy Team of municipal employees from various City departments and agencies. This model assigns an existing employee as “preservation officer” within their agency to work with a larger policy team to coordinate activities. To extend historic preservation from City departments and agencies to their decision-making bodies, we suggest that boards and commissions across the city have more knowledge of real estate development as well as historic preservation. **Assigning staff and changing the composition of boards and commissions will both improve knowledge and coordination and help the successful adoption of “preservation-first” policies across departments,** such as the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) and through processes such as the City’s Capital Budget and Program. These actions are important not only to preserve buildings and sites on the Philadelphia Register, but to support adaptive reuse of historic resources.

The City's Division of Development Services, within the Department of Planning and Development, already guides real estate developers through the approvals process. This Division provides an appropriate platform for a new "Historic Preservation Liaison" position that works to facilitate reviews within the city and to understand state and federal programs that support historic preservation.

As the Planning Commission considers the next round of its comprehensive plan and district plan updates, any property survey work should identify historic assets.⁶ This identification will help the Philadelphia City Planning Commission (PCPC) and the community to create and update plan recommendations. This will inform the planning process and assist in the Historical Commission's data collection and designation process. In addition, this work can help to inform zoning remapping recommendations to City Council. **Survey and analysis can assist in the identification of areas where there may be a mismatch between high-density zoning and areas of the city in need of historic preservation.**

What challenges are we trying to solve?

- There is historic preservation activity that happens in multiple City offices and agencies, but currently those disparate activities are not linked or leveraged.
- Historic preservation is not consistently represented on the many City boards and commissions and within other development organizations.
- High-density zoning discourages historic preservation of undesignated historic properties.

What best practices did we investigate?

- Having historic preservation representatives from different perspectives sit on the different organizations' boards (Washington, DC).
- Holding historic preservation presentations and hands-on workshops for neighborhood organizations (Washington, DC).
- Using historic preservation as a tool across departments to reduce displacement of existing residents and encourage equitable development (Atlanta, GA & New Orleans, LA).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Create a Historic Preservation Policy Team of municipal employees to pursue policies and practices beneficial to historic preservation activities.
- B. Ensure boards and commissions understand all aspects of development, including historic preservation, to form partnerships and leverage resources.

⁶ <https://www.phila2035.org/>

- C. Assign a Historic Preservation Liaison as a single point of contact who can forge relationships between individuals, property owners, community groups, developers, and the City and shepherd applications through the approval process as part of DPD Development Services.
- D. Direct City agencies and partners to adopt “preservation-first” and adaptive reuse policies in order to revitalize vacant buildings.
- E. Collect and update historic resource inventory data during neighborhood and district planning processes and use this information to inform those plans.
- F. Use zoning as a tool to support historic preservation activity.

A. Create a Historic Preservation Policy Team of municipal employees to pursue policies and practices beneficial to historic preservation.

- **The Task Force recommends using the Federal Preservation Officer model to better incorporate, moderate, and coordinate historic preservation practices through all City agencies and departments.** (At the national level, each federal agency is required to designate a qualified staff member to be the agency’s “preservation officer.” The preservation officer coordinates activities related to the National Historic Preservation Act and legislation for their respective agency).
- City agencies and departments that have a direct or indirect role in historic preservation of City facilities and/or provide incentives or regulations that impact historic properties or infrastructure should create a “preservation officer” role to act as a resource within their respective agencies on historic preservation issues.
- The City should identify an existing staff member whose current duties best align with the preservation officer role in each of the following departments: Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, and Sustainability (oTIS), Finance, Commerce, Licenses and Inspections, Department of Public Property, Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Department of Planning and Development (DPD).
- These preservation officers should convene as a Historic Preservation Policy Team. The Team should meet regularly to discuss timely issues, receive training on relevant topics, and act as advisors. The Team should be tasked with reviewing existing practices, requirements, and policies that support as well as deter historic preservation and provide recommendations on how to resolve the deterrents.
- The team should be led by a senior staff member from DPD.

B. Ensure boards and commissions understand all aspects of development, including historic preservation, to form partnerships and leverage resources.

- The Mayor should appoint representatives with historic preservation experience and expertise to City boards and commissions that affect development, including, but not limited to, the Planning Commission, Art Commission, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Housing Advisory Board, Board of Building Standards, Philadelphia Housing Authority, Office of Sustainability, and Licenses and Inspections Review Board.
- Support a City Charter change to require all existing boards and commissions that impact historic preservation and real estate development decisions made throughout the city have a member with experience and knowledge managing historic preservation and real estate development activities. This would ensure future City administrations' support for historic preservation activities.

C. Assign a Historic Preservation Liaison as a single point of contact who can forge relationships between individuals, property owners, community groups, developers, and the City and shepherd applications through the approval process as part of DPD Development Services.

- Currently, owners and developers receive guidance from Development Services, a division of DPD, on project issues. The Development Services staff helps individuals, property owners, community groups, and developers better understand and use the real estate development processes and provides guidance regarding permitting and development approval processes, both generally and regarding specific projects or properties. **Development Services should expand its services and support to projects reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission to ensure that all applicable City regulatory and financial resources are applied to support these projects and that they proceed in a timely manner.**
- Development Services' staff should be trained and knowledgeable about available statewide and national technical resources and financial incentives that support investment and development of historic preservation of buildings, structures, and sites in Philadelphia.

D. Direct City agencies (such as Public Property and Department of Parks and Recreation) and partners (such as Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority and Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation) to adopt "preservation-first" and adaptive reuse policies in order to revitalize vacant buildings.

- More than 5,000 buildings have been demolished in the last decade by the City's Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) under police powers granted by the code in order to remove threats to public safety. The City should provide additional funding to this department to increase enforcement actions against owners of vacant, locally listed buildings who are allowing these resources to deteriorate by

neglect. The City should also enforce action against property owners before the buildings pose threats to public safety and warrant demolition. Finally, the City should establish a fund to support stabilization of such properties in cases where owners fail to comply with the Courts' legal orders to maintain these buildings.

- As City agencies plan for their Capital Program Investments, prioritize building reuse, either for existing facilities or in support of expanded programs and initiatives. We recommend that the City prioritize building reuse when funding capital improvements and investments.
- Align historic preservation activities in the City with the City's broad and ambitious sustainability objectives, including the reduction of building waste to landfills through adaptive reuse. We suggest the Mayor's staff work with the Office of Sustainability, PHC, and DPD staff to create policy guidelines that support these goals.
- DPD and the Budget Office should **prioritize historic preservation and reuse activity more heavily than new construction or demolition of historically and culturally significant resources.**

E. Collect and update historic resource inventory data during neighborhood and district planning processes and use this information to inform those plans.

- The collection of updated historic resource inventory data points should be integrated into all planning projects of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Ideally, surveys would be completed prior to / at the beginning of each planning process so that the information can be used for the plan's analysis and outcomes. The survey data gathered will be shared with the community in order to examine their neighborhood assets and help to make informed decisions throughout the planning process.
- **Use the City Planning district boundaries to systematically collect comprehensive historic resource inventory data and fill in existing data gaps.**

F. Use zoning as a tool to support historic preservation activity.

- Identify concentrations of historic resources with high-density zoning that are not compatible with their existing configuration and prioritize their survey and potential local historic designation.
- **Correlate a neighborhood's district zoning with a neighborhood's historic building scale, mass, and height.**
- Apprise City Council of any zoning remapping ordinances in support of historic preservation to obtain approval.

2. Create a Historic Resource Inventory

Every day, Philadelphians traverse places that reveal our predecessors' stories – their hopes, ambitions, triumphs, failures, celebrations, and sorrows. These places are big and small, iconic and commonplace, community anchors and cultural landmarks, neighborhood businesses and homes. **Because Philadelphia is an old city with a complex history, many of these unique and special places are hidden in plain sight**, waiting to be recognized and revitalized for contemporary use. If we wish to realize the economic and cultural opportunities that our city's historic places offer, we must identify these places and gather information about them in order to prioritize their care and maintenance.

Through a historic resource inventory process, City agencies could gather historic resource information via survey and organize, manage, and update existing and new data. Typically, these inventory processes help property owners, decision-makers, researchers, policy-makers, and the public learn about a city's history, understand what historic resources remain, and how future change may best be managed. Information collected during a survey can be gathered by public and private organizations and may be applicable in support of historic preservation activity when applying for financial assistance (state and/or federal funding, historic tax credits and grants). No matter the reason, this information helps fill critical gaps in the public's collective knowledge and helps cities set priorities for future development.

Philadelphia is a dynamic city with a built record of several centuries of change. **Thus, we recognize that creating a historic resource inventory is not a discrete, one-time project, but rather an ongoing effort.** We must continuously gather information both to improve existing databases and records and gather new information to build those repositories. This action requires knowledgeable and dedicated staffing, who must carefully integrate this work into relevant City agencies and databases to ensure current and useful information is readily available to decision-makers and the public.

In a city as large and complex as Philadelphia, in which a citywide survey has never been done, collecting historic resource information will take time, collaboration, and partnerships between city agencies, neighborhood organizations, and cultural and academic institutions. By sharing information, this coordinated effort will help to spread the responsibility and the cost of surveying the city's historic resources across public and private organizations as well as engage community members in a meaningful way.

Currently there is a wealth of useful historic resource information found at municipal and community-based organizations' collections: the Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC); the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office; community and academic institutions like the Athenaeum, University of Pennsylvania's Architectural Archives, the Philadelphia Free Library, and others. Unfortunately, none of this information is centralized and easily accessible to the public, and centralization is critical in order for the information to be useful for planners, researchers, decision-makers, and citizens.

If we hope to preserve and enhance Philadelphia's older and historic places, we need information to make good decisions about their future, to help owners and communities care

for these places, and to share their stories and meaning for our community members and visitors.

What are the challenges we are trying to solve?

- The city's historical resource inventory is limited, with many significant individual and neighborhood resources under-represented.
- There is a desire and fundamental need, but neither a process nor staffing capacity to undertake an ongoing citywide survey and inventory process. Hence there is:
 - Limited, uneven, and incomplete survey data and inventory of Philadelphia's historic structures, buildings, sites, objects, interiors, and archaeological resources;
 - No citywide inventory and no citywide agency data-sharing plan; and
 - No current digital inventory management system to collect, track, maintain and share historic resource data.

What best practices did we investigate?

- Inventory Management Systems and Survey Methodology used by New York Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources.
- Staffing supplementation by volunteers (Alexandria, VA; Detroit, MI; and Muncie, IN).
- How best to incorporate community input (SurveyLA - Los Angeles, CA).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Establish an ongoing, citywide survey program for historic and cultural resources as a core function of the Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC) and Department of Planning and Development (DPD).**
- B. Use available inventory management software.
- C. Verify and use legacy data from City agencies and departments as well as local, state, and federal organizations.
- D. Leverage the efforts and resources of partners in public, private, and nonprofit sectors.
- E. Create a survey protocol that is useful for decision-making across the city.
- F. Prioritize survey efforts.
- G. Provide adequate staffing and financial resources to implement a survey program.

A. Establish an ongoing, citywide survey program for historic and cultural resources as a core function of the Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC) and Department of Planning and Development (DPD).

- PHC should consult with other agencies and partners at the city, state, and federal levels of government to determine what information the City needs to gather and maintain regarding the historic, cultural, and architectural significance of properties. PHC should establish policies and systems that allow data gathered by other City agencies and external partners, including legacy data, to help infill and supplement their data collection. For data categories where information is missing, old, or unreliable, the City should conduct discrete survey projects to collect that information.

B. Use inventory management software.

- A strong inventory process requires specialized software to collect, store, analyze, search, and retrieve historic and cultural resource information. PHC is actively evaluating the suitability of Arches, a free and open source inventory platform developed and maintained by the Getty Conservation Institute for use by professionals and the public.
- The digital platform should:
 - Integrate with other City-maintained property databases and be configured to allow for communication between these databases.
 - **Allow for public access to historic resource data** in a read-only format and respect the sensitive nature of some parcel data.
 - Facilitate the collection of survey information via mobile devices by a range of users.
 - Collect information on a wide range of resource types, including historic buildings, structures, objects, landscapes, and archaeological resources.

C. Verify and use legacy data from City agencies and departments as well as local, state, and federal organizations.

- Survey does not entirely require the collection of information from scratch. There are significant sources of reliable information that should be systematically verified and imported into the inventory management software at the outset of the survey project. If gathered from trusted and verifiable sources, this information, particularly historical information, should be used to populate the inventory database, saving the City time and money.
- Legacy data exists in many forms and is available from a variety of sources: the National Register of Historic Places, the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO), PHC, and the Philadelphia Architects and Builders Project. The nature, scope, and reliability of existing information will vary based on the source, age, and reasons it was acquired. For example, many National Register Historic District nominations have property-level inventories that contain significant and reliable information about dates of construction, designers/architects, and former occupants or events.

D. Leverage the efforts and resources of partners in public, private, and nonprofit sectors.

- Historic resource surveys are routinely undertaken by diverse public and private partners for a variety of purposes. Examples include: surveys conducted by Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, SEPTA, and Amtrak in conjunction with construction projects financed with state and federal funding; projects sponsored by the City’s Division of Housing and Community Development using U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding; and National Register building and district nominations sponsored by real estate developers to enable historic tax credit projects. These surveys produce information that would meet the City’s needs but are typically submitted to (and held by) the PA SHPO rather than to the City.
- **Encourage community organizations, universities, advocacy groups, and individuals to sponsor surveys of particular neighborhoods or resource types, independent of City-initiated efforts or other publicly funded projects.**
- The survey program established and managed by PHC should:
 - Allow for the exchange of data with PA SHPO on a regular basis;
 - Establish standards, protocols, and tools to allow internal and external partners to gather and submit survey information; and
 - Allow members of the public, (including those without formal training or education in historic preservation, architecture, or architectural history) to contribute to survey efforts in ways that use their skills effectively while ensuring that the collected information is useful and accurate. This may include employing volunteers to check existing data, take photographs, identify important community landmarks, and contribute to discussions about historic and cultural significance.

E. Create a survey protocol that is useful for decision-making across the city.

- Intended to be coordinated with the aspirations and requirements of the new district types proposed herein, we identified the following three tiers of survey / inventory data [see Table 1 below]:
 - *Identification / Planning*
 - Data collected should include basic location, ownership, historical, and architectural information sufficient to identify patterns and trends, establish priorities for more intensive investigation, and make preliminary decisions.
 - Data should be obtainable quickly, with relatively minimal survey and data gathering training. Some information may be gathered from current high-resolution photographs.
 - Fields should include the “minimum record” information required by PA SHPO for integration into the State’s database. Terminology should conform to PA SHPO / National Park Service standards.

- *Intensive / Evaluation*
 - Fields should include all information from the Identification / Planning stage and detail history that may be useful in determining whether the historic resource should be considered for certain incentives or designations.

- *Designation*
 - Fields should include information from the Identification / Planning and Intensive / Evaluation stages with additional information / analysis necessary to apply designation status through regulatory programs.
 - Specific fields and documentation requirements may be further segmented to correspond with proposed district and individual landmark designation types.
 - For example, fields may include detailed information that is necessary / useful in managing the resource for the future (i.e. architectural details, character-defining features, etc.)

TABLE 1 - Example Criteria for Proposed Survey Protocol

	Identification / Planning	Intensive / Evaluation	Designation
Location	X	X	X
Materials	X	X	X
Style	X	X	X
Historic function	X	X	X
Current function	X	X	X
Form	X	X	X
Age/Era	X	X	X
Exterior photography	X	X	X
Architect		X	X
Cultural affiliation		X	X
Historical narrative		X	X
Architectural description		X	X
Character defining features			X

F. Prioritize survey efforts.

- While the survey program should accept information from a variety of internal and external sources on an ongoing basis, **the City should sponsor targeted survey projects to gather new or update existing historic resource information.** These targeted survey projects may include resources that may not be surveyed for other purposes or that require special data collection, including areas / properties that are identified as endangered after a zoning analysis during which it is identified that the existing or proposed zoning is significantly different than the form and character of the existing buildings.

- Historic contexts, or studies about themes, resource types, or geographies, should be prepared at the outset of individual survey projects to assist in the understanding and documentation of the historic resources.

G. Provide adequate staffing and financial resources to implement a survey program.

- Assign dedicated staff to develop necessary policies and procedures, perform quality control, manage survey data, and coordinate City-initiated survey projects. At a minimum this should include hiring a PHC Survey Manager and providing related support from other divisions within DPD, including Geographic Information Systems (GIS) / Information Technology (IT).
 - Once a plan is established to begin a survey program, the Survey Manager should have access to a budget and hire consultants to conduct survey work and / or use dedicated funds for grants to complete this work.

3. Modify Historical Commission Processes

How the City regulates historically designated resources reveals our collective values.

Making sure that alterations to designated resources do no material harm to their significance is fundamental to demonstrating and maintaining a strong historic preservation ethic. Thus, we recognize that new construction and alterations – even to buildings that have been deemed “non-contributing” in historic districts - can do material harm to the historic district’s integrity if reasonable safeguards (related to the general shape, form, and size of buildings, materials, and setbacks) are not in place to prevent unsympathetic developments.

Conversely, such regulatory processes must be conceived and implemented in a manner that is not overly burdensome to residents or business owners, and that contain an appropriate level of clarity, flexibility, and predictability to ensure fundamental fairness. Moreover, we recognize that historic preservation and real estate development are not, and should never be, mutually exclusive. We recognize that in the tradition of Ben Franklin, the City of Philadelphia should always be looking to foster (and never stifle) innovation related to how Philadelphians live, work, and travel in our historic city. **We believe the historic character of Philadelphia, and the intrinsic sense of place of our neighborhoods, are strengths, not weaknesses.** With the right level of regulatory balance, a progressive historic preservation policy can be our competitive advantage as we seek to attract new residents and businesses as well as retain and support Philadelphians in this dynamic economy.

To advance our collective values and support a historic preservation ethic, we recommend key refinements to the Philadelphia Historical Commission’s processes. Recognizing that the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance is already one of the strongest in the U.S., we recommend alterations that advance these values, while doing no harm to an otherwise very strong regulatory system.

First, for contributing properties in historic districts, we recommend a refined review system tailored to the historic resource’s significance. Although this has been standard practice for many PHC approvals, the practice has been somewhat *ad hoc*. Key to this recommendation is an understanding of the flexibility inherent in the U.S. *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* – in particular, the Rehabilitation Standards. Despite the common perception that approvals to alter historic properties are made while attending long monthly public meetings, Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC) staff approve most applications – around 90 percent – at the staff level and outside the PHC monthly meetings. For this reason, and as a way to foster transparency and consistency, we recommend that the Commission staff regularly report on those permit approvals to both the Commission and the public.

Second, even for non-historic properties in historic districts (whether an undeveloped site or a non-contributing building), **we affirmatively recognize that unsympathetic new construction and alterations can do harm to neighboring historic properties in the district**

and to the district as a whole. Therefore, the Commission should have the ability to approve – as opposed to simply comment on – such matters. However, such approval is not intended to be either *ad hoc* or unlimited; it should be based upon public design guidelines adopted by the Historical Commission. Such guidelines do not currently exist.

The Historical Commission’s approval should supplement, but not replace, the underlying zoning rights for a property. Historical Commission approval should concern massing, setbacks, and materials, as opposed to density, overall height, and other legislatively-bestowed zoning rights; doing otherwise could decrease predictability and result in *ad hoc* decision-making.

Last, after lengthy reviews by the Historical Commission’s staff, committees, and its members, permit decisions should only be overturned if there is a clear error of law or a manifest abuse of discretion. To ensure predictability and consistency, we recommend replacing Licenses and Inspections Review Board involvement in such matters with review of appeals by an administrative law judge familiar with the Commission’s powers and obligations.

What challenges are we trying to solve?

- The current regulatory framework for locally designated historic resources is perceived as overly rigid for both individually listed historic resources and districts, though it has more flexibility than is understood or exercised. Based upon the identified level of significance and/or identified financial hardship of the applicant, the Historical Commission can, and often does, exercise lesser or greater levels of regulatory control, some of which can be administered by PHC staff. However, there is no straightforward way for the public to understand their property’s level of significance and the associated approval process for proposed alterations.
- **Currently, PHC staff review and approve approximately 90% of submitted permit applications,** having been given broad authority to do so in PHC’s Rules and Regulations. However, staff do not report this information regularly at monthly meetings.
- The regulatory framework does not provide PHC with full jurisdiction and review for all properties within the boundaries of local historic districts. In particular, the design review of new construction in local historic districts does not fall within PHC’s purview and the lack of review can negatively impact the historic character of historic districts when new construction is incompatible in massing, scale, and character.
- Appeals of Historical Commission rulings are the responsibility of the L&I Review Board, which does not have historic design or regulatory review expertise and whose process can be lengthy (several months to many years).

What best practices did we investigate?

- Design guidelines that clearly articulate expectations of the historic property owner and the historic preservation ordinance processes (Pittsburgh, PA).
- Proactive education and outreach activities sponsored by City agencies and historic preservation nonprofits at neighborhood meetings and events (various cities).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Create a review system for individual properties already subject to existing historic district review criteria (based upon their level of significance) to help identify properties at which lesser levels of review diligence is required (non-contributing) or where exterior alterations should be minimized (high significance).
- B. Clarify the existing staff review process (Section 6.10.c) within the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Ordinance *Rules and Regulations*.
- C. **Establish PHC regulatory approval for all new construction within designated historic districts** and substantial alterations to non-contributing buildings, subject to guiding principles.
- D. Create a new appeal body for alteration and demolition decisions.

A. Create a review system for individual properties already subject to existing historic district review criteria (based upon their level of significance) to help identify properties at which lesser levels of review diligence is required (non-contributing) or where exterior alterations should be minimized (high significance).

- Establish criteria defining levels of significance for PHC designated properties and identify a process to adopt a historic resource inventory that identifies those levels of significance based upon current survey data.
- Build upon existing survey data, creating levels of significance within districts, if and as appropriate.
- Implement refined designation procedures administratively through PHC with the adoption of formal regulations:
 - Qualify “significant,” “contributing,” and non-contributing” evaluations of individual properties, whether stand-alone or within local historic districts, with corresponding design standards with greater or lesser of change for each criterion. This supplemental aspect of a property’s evaluation would allow for a consideration of context – for example, a higher level of review for alterations of row houses in an intact row, even if a row house is seen as “contributing” rather than “significant.” Conversely, the same rowhouse on a highly altered block would still be “contributing,” but regulated in a more flexible manner.

- Draw distinction between individually list-able buildings (“significant”) and those that reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the Historical Commission’s designation (“contributing”), but with regulation informed by allowable degrees of alteration identified in clear guidelines.
- Staff review authority, in 6.10.c. of PHC’s Rules and Regulations, is broad. PHC’s Rules and Regulations should be amended to clarify supplemental language. When guidelines exist or are created, the range of acceptable treatments that have staff review should be specified.
- Allow for PHC to define jurisdiction of the historic resource during designation.
- Acknowledge flexibility inherent in the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*, quoting from the federal regulations (36 CFR Part 68): “one set of standards ...will apply to a property undergoing treatment, depending upon the property’s significance, existing physical condition, the extent of documentation available, and interpretive goals, when applicable. The Standards will be applied **taking into consideration the economic and technical feasibility of each project** (emphasis added).”
 - Include a public summary of staff design review approvals for building permits in PHC’s monthly agenda. Through public reporting, PHC can insure public transparency about the PHC approvals that are at staff level, and thereby improve consistency between and among staff reviews.

B. Clarify the existing staff review process (Section 6.10.c) within the Philadelphia Historical Commission Rules and Regulations.

- **Establish a monthly staff procedure to digitally post a comprehensive list of staff design review approvals for building permits on the PHC website.**
 - This posting should include a brief, bulleted description of the decision components, with-reference to specific guideline standards.
 - In local historic districts, a certain degree of staff and Commission discretion must be preserved. The proposed monthly posting should be clear when decisions / recommendations are considered discrete, versus when they are explicitly drawn from guidelines.
 - Consider a bi-annual public report to the Historical Commission by DPD staff overseeing districts other than local historic districts on actions taken, for comments, and to help identify broad trends. A similar record, though less detailed, of decisions made by DPD staff based on guidelines should be made available.
- Incorporate the following document preambles into PHC’s *Rules and Regulations* to clarify the public’s right to historic preservation, and the City’s purpose of and right to regulate historic properties:
 - National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
 - Pennsylvania Constitution, (Article I, Section 27)

- 1984 Philadelphia Ordinance Section 14-2007 Historic Buildings, Structures, Sites, Objects, and Districts
- Individually and collectively, these high-level documents identify historic preservation as a public good, rather than a mere nicety.
- *Note that the preamble to the 1985 Philadelphia Historic Preservation Ordinance no longer appears in the latest version of the Zoning Code. After the Code was revised, those introductory words were removed and should be reintroduced.

C. Establish PHC regulatory approval for:

All new construction within designated historic districts, subject to the following guiding principles:

- PHC must produce understandable guidance defining compatibility.
- PHC approval of new construction should concern massing, setbacks, fenestration patterns, materials, and further architectural detail than what is already governed by zoning, such as use or general bulk area entitlements, ultimate gross floor area, and overall height, etc. City Council should ultimately legislatively remap historic districts to better align zoning requirements with the goals of the specific historic district.
- **All newly prepared guidelines should acknowledge and accommodate the aspirations and exceptions for excellent contemporary architectural design, consistent with the strong architectural evolution of the city.**

Substantial alterations to non-contributing buildings, subject to the following guiding principles:

- Procedures can be adopted and implemented administratively by PHC with the adoption of formal regulations.
- PHC approval of substantial alterations should concern massing, setbacks, fenestration patterns, materials, and further architectural detail than what is already governed by zoning, such as use or general area entitlements, ultimate gross floor area, and overall height, etc. City Council should ultimately legislatively remap historic districts to better align zoning requirements with the goals of specific historic district.
- All newly prepared guidelines should acknowledge and accommodate the aspirations and exception for excellent contemporary architectural design, consistent with the strong architectural evolution of the city.
- The demolition of non-contributing buildings will remain unregulated.

D. Create a new appeal body for alteration and demolition decisions.

- Ensure appeals of alteration and demolition decisions go to a specialized administrative law judge with preservation expertise, designated by either the Mayor or the DPD Director, rather than the Licenses and Inspections Review Board. Appeal hearings are on the record, but should continue to be limited to whether PHC's actions were arbitrary or capricious. This will require City Council to introduce an amendment to the existing Ordinance.

4. Reduce Historic Building Demolition and Broaden Neighborhood Preservation

Philadelphia has a wealth of historic resources but is challenged by a relatively low percentage of designated properties, the majority of which are concentrated in just a few of its neighborhoods. As a result, undesignated buildings across the city are demolished by-right, without having to undergo a neighborhood or Historical Commission impact review. This is exacerbated when new construction, out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, is constructed in its place.

The current historic resource nomination process is largely initiated through volunteer efforts focusing on individual properties rather than local historic districts. Despite the tireless efforts of volunteers, many buildings of merit and neighborhood importance are demolished. Although successful designations can significantly curtail the potential of an individual property's demolition, volunteer designation efforts tend to be focused on individual properties of the highest architectural merit and under the greatest perceived threat, rather than districts, leaving the large majority of buildings that define a neighborhood's sense of place at the greatest risk.

Although troubled by neighborhood demolition of historic properties, many Philadelphians recognize that the current one-size-fits-all approach to historic preservation does not meet the needs of their neighborhoods. Similarly, the City's Conservation District program, administered by the City Planning Commission, is currently limited to the review of new construction and parking and is not used to protect existing buildings.

Through National Trust for Historic Preservation research, we learned about efforts in Chicago to preemptively survey and classify buildings based upon local criteria. This practice ensures that identified historic resources are considered for designation prior to demolition approval. We also learned about New Orleans' use of varying levels of regulatory review in differentiated historic district types that are defined at the time of adoption.

The recommendations of this section **suggest creating a property index based on local criteria to provide temporary protection for unregulated buildings across the city and to allow for consideration of their historic designation.** This is understood to be a one-time stop-gap measure to identify and prevent the demolition of significant buildings before a citywide historic resource inventory and corresponding survey can be completed.

Recognizing the broadening of neighborhood historic preservation, **we recommend the adaptation of two additional historic preservation district types.** The first type, to be administered by the Historical Commission, would be a more explicitly flexible version of the current historic districts and would have a less rigorous demolition review process. The second new district type would be a historic preservation-centric Conservation District administered by the Department of Planning and Development, with limited, pre-defined review criteria that could be administered at the staff level. If a proposed project is not

compliant, the applicant would be required to present their proposal at a public meeting, which would provide the opportunity for neighborhood input.

A range of incentives could be provided to properties subject to historic preservation review, with the greatest range of incentives offered to those properties with the greatest level of regulatory control. The incentives should be appropriate to the needs and conditions of the neighborhood and identified at the time of designation. For example, the incentives should recognize that what may be suitable in the Mayfair may not be appropriate in East Mt. Airy.

Lastly, we recognize that to be successful, these options will require clear communications and public outreach efforts that explain the benefits of the varying designation levels and the associated review criteria. These efforts should include clear illustrations and descriptions tailored to each district, with requirements and review process explanations.

What are the challenges we are trying to solve?

- Historically important, undesignated buildings across the city are demolished by-right, without review of potential neighborhood impact. The current designation process is slower than the current rate of demolition and is overly reliant on the designation of individual buildings rather than local historic districts.
- **Demolition of existing buildings and incompatible new construction are altering neighborhoods throughout the city.** Philadelphians are seeking an approach to designation that provides more regulatory control than the current Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO or “Conservation District”) process, especially with regard to demolition, and less than the current PHC review process, especially with regard to alterations.
- PHC provides a framework for detailed review of proposed alterations and associated materials to maintain historic integrity. Demolition review is generally limited to a rigorous financial hardship application process that, in its current form, is time-consuming and costly. The PHC demolition review process is perceived as too burdensome in detail and costly in compliance to be an option for many of the City’s neighborhoods.
- Philadelphia’s Conservation District regulatory review is limited to specific design items identified at the time of adoption. The existing six Conservation Districts focus on new construction and parking, subject to simple guidelines that are typically verbal only. Only one district’s guidelines address alterations, and none address delay or prevention of demolition.
- The current PHC designation and Conservation District designation processes are insufficient to meet the emerging range of flexibility, protection, and regulatory control desired by Philadelphia’s neighborhood organizations, residents, and property owners.

What best practices did we investigate?

- Pre-emptive historic resource survey and classification to determine eligibility for listing on the local historic register (Chicago, IL).
- Proposed demolition applications review for all properties more than 50 years old (St. Augustine, FL).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Create a property index of historically and culturally important, undesignated buildings.
- B. Adopt an ordinance amendment establishing additional district types.
- C. Correlate minimum documentation requirements for designation of each of the differentiated historic districts (for example, a higher level of protection and compliance requires increased documentation). Define the level of documentation that is sufficient for demonstrating that an area meets each districts' criteria.
- D. Correlate incentives with each of the differentiated historic districts (for example, a higher level of protection and compliance increases access to higher value / greater range of incentives).
- E. Supplement information that is useful for decision-making.
- F. Impose a demolition review process in Conservation District CD-1, a new district type.
- G. Create and/or update communications materials to explain the various aspects and benefits of designation.

A. Create a property index of historically and culturally important, undesignated buildings.

For the City to “catch-up” on designation efforts, as a one-time effort it will create a property index of eligible historic resources subject to demolition stay. To be listed in the index, every property must include a documented finding that the property meets at least one of the current Ordinance’s criteria for designation, as determined by either the Historical Commission staff or a third-party consultant. It is anticipated that the property index could include hundreds of unrelated properties throughout the city. If certain regulatory actions are proposed, such as the application for a demolition permit, historic properties with high density zoning, or a property owner’s proactive request for a designation determination, the Historical Commission will have a defined period of time to either add the building to the Philadelphia Register or elect not to do so. If the designation does not occur, the property would be exempt from designation for a to-be-determined period of years.

The adoption of the property index would essentially regulate numerous unrelated properties throughout the city (as opposed to the case-by-case designation of individual properties and historic districts) at one time. We believe the delegation of administrative authority from City Council to the Historical Commission to create this property index will be necessary. Once the concept of such an index is approved by City Council, the Historical Commission staff would be responsible for the mechanism, identification and approval of the properties on the index.

As part of PHC's determination of the property index, the property owners will be notified expeditiously. In the meantime, the Historical Commission can continue to review designations of individual properties independent of the index.

B. Adopt an ordinance amendment establishing additional district types.

The City should adopt ordinances and provide administrative regulations for new types of historic regulatory control. Also, the City should provide direction, through clear design guidelines and procedural descriptions, to facilitate property owners' understanding of these newly flexible options and their associated incentives and requirements.

The 4 district types include:

1. Keep local Historic Districts (PHC-1) the same. An important adjustment includes new construction regulation within the districts in all cases, with reference to a set of newly-created district-specific design guidelines that are informed if / as appropriate by zoning and administered by PHC.
2. Adopt a new Historic District typology, to also be administered by the Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC-2). **The new district type would include a "lighter" historic preservation review framework, relaxing PHC-1 standards, such as the use of alternative materials. The ability to prevent demolition would remain, and the financial hardship demonstration required for properties in locally designated districts appropriately would be simplified.**
3. New enhanced Conservation District type (CD-1) would have "lighter" regulation of alterations than Historic District type PHC-2, regulation of new construction, and public review if district criteria were not met by the applicant. All review would be based on clear and presumably checklist-format, district-specific guidelines administered by PCPC.
 - a. Established designation criteria as well as associated incentives need to be identified for enhanced "conservation district types."
 - b. Inclusion of a process for the degree of demo delay / regulation is included to enable demolition. PCPC will need resources to add such a process to its review for the CD-1 as an expanded range of Conservation Districts.
4. Existing Conservation District type (CD), would remain unchanged and continue to focus on new construction and parking, subject to simple, verbal guidelines.

C. Correlate minimum documentation requirements for designation of each of the differentiated historic districts (for example, a higher level of protection and compliance requires increased documentation). Define the level of documentation that is sufficient for demonstrating that an area meets each districts' criteria.

- Implement designation procedures administratively through PHC with the adoption of formal regulations.
- Acknowledge that proposed level CD-1 designation and approval processes for districts or properties will be administered by PCPC, not PHC.

D. Correlate incentives with each of the differentiated historic districts (for example, a higher level of protection and compliance increases access to higher value / greater range of incentives).

- At the time of permitting, an owner would be presented with a menu of incentive options to determine the best package of incentives for his / her project.
- Properties reviewed under PHC-1 would have access to the greatest number of incentives, with PHC-2 being more limited and CD-1 having the smallest range.
- Historic preservation incentives would not be available to properties solely regulated by the current Neighborhood Conservation Overlay ordinance that are not subject to historic preservation review.

E. Supplement information that is useful for decision-making.

- In addition to designation and permit reviews undertaken by PHC and PCPC, survey information should be used to inform a variety of City-level decision-making processes, including the development of neighborhood and district-level plans and zoning maps, code enforcement actions, and expenditure of public funding.
- The survey program, including the software, policies, and guidance documents, should support the four-tiered level of regulation and range of incentives proposed. Some fields can be populated from other datasets within the city as well as existing surveys from a variety of sources.

F. Impose a demolition review process in Conservation District CD-1.

During the process, the applicant must present their proposal for demolition / new construction simultaneously; if a variance is required, the applicant must then present their proposal at a public neighborhood meeting. After the design has been reviewed and an application that meets the required criteria has been submitted along with all required documentation regarding the proposed demolition (or the presentation of the application in the case of a variance), the applicant may proceed with the demolition upon approval of all the required submissions.

G. Create and/or update communications materials to explain the various aspects and benefits of designation.

Design guidelines addressing alterations and new construction applicable to each districts' criteria should clarify and inform a consistent application review process by PHC and PCPC staff and be able to be referenced by staff in such reviews. Additionally, they should be informed by the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* and the *Guidelines on Sustainability* as well as environmental impact criteria under Pennsylvania state laws, should be incorporated.

- The absence of neighborhood-specific design guidelines is a rare deficiency in Philadelphia's Certified Local Government ("CLG") processes.
- Design guidelines clearly will play a role at minimizing perceived inconsistencies in review, and can be tied to the interrelated concepts of acceptable change as well as significance and make as clear as possible the designation and approval processes.
- In Conservation District level CD-1, design guidelines should clearly identify – using "yes-no" decisions, where possible – the applicable criteria for permit-requiring work. Where professional judgment is inevitably necessitated, they should say so, while still providing baseline guidance.
- Acknowledge the difference in degree and type (verbal or written) of design guidelines within Neighborhood Conservation Districts versus local Historic Districts. For example, the guidelines for the six existing Neighborhood Conservation Districts are written design guidelines.
- Design guidelines should encourage sustainable improvements appropriate to a property's character, significance and level of regulatory review. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* could serve as the basis for the establishment of local criteria. In addition, the Historical Commission should adopt regulations to ensure its compliance with the public trustee obligations under Pennsylvania Constitution Article I, Section 27 (amendment related to environmental rights).
- Fund the preparation of design guidelines, both to retain a consultant as well as for their on-going updating and printing for public use.

A clear framework / roadmap for applicants to understand the nomination and permit review processes and requirements.

- Guidelines must be clear to and legible by their four primary audiences: the public, neighborhood residents, property owners / applicants / designers, and the City's design reviewers. The guidelines can include language such as "likely to get approved," "may be approved," "not likely to be approved" – always leaving room for appropriate regulatory discretion.

- Guidelines need to include clear process flow charts understood by all four audiences.
- A process checklist that guides applicants could be incorporated in the framework / roadmap, and particularly helpful to proposed Conservation District CD-1 applicants.

5. Clarify the Designation Process

In 1984, when City Council adopted the current historic preservation ordinance, it delegated some of the broadest power to designate individual properties and districts in the U.S. Unlike most city agencies, the newly-empowered Historical Commission has authority to designate properties and districts without requiring regulatory concurrence from City Council. **Rather, City Council gave the Historical Commission power to designate properties citywide, without requiring property owner consent, and using broad designation criteria.** In doing so City Council recognized that a historical commission needed to be comprised of diverse perspectives and professional training, and exercise informed discretion. This is especially true when the public's interest in historic preservation directly confronts and often outweighs individual private property rights. Beyond the power to designate, the ordinance also empowered "any person" to file a nomination. Furthermore, upon the finding that such a nomination was complete and correct, an automatic hold applied to all subsequently filed permit applications.

The designation process has been fraught with controversy, both substantively and procedurally. Substantively, many of the existing designations (especially the pre-1984 Ordinance designations) fail to identify character-defining features and historic importance of a designated property with regularity. This lack of information hinders the Commission's ability to review alteration applications and fails to inform the public and the property owner about a historic resource's importance and the basis for Commission action. Procedurally, the public lacks clear guidance on the designation process. Nominations can take months (if not years) to resolve, and property owners sometime fail to learn of a nomination over the weeks/months that the staff reviews a nomination for completeness and correctness.

To improve the designation process, we recommend some fairly simple reforms that the Historical Commission can initiate. First, for historic districts and individual properties, the nomination statement of significance and inventory should read like a roadmap for future reviewers and the public. Second, the Historical Commission must provide clear guidance regarding the designation process. There should be no surprises. The requirements for nominations (and the review process) should be set forth on the Historical Commission's website, along with expected review timeframes. Nominators and property owners should be encouraged to meet with PHC staff early in the process. **Third, the City should streamline the nomination and designation process.** Currently, the process takes too long. Staff review of completeness and correctness must follow established protocols. To do so, PHC needs additional staff resources to safeguard historic resources and property rights. Last, the Historical Commission should establish a process whereby a property owner is expeditiously notified of a nomination, regardless of its completeness or correctness. Most jurisdictions either require simultaneous notice to the property owner upon filing a nomination or notification with a set period to time, e.g. 10 days, after the government receives the nomination. Through training, establishing set protocols, and informing the public, we are confident the Historical Commission can protect historic resources while providing due process to property owners.

What challenges are we trying to solve?

- There is not a clear and universal understanding of how the nomination and designation to the Philadelphia Register process works to protect historic resources. This includes clarifying the specific information needed to classify an application as “complete,” and the difference between “complete” and “complete and correct.”
- The current Historical Commission policy is to notify property owners only upon the receipt of a “complete” application. When “incomplete” nominations are submitted by third parties, the staff works with the applicant to revise the application so that it meets the Historical Commission’s requirements, a process that can take several months and is often ongoing without the property owner’s knowledge.
- The existing designation process does not identify a nominated property’s level of significance as related to any subsequent regulatory review criteria.

What best practice did we investigate?

- How best to qualify levels of designation based upon significance (City of New Orleans, LA).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Establish criteria by which PHC reviewed properties are designated based upon their level of significance.
- B. Provide clear guidance regarding the designation process.
- C. Streamline the PHC nomination review process.
- D. Establish a process by which property owners are expeditiously notified of a PHC historic designation application.

A. Establish criteria by which PHC reviewed properties are designated based upon their level of significance.

- **Provide clear criteria for designation levels in districts based upon three levels of significance: “significant,” “contributing,” and “non-contributing,” qualified by identification of associated allowable alterations.**
- Identify criteria for the review of properties proposed for designation owing to their cultural rather than design (architectural or landscape) merit.
- Individual nominations should be clear about the significance of the resource and guide PHC in its administration of permit applications.

B. Provide clear guidance regarding the designation process.

Offer clear direction regarding the PHC designation process, clearly defining the expectations and requirements for complete and correct nominations:

- Refine the requirements for nominations to the Philadelphia Register, found in Section 5 of the *Rules and Regulations*, to accommodate adjustments recommended in this report, such as levels of significance and allowable degrees of alteration.
- Post the designation criteria information on PHC's website.
- Post examples of successful PHC-approved nominations on PHC's website for reference by nominators.
- Encourage potential nominators to meet early with PHC staff to receive guidance, as needed, to submit a successful nomination application.

C. Streamline the PHC nomination review process.

- Implement designation procedures administratively through PHC with the adoption of formal regulations.
- Establish a policy by which PHC staff review of the completeness of nomination submissions occurs expeditiously and within a defined time period.
- Increase the frequency of designation meetings to reduce the overall time for nomination review.
- Provide additional staff resources to review and author additional nominations.

D. Establish a process by which property owners are expeditiously notified of a PHC historic designation application.

Under the existing ordinance, upon the Historical Commission's determination that a nomination is complete, all building permits (including demolition permits) must be reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. This is the automatic "stay" that remains pending the timely review of the nomination.

- Implement more explicitly defined designation procedures administratively through PHC with the adoption of formal regulations.
- Property owners should be notified expeditiously of the Historical Commission's receipt of a designation nomination from whatever source – regardless of the quality, completeness, or correctness of that nomination. Such notification shall clearly inform the owner of the Commission's associated processes and authority and include a copy of the nomination.

6. Incentivize Historic Preservation

The purpose of providing incentives in support of historic preservation activity is twofold: first, incentives help to compensate property owners for any burden placed on the property by historic designation, and secondly, incentives encourage property owners to seek historic designation for their properties.

Properties on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places face many restrictions. For example, designated properties cannot, in general, be demolished, nor can they be extensively modified. Even minor modifications require permission from the Historical Commission, which means that the property owner must prepare an application complete with documentation and plans that the owner must pay for. In addition, designated properties often must be maintained to high standards.

However, current City policy provides no incentives targeted at historic properties. Thus, the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Ordinance is all “stick” and no “carrot.” As a result, many owners of historic properties that would be eligible for designation choose not to nominate their properties for the Philadelphia Register.

We researched other cities’ incentives provided to historic property owners. We found that some of these incentives are already in use in Philadelphia, for all properties, historic and non-historic. For example, some cities use tax abatements for historic properties, whereas Philadelphia has tax abatements for all properties. [Note: We do not recommend changing the current tax abatement.] Some incentives used elsewhere are not possible in Philadelphia. However, there are several incentives that are not currently used in Philadelphia but could be.

We also talked to many Philadelphians at the public outreach sessions, and gathered suggestions through interviews, workshops, and other types of public input. Many of our recommendations resulted directly from such public suggestions.

One thing is clear – there is no single incentive that applies to all properties in all circumstances and is so powerful that no other incentives are needed. Therefore, we have developed a variety of recommended incentives. We believe that the suite of incentives will reduce the burden of historic designation, and in many cases, be beneficial enough to encourage owners to seek designation.

Our recommendations fall into the following three broad categories:

1) Rule Changes

Many City actions or rules affect the financial situation of a property. We have identified many ways the City can change its procedures to benefit historic properties. Some of these rules are relatively simple administrative changes, while others require changes to existing policy. Some changes may require City Council approval or action by parts of the government not directly controlled by the Mayor or Council.

We also recommend the creation of a Historic Preservation Fund, with potential contributions from a variety of sources, including government, foundations, and the private sector.

2) Direct Funding

Currently, the City of Philadelphia has several programs that support repair to existing buildings. There are many factors that determine which properties receive funding, and we recommend including historic status as part of the process. Essentially, we recommend that historic properties receive higher priority than similarly situated non-historic properties.

[Note that apart from the creation of a Historic Preservation Fund, we do not identify new sources of funding for historic preservation.]

3) Other Changes

We offer several other recommendations that are broader than rule changes or direct spending. Though these changes are intended to address problems that disproportionately affect historic properties, they can potentially benefit all types of properties.

What challenge are we trying to solve?

- **There is little to no City-sponsored financial assistance and tools to promote and support residential and commercial historic preservation activities; restoration, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse.**

What best practices did we investigate?

- Adaptive Reuse Ordinances (ARO) (Los Angeles, CA; Phoenix, AZ)
- Programs to encourage historic building reuse and homeownership (Baltimore City Vacants-to-Value (V2V); Chicago Historic Bungalow Initiative and Greystone and Vintage Home Program)
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) / Density Bonus programs

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- Modify and expand existing tools to incentivize historic preservation activities, such as by-right zoning for special purpose historic buildings.
- Expand existing City-led financial programs such as home buying incentives and the storefront improvement program.

- Introduce new City-led financial programs such as Housing Preservation Loan Program (HPLP).

As we considered incentives that would support historic preservation activity in the city, the following financial and regulatory incentives were identified and developed. **We recognize that incentives need to be linked to districts as they are adopted and customized to their specific type of building, for example, Germantown twin residential buildings on large parcels vs. Fishtown rowhouses on smaller parcels.** Although the menu of incentives may be broad, every incentive proposed cannot be adopted wholesale across the city. This will help ensure that there is equitable distribution of incentives to all property owners regardless of financial means. Aside from the tax assessment and abatement, in order for property owners to receive the following incentives, the property must be historically designated and / or under jurisdictional control of PHC or DPD.

REGULATORY CHANGES

A. Assessment Formula that Recognizes Historic Impact

The Office of Property Assessment (OPA) assesses a property's market value based on its characteristics and recent sales. Historic designation places restrictions on a property, and the presence or absence of a restriction is a property characteristic in the same way the presence or absence of a garage is a property characteristic.

Proposed Change: We propose that OPA take the historic preservation status of the property into account when it assesses a property's market value. This recommendation will likely require procedural change at OPA. *This proposal applies to any property affected by local historic designation.*

B. Accelerate Permit Speed

Development projects require building, zoning, and other permits from the City. Permits often take a substantial amount of time, which delays projects and adds costs to the development process. Faster permitting removes an incentive to tear down older buildings and provides incentive to get a building historically designated.

Proposed Change: We propose that certain historic preservation projects (either contributing buildings in a historic district or historically significant individual buildings) receive accelerated treatment in the entitlement process by allowing automatic expedited treatment of permits for locally designated and National Register listed properties. The accelerated permit process makes historic status more valuable and makes investment easier.

C. Reduce Parking Requirements

Parking requirements add significant cost to development projects both because of the cost to construct the parking and because the need to provide parking limits the flexibility of design.

Proposed Change: We propose that parking requirements be reduced or eliminated for historic building redevelopment projects that preserve the building's façade and relationship to the street. We recognize that in many circumstances, this recommendation is current practice. Implementation may require policy changes and perhaps City Council action.

D. Allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in historic buildings

An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is a second habitable unit in a building or on a property that can be rented. The current code allows for ADUs to be established for a defined single-family unit and that are owner occupied (the homeowner must reside on the property). The ADU, if in the same building as the main unit, is accessed via the same front door as the main unit. (From the street, the structure appears as a single-family residence). ADUs are already included in the zoning code, but not correlated to a specific location.

Proposed Change: We propose that ADUs are permitted by-right for properties in all defined categories of historic districts. Permitting ADUs will provide revenue to homeowners to help maintain the building. Vacant properties could also be rehabilitated and sold with an approved ADU, assuming one unit is owner-occupied after rehabilitation.

E. Allow By-Right Zoning for Special Purpose Historic Buildings

Certain types of historic buildings, such as churches, theaters, or gymnasiums, are very difficult to adapt to other uses and are often not zoned to permit residential or commercial uses. The expense of rezoning a special purpose building, combined with the physical challenges inherent in such a building, limits the ability and willingness of a developer to attempt building reuse.

Proposed Change: We propose the City amend the zoning code to allow any permitted use in historic buildings within CMX1, CMX2, CMX 2.5, CMX 3 (and perhaps other districts) zoning areas, if the developer commits to rehabilitating the building. By-right zoning removes uncertainty in the development process and makes it more likely that an owner would seek to rehabilitate the existing building instead of demolishing and replacing it with a new building. The by-right building rehabilitation would still require approval from the Historical Commission.

F. Historic Property Prioritization for Grants

The City supports annual grant applications for many projects and often must prioritize or rank different projects for funding.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City prioritize projects that include historic building restoration, reuse, and rehabilitation in its applications for the Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program (RACP) and other grants. This recommendation will require a policy change

with all agencies, including the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC) and the Department of Commerce.

G. Upgrade Life and Safety in Historic Buildings

Many existing historic buildings structures lack standard life safety systems, particularly sprinklers. The lack of sprinklers allows otherwise minor fires to spread and destroy buildings and often the adjacent buildings. The lack of sprinklers increases fire insurance costs for buildings without sprinklers and for sprinklered buildings near un-sprinklered buildings.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City consider increasing the fire protection requirements for existing buildings and prioritize assisting building owners with sprinklers and other life safety improvements of historic properties. A current example is Bill #180745. Written by the Department of Licenses and Inspections and sponsored by Councilman Squilla. This Bill proposes to revise the Fire Code to require some existing 5- and 6-story buildings (many in the Old City neighborhood) to install fire sprinklers. The intent of these changes is to address the preservation of densely situated historical buildings, reduce business disruption to the surrounding community, and protect firefighters from the difficulties in fighting fires in these types of buildings. Since Fire Code revisions are mandatory, there may be significant pushback. However, increased use of sprinklers will lead to fewer buildings lost to fire and ultimately reduce fire insurance costs for many building owners. We encourage the City's economic development agencies to consider ways to help owners manage these new costs.

H. Streets Department Right-of-Way Requirements

For development projects that affect adjacent or nearby sidewalks and streets, the Philadelphia Streets Department may require targeted infrastructure improvements. Examples could include new ADA-compliant sidewalk ramps to crosswalks, new stop signs or signals, and/or repaving.

Proposed Change: The City will re-evaluate its transportation improvement-related requirements associated with the rehabilitation or restoration of historic properties.

I. Zoning Bonus for Historic Preservation

The Philadelphia Zoning Code contains Floor Area Ratio (FAR) bonuses that allow developers to increased density in RMX-3, CMX-3, CMX-4 and CMX-5 districts. The code offers several bonus options, including public plazas, affordable housing, and other amenities.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City adds historic preservation as a zoning bonus option. If a property developer agrees to rehabilitate one or more historic buildings or contributes to the Historic Preservation Fund, the developer will receive a bonus. The historic building or buildings do not need to be located near the parcel receiving the bonus. Larger historic preservation development investments will result in larger zoning bonuses, up to the

maximum zoning bonus allowed on the site. The historic preservation bonus can be combined with other bonuses, again, up to the maximum permitted. The City will need to determine a pricing mechanism and a regulatory regime to ensure the funds go to historic preservation. The bonus is conceptually similar to a Transfer of Development Rights program (described below), but is administratively much simpler. This incentive rewards private capital for investing directly in historic preservation.

The proposed Historic Preservation Fund would be designed to accept: (a) private contributions from either donations or payments made to access the zoning bonus; (b) public funds; or (c) philanthropic investments. The Historic Preservation Fund would support capital investment projects that restore, revitalize, and maintain buildings that are within a local historic district and designated as “significant” or an individually locally designated property. The Fund would be administered by the Department of Planning and Development, and it would have a board to oversee the allocation of funds and establish criteria for allocating the funds on a regular basis.

J. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

A TDR program transfers unused development rights from an existing building or buildings (sending properties) to a development site (receiving property). These transfers are only possible where the development size is determined by a floor to area ratio (FAR), as opposed to a height limit or other dimensional standard.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City develop a TDR program that allows historic building owners to transfer development rights, e.g. allowable gross floor area, to other projects. Implementation of a TDR program is technically and politically challenging and may not generate significant interest citywide, depending on demand for new construction and density. A TDR program is similar in concept to a zoning bonus, but administratively more complex. This incentive rewards private capital for investing directly in historic preservation.

K. Real Estate Tax Abatement

Zero Basis for Significant Renovations – Property assessments have two components; the land assessment and the improvements assessment.

The tax abatement applies to the change in the property improvement assessment. For example, a vacant lot has an improvement assessment of \$0, so the abatement applies to the full value of the improvement once it is built. Because a historic property has an improvement assessment before it is redeveloped, the abatement applies only to the increase in the assessment, which is less than the full value of the improvement. Thus, improvements to an existing building typically receive a smaller abatement benefit than new construction.

For example, consider two lots, A and B. Lot A is vacant and has an assessed land value of \$100,000. Lot B also has an assessed land value of \$100,000, and also has an existing structure with an assessed improvement value of \$200,000. The Lot A developer constructs a building and the assessed value of the new building is \$900,000. The developer is eligible

for an abatement of \$900,000 for 10 years. The Lot B developer significantly rehabilitates the building, replacing all interior systems, and the assessed value of the rehabilitated structure is \$900,000. The developer is eligible for an abatement of \$700,000 (\$900,000 new assessed improvement value less \$200,000 pre-rehabilitation assessed value) for 10 years. The abatement value is less for the rehabilitation than new construction. This difference provides the Lot B developer an incentive to demolish the existing structure and construct a new structure.

Proposed Change: We propose that OPA reassess the improvement value to \$0 while a project to rehabilitate an existing building is under construction. Once the project is complete, OPA can reassess again to the appropriate completed project's market value. This change means the abatement would apply to the full improvement value, making the rehabilitation abatement benefit equivalent to the new construction abatement benefit and lowering the incentive to demolish the existing building. The rehabilitation must be significant; requiring that the developer spend at least the amount that the improvements are assessed at pre-renovation. This change will likely require procedural change at OPA. This proposal applies to any type of rehabilitation, regardless of historic status.

FUNDING TO BUILDING OWNERS

A. Targeted Home Buying incentives

Potential homeowners face significant upfront costs when buying older historic buildings - often requiring additional maintenance and financial investments that may discourage buyers.

Proposed Change: We propose creating a targeted home buyer program to encourage property investment and purchase within local historic districts. The program will help steer homebuyers toward existing historic buildings, incentivizing their continued use. This proposal requires funding, and the City needs to identify an external funding source. The incentives apply to a broad range of historic buildings.

B. Storefront Improvement Program

The City has a grant program for retail stores in selected commercial corridors that provides funding to fix-up storefronts.

Proposed Change: **We propose to increase the grant amount for historic commercial properties and expand the number of corridors that are eligible for funding.** The increase in potential funding depends on the level of historic significance. It is further recommended that this program be expanded to include established corner stores. This recommendation requires a policy change and additional funding.

C. Housing Preservation Loan Program (HPLP)

The City will launch a loan program for homeowners in January 2019. The loan will allow the homeowner to borrow up to \$25,000 for repairs to her property.

Proposed Change: We propose that the loan limit be increased to support historic preservation efforts. The increase amount would depend on the level of historic significance.

D. Basic System Repair Program

The City has an emergency grant program that allows low-income homeowners to receive grants to fix core operating systems, stabilize them, and make them compliant with City code. The construction work is completed by Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation contractors, and the scope is limited to \$17,000.

Proposed Change: We propose the City increase marketing efforts for this program in local historic districts to low-income homeowners.

E. Energy Efficiency Program

The new Energy Code Standards require significant property changes to reduce energy inefficiencies. These code changes only exempt historic properties from the window and exterior standards. A complete review should be conducted of all the requirements and ensure historic preservation exemptions are provided in all cases that create a significant financial requirement or put burdens on the property that are inconsistent with preserving a building's historic character.

GENERAL CHANGES

A. Increase Tangled Title Program

Many houses have deficient, or "tangled" titles. Tangled titles arise for a variety of reasons, and often because of inheritance that is not formalized. A property owner with a tangled title has difficulty accessing financing and may not be eligible to participate in City programs.

Proposed Change: **We propose that the City assist property owners to secure clean title to their historic properties.** This will remove a significant obstacle to reinvestment. However, title clearance can be complex and is difficult to do at scale. Removing a tangled title allows the owner to invest with ease and confidence in the historic property, since the owner will be able to enjoy the improvements and can profit from their value when selling the property.

B. Activate Upper Floors of Commercial Properties

Many multi-story commercial properties' upper stories are unused or used for storage. Reactivating these upper story spaces as habitable residential or commercial space would be useful because it would increase a building's value. Often the upper floors are underused because property owners find it too difficult or expensive to upgrade the units and make them compliant with the fire and safety code.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City investigate and pilot programs to put the upper stories back to use. Funding will likely be required and could be secured through the Department of Commerce. This problem is technically challenging, and design guidelines will be necessary.

C. Contextually Designed Buildings Permitted

In many neighborhoods, the predominant building type is not permitted as-of-right – rebuilding the existing neighborhood buildings would not be possible. Therefore, any new building will not conform to existing buildings. Some developers who want to develop contextually sensitive buildings are frustrated because of the zoning variance process, and, as a result, they choose to build aesthetically incompatible as-of-right buildings.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City extend permission to selected vacant lot owners and permit new construction to match the existing overall physical attributes found within their context. This recommendation will require changes to the existing zoning code and mapping.

D. Technical Assistance

The City currently offers limited technical assistance for building rehabilitation, restoration, and reuse.

Proposed Change: We propose that the City continue providing aid to property owners with help from DPD Development Services, working with PHC staff. Funding will be required.

7. Support Archaeology

Much of Philadelphia's history lies below our feet; Philadelphia's diverse archaeological heritage is buried beneath its buildings, streets, backyards, and open lots. These historic deposits not only reflect the city's European origins since William Penn's arrival in 1682, but also a varied Native American heritage that preceded it for thousands of years.

Unlike many cities, Philadelphia's regulatory framework allows through designation on the Philadelphia Register, for the historic preservation of information that can be gathered from buried archaeological remains. Yet these remains may be subject to demolition through the development process of the Philadelphia Historic Preservation ordinance. In support of these activities, the City had employed a full-time archaeologist. However, in recent years, archaeological protection has been addressed on an *ad hoc* basis and without professional archaeological staff support. This has left the City without a clear understanding of the location of potential resources and trained staff and Historical Commission members to administer and evaluate archaeological applications.

For property owners, there is no clear path to determine their responsibility when archaeological remains are encountered, especially outside of designated sites and districts. In fact, the majority of archaeological review through the Historical Commission has been in response to a proposed development within a designated architectural historic district. Unfortunately, many of the city's archaeological resources are located outside of these designated district areas, and thus do not receive oversight.

Through our best practice research, we identified several cities that have active archaeological protection programs including: Alexandria, VA; St. Augustine, FL; San Antonio, TX; New York, NY; and Phoenix, AZ. We reviewed their processes and procedures to identify those that could improve the Philadelphia review methodology and expand the protection of archaeological resources. [Examples of best practices from these cities include having a dedicated archaeology ordinance, archaeological staff and mapping that identifies areas of potential archaeological deposits and human remains.]

In addition to City resources, several cities maintain partnerships with local volunteer organizations that support local archaeological activities through mapping, conducting archaeological investigations, and processing of artifacts. In the absence of a staff archaeologist, the non-profit Philadelphia Archaeological Forum has served in an advisory capacity to the City's Historical Commission, identifying sites with potential artifacts and raising awareness through its educational programs.

The underlying key to the successful protection of archaeological resources is understanding where they may be located. While architectural resources are more apparent, the identification of archaeological resource locations will require trained personnel with an understanding of local historical settlement and development patterns. Although the City has not undertaken an archaeological survey, there is a wealth of information available through the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum and the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office. This information can provide the basis for mapping archaeological zones of the greatest sensitivity.

While PHC can designate areas of known archaeological resources to the Philadelphia Register, the practice is uncommon and not well documented in PHC's *Rules and Regulations*. Adopting a new ordinance would allow the PHC to outline a unique designation process in its *Rules and Regulations*, informed by surveyed sensitivity zones. The ordinance would also allow for a specific process for property owners to follow that would create more predictability and a clear path to compliance in the identified "zones." **Finally, the introduction of greater archaeological expertise on the PHC staff and on the Historical Commission would ensure that the City is able to enforce the new ordinance and assist property owners and developers in navigating the resource protection process.**

What is the challenge we are trying to solve?

- Philadelphia does not have an inventory or regulatory process that adequately protects archaeological sites.

What best practice did we investigate?

- Archaeological ordinance and review procedure (Alexandria, VA; Phoenix, AZ; New York, NY; St. Augustine, FL).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Create map-based predictive models of archaeological sensitivity.
- B. Adopt a new ordinance for archaeological resources which delegates to PHC the ability to designate "sensitivity zones."

A. Create map-based predictive models of archaeological sensitivity.

Data regarding the presence / absence of archaeological resources is gathered and managed in fundamentally different ways than it is for above-ground resources. To effectively manage impacts to archaeological resources, **the City should create map-based sensitivity models that combine existing information about known archaeological resources with topographic and environmental data as well as historic maps to identify likely subsurface resources.**

B. Adopt a new ordinance for archaeological resources which delegates to PHC the ability to designate "sensitivity zones":

The "sensitivity zones" must be established through thorough research, and the new ordinance must create safe harbors for property owners. **For example, if a "Phase 1" report finds that no archaeological evidence is present, then the property applicant is done with the project and construction review process. If a "Phase 1" report does yield archaeological evidence, then the property owner follows review process steps in the new ordinance to inform the course of action.** An overarching goal is that developers can

accomplish the investigation and review with PHC in a timely manner during the pre-development period, and PHC can help to preserve important archaeological resources.

PHC already has authority to designate archaeological resources – not only those that are known or reasonably believed to exist as part of a particular property, in association with a building designation, but also archaeological sites, but it has done so only rarely. However, PHC's *Rules and Regulations* are less than informative about nominations and regulatory implications.

- Add an archaeologist to the PHC staff.
- Add a professional archaeologist to the Historical Commission.
- Create a committee to craft legislation to address this issue and present ordinance language to City Council. Ensure a clear development timeline and firm deadline to see this task through.

8. Activate Education and Outreach

Historic preservation activities should represent Philadelphia's diverse history and cultural heritage. The activities should be accessible to all Philadelphians. Yet the Philadelphia Historical Commission's (PHC) limited staff and resources have yielded a City agency that is primarily reactionary, focused on building permit reviews and, when possible, designating historic resources and precluding time and resources to engage in proactive outreach and education. Many community groups, historical societies, and non-profit organizations support cultural and historic preservation-related activities though much of their work is divorced from the highlight regulatory work of PHC and other City agencies. As a result, the diversity and range of historic preservation-minded Philadelphians are not leveraged to reach broader historic preservation goals. As a Task Force, we acknowledge that the City must provide education and outreach to connect the work of non-governmental organizations with the work of City agencies in order to carry out this report's recommendations and bolster historic preservation activities.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation identified other U.S. cities' best practices in education and outreach that we reviewed. These best practices include public and private efforts that build support and engage residents in cultural and historic preservation activities. We found that in some cities, outreach was focused on residents not traditionally engaged in historic preservation activities. For example, cities such as Baltimore, MD; New Orleans, LA; and Washington, D.C. bring city agency staff to neighborhoods and build relationships outside of their offices' regulatory role. By building these relationships, City agencies strengthen historic preservation efforts and provide education about the benefits and value of historic preservation activities. Attending neighborhood meetings and events, providing workshops and tours, and having a robust website for easy access to information all residents help these cities to rally the public for various historic preservation activities.

We recommend several key programs that will broaden historic preservation efforts, expand public outreach, and help connect existing neighborhood programs.

Over the years, PHC and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission (PCPC) produced several booklets and brochures that outline best practices and advice for historic property owners. The *Philadelphia Rowhouse Manual* and the unique booklets produced for local historic districts address many basic questions and provide useful information, such as architectural terms and styles, definitions, and guidance for maintaining historic properties. These helpful guides should be updated and republished and have a presence on a robust website that provides a one-stop-shop for information.

At the beginning of our work, we created www.phlpreservation.org to update the public on the Task Force's progress. The City should update and maintain this website and continue to provide information to historic property owners, researchers, and others interested in historic preservation. This website should include information about nominating a property to the Philadelphia Register, PHC regulations, the building permit application process, and advice for historic property owners.

As the National Trust's research noted, programs outside of the regulatory framework help to build relationships. Creating hands-on experiences, such as walking tours, lectures, workshops, and presentations, help the public explore the city's history and architecture, brings together different community members, and provides the opportunity to highlight lesser known historic resources.

The newly formed Department of Planning and Development (DPD) has brought together PHC with PCPC, creating opportunity for enriched engagement efforts. The Citizens Planning Institute (CPI), with PCPC, educates and engages citizens successfully in planning, zoning, and real estate development-related issues. We recommend that DPD add historic preservation-themed classes to CPI's curriculum and consider creating robust coursework addressing historic preservation-related issues.

Lastly, creating the potential historic resources inventory that we recommend will need the help of many City staff and volunteers. **Engaging the public as volunteers in the survey process will engage residents and neighborhood organizations and provide valuable information about socially and culturally important sites.**

The following recommendations identify various activities already happening around the city and how best to improve relationships between city agencies, specifically PHC, and the public. Encouraging and supporting a pro-preservation public will ensure that Philadelphia's historic resources are preserved and that we can continue to learn from the city's past to help inform our future.

What are the challenges we are trying to solve?

- Not enough resources dedicated to building constituency for historic preservation. Philadelphia needs more tools (in-person and online) to engage citizens and to help them access information.
- **Current historic preservation education and outreach efforts do not recognize the city's diverse cultural heritage and proactively engage Philadelphians in historic preservation in their neighborhoods.**
- Outreach does not reach all Philadelphians.

What best practices did we investigate?

- Preservation Resource Center of New Orleans' fully staffed Education and Outreach Program (New Orleans, LA).
- Neighborhood-based hubs for citizen outreach (St. Louis, MO).
- Targeted outreach to neighborhood and community organizations (Atlanta, GA; Chicago, IL).

- Relationship building with residents who have not traditionally been part of the conventional historic preservation movement (Boston, MA; New York, NY).
- City, schools, congregations, and after-school programs programming that supports and grows interest in cultural and historical resources (Atlanta, GA, New Orleans, LA; St. Louis, MO).
- Walking and trolley tours of the city's architectural and cultural history, sponsored by traditional historic preservation organizations and neighborhood organizations (Baltimore, MD; Chicago, IL; New Orleans, LA).
- E-newsletters and social media for communication (Buffalo, NY) and a well-designed and user-friendly website (New Orleans, LA; Washington, D.C.).

What are we recommending Philadelphia do?

- A. Expand outreach efforts and build broader public support for historic preservation
- B. Create hands-on experiences to learn about historic preservation and the city's history.
- C. Maintain a user-friendly website.
- D. Produce digital and print information to promote historic preservation and inform property owners.
- E. Form partnerships with artists and historic sites' organizations to foster collaborations and draw public attention and awareness to these sites.
- F. Integrate education and outreach activities into the survey and inventory process.

We found that many neighborhood organizations and their residents are interested in historic preservation, but are not familiar with the regulatory process, tools, and resources of the Historical Commission. As we consider how best to provide connections to the public's interest in historic preservation and the City historic preservation process, we identified the following ways the City can meet organizations and residents where they are in their understanding and expand the constituency that helps protect the city's heritage and drives economic opportunity in various neighborhoods:

- Expanding PHC and PCPC staff to address various neighborhood historic preservation issues in addition to the offices' regulatory role;
- Focusing on the people and special places in neighborhoods rather than just the City's regulatory duties; and
- Incorporating existing community resources – knowledge, experience, connections, etc. – to provide supportive historic preservation education.

A. Expand outreach efforts and build broader public support for historic preservation

- Outreach can be done through strategic communications:
 - Create a dialogue between the City and constituents through person-to-person interaction;
 - Meet residents on their own terms (i.e. at neighborhood meetings / events) and increase the frequency of public information;
 - Hold consistent discussion groups with historic preservation advocates, including non-profits and historical societies, and professionals to address timely issues;
 - Commit PHC and PCPC staff to attend community and nonprofit organizations' meetings and provide timely information; and
 - Continue to integrate residents' input into City plans and programs.

B. Create hands-on experiences to learn about historic preservation and the city's history

- Provide better access to historic preservation educational materials, especially pertaining to PHC's regulatory process and technical resources.
- Create public opportunities to discuss the city's history and historic preservation opportunities:
 - **Expand the Citizens' Planning Institute curriculum to include more historic preservation topics;**
 - Partner with schools, religious institutions, and youth centers to educate youth about historic preservation and its role in city planning and the city's history;
 - Work with the tourism industry and local historical societies to create walking and trolley tour programs of neighborhoods outside of Center City;
 - Partner with the World Heritage Foundation and the Independence Visitors Center to highlight more geographic areas of the City and reach a wider audience; and
 - Engage neighborhood representatives, supported by local historical societies and civic groups, to lead tours and advertise to local community members.
- Create a mobile historic preservation exhibition including the Historic Preservation Task Force's recommendations and ways to get involved in historic preservation-related activities.

C. Maintain a user-friendly website.

- Create a website that provides helpful historic preservation information.
- Categorize information by user, such as historic home-owner, developer, researcher for easy navigability.
- Make the site mobile and desktop computer-friendly;

- Present information in an accessible style with clear and simple language and multiple language options;
- Provide information about design guidelines, permit applications, and available incentives for historic property owners; and
- Provide maps of historic districts, survey and inventory data, local register designation reports, and strategic neighborhood and area plans (through both the public and nonprofit sectors) for researchers.

D. Produce digital and print information to promote historic preservation and inform property owners.

- Create user-friendly, well-designed, and relevant brochures and booklets.
- Create digital media that includes:
 - An updated *Philadelphia Rowhouse Manual* and other local historic district guides; and
 - A new “Benefits of Historic Preservation” and “Incentives for Historic Property Owners” booklet.

E. Form partnerships with artists and historic sites’ organizations to foster collaborations and draw public attention and awareness to these sites.

- Tying important sites or buildings to the arts brings an added dimension to the understanding and accessibility of these locations.
- Seeing historic locations through the eyes of contemporary artists reinforces the relevancy of those sites in today’s world.
 - Activate Mayor’s Office of Arts & Culture / Mural Arts toward this cause.

F. Integrate education and outreach activities into the survey and inventory process.

- **Welcome and encourage neighborhood participation in survey projects by:**
 - Working with neighborhood organizations to undertake survey projects when possible and feasible;
 - Identifying skill-appropriate tasks that volunteers can undertake with the appropriate training, coordination and supervision, such as photography, and field verification of existing information;
 - Engaging with the public in areas that are being surveyed to identify important themes and community landmarks; and
 - Establishing clear policies and procedures for external partners to sponsor survey projects and contribute the results to the City.

Next Steps

We present these recommendations to Mayor Kenney and the City Council so that they may review and change current City programs. Additionally, we encourage community partners to consider ways that they can support historic preservation practices, policies, and processes throughout Philadelphia and in partnership with the City.

We affirm that the current historic preservation policies and procedures, which have protected countless resources across the City, remain appropriate and should continue with minor adjustment to enhance citizen participation. We agree that a broader array of preservation tools will allow participation by a wider constituency. To that end, we encourage the convening of a City and community-driven effort to establish a flexible framework that will allow for the protection of the breadth of Philadelphia's historic and cultural heritage.

Implementation of these recommendations will require careful coordination, staffing, resources, and time (see table on page 54). To help guide the creation of an action plan, we have begun to consider what types of resources will be required for each recommendation. We have listed nine considerations for implementation that fall into three general categories:

1) Staffing

Some recommendations can be implemented utilizing current staff. Others may require additional new staff, especially where there would be a long-term need to support a recommendation. Where there is a short-term need to accomplish tasks, we have highlighted a potential need for hiring an outside consultant.

2) Changing the rules

Where a recommendation suggests changing a current law, policy, or practice, we have listed how that change needs to happen. Changes to the zoning code or preservation ordinance require City Council action for it to become law. Changes to the make-up of the City's boards and commissions that live in the City Charter require a Charter Change to be implemented. This is done by Council Action and ballot measure, voted on by Philadelphians. Policies that live in a department's "Rules & Regulations" can be changed by the board or commission that oversees that department.

3) Resources

We believe that about half of the recommendations have a cost associated with them. While we have not investigated what those costs will be, we have estimated which recommendations would require a small (\$), medium (\$\$), and large (\$\$\$) investment. Alongside those estimates, we have highlighted where there may be possibilities to look for outside funding and outside partner opportunities. These are opportunities to partner with foundations, non-profit, and other governmental agencies to increase the resources available for implementation.

We are aware that the City and the community must create a flexible, community-driven process to protect Philadelphia's historic resources, and that the process should not be at the mercy of a single power at the neighborhood, district, or citywide levels. We agree that the current and existing historic preservation policies and procedures are appropriate. However, we also agree that historic preservation expansion will allow greater participation by a wider community. This will require that the City improve historic preservation efforts with new processes and programs.

Follow this process and take part in public discussion by visiting www.phlpreservation.org.

NEXT STEPS

	Utilize Current Staff	Requires Add'l Staff (LT)	Outside Consultant (ST)	Council Action	Charter Change	Rules & Regs Changes	Cost	Outside Funding Opp	Outside Partner Opp
1. PLAN FOR SUCCESS									
1.1 Create Historic Preservation Policy Team	■								
1.2 Add preservation expertise on City's boards and commissions				■	■		\$		
1.3 Assign a Historic Preservation Liaison	■								
1.4 Adopt "Historic preservation-first" and adaptive reuse policies	■								
1.5 Collect, update, and use building survey information during City planning processes	■								
1.6 Use zoning as a tool to support historic preservation activities	■			■					
2. CREATE A HISTORIC RESOURCE INVENTORY									
2.1 Establish an ongoing, citywide survey program	■		■				\$\$\$	\$\$\$	
2.2 Use inventory management software	■						\$	\$	
2.3 Use legacy data from City agencies as well as local, state, and federal orgs	■		■						■
2.4 Leverage the data collection efforts and resources of partners	■		■						■
2.5 Collect information that is useful for decision-making across the city		■							
2.6 Prioritize survey efforts		■					\$		
2.7 Provide adequate staffing and financial resources to implement a survey program		■	■				\$\$\$	\$\$\$	■
3. MODIFY HISTORICAL COMMISSION PROCESSES									
3.1 Create a tiered review system for designated individual properties	■		■	■					
3.2 Clarify the existing staff review process	■					■			
3.3 Establish PHC approval and guidelines for all new construction within historic districts		■	■	■		■	\$\$	\$\$	■
3.4 Establish PHC approval for substantial alterations to non-contributing buildings		■	■	■		■	\$	\$	■
3.5 Create a new Appeal Board to review appeals of PHC decisions	■			■			\$		
4. REDUCE HISTORIC BUILDING DEMOLITION AND BROADEN NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION									
4.1 Create an index of potentially significant buildings	■		■	■			\$\$\$	\$\$\$	
4.2 Adopt ordinance amendments establishing additional district types	■			■		■			
4.3 Match documentation requirements and incentives for each of the district types	■					■			
4.4 Use Historic Resource Inventory to help to decide locations of new districts	■								
4.5 Modify the Conservation District to include public review if guidelines aren't met	■			■					
4.6 Create and/or update materials that explain benefits of designation and conservation	■								■
5. CLARIFY THE DESIGNATION PROCESS									
5.1 Establish designation criteria for PHC-reviewed properties based on level of significance	■		■			■	\$	\$	
5.2 Provide clear guidance regarding the designation process	■					■	\$	\$	
5.3 Streamline the PHC nomination review process	■		■			■	\$	\$	
5.4 Establish a process where owners are notified expeditiously of nominations	■					■			
5.5 Re-survey all Register properties and establish properties' level of significance	■		■			■	\$\$	\$\$	■
6. CREATE A HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND									
6.1 Modify and expand existing City codes and policies to incentivize historic preservation activities	■	■		■		■			■
6.2 Expand existing City-led financial programs	■	■		■		■	\$\$	\$\$	
6.3 Introduce new City-led financial programs	■	■		■		■	\$\$	\$\$	
6.4 Advocate for expanded State Historic Tax Credit	■								
7. SUPPORT ARCHAEOLOGY									
7.1 Create map-based predictive models of archaeological sensitive areas		■	■				\$\$	\$\$	■
7.2 Adopt a new ordinance for archaeological resources		■	■	■		■	\$	\$	
8. ACTIVATE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH									
8.1 Expand public outreach efforts, build a broader constituency for historic preservation	■						\$	\$	

Glossary of Terms

accessory dwelling unit (ADU): A second unit in a building or on a property that can be rented

adaptive reuse: Process of adapting a building or site for a new purpose other than its original use

alter or alteration: A change in the appearance of a building, structure, site, or object which is not otherwise covered by the definition of demolition, or any other change for which a permit is required under The Philadelphia Code of General Ordinances. “Alteration” includes the reroofing, cleaning, or pointing of a building, structure, or object.

application: A request to the Historical Commission made in order to obtain an approval for work to a designated historic property

archaeological site: Property containing archaeological deposits or features, usually with site boundaries defined by the character and location of said deposits or features

architectural merit: A property is significant for its physical design or construction and can be considered one of the best representatives of a particular type or period of architecture, or method of construction.

built environment: Human-made surroundings such as buildings, parks, and other facilities that provide the setting for human activity

by-right zoning: A 'use by right' is a use permitted in a zoning district and is therefore not subject to special review and approval by a local government.

Capital Budget and Program: The six-year blueprint for investing in Philadelphia’s physical and technology infrastructure, community facilities, and public buildings. The Capital Budget is the Program’s first year spending plan

Certified Local Government (“CLG”): Jointly administered by the National Park Service (NPS) and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), each local community works through a certification process to become recognized as a Certified Local Government (CLG). Once certified, CLGs become an active partner in the Federal Historic Preservation Program, gain access to benefits of the program, and agree to follow required Federal and State requirements

character: The distinctive nature of something.

Citizens Planning Institute (CPI): The education and outreach initiative of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission

charter: A legal document (charter) establishing a municipality such as a city or town

compatible: In harmony with location, context, setting, and historic character

contributing building, structure, site, or object: A building, structure, site, or object within a historic district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Historical Commission's designation. These resources are of the highest importance in maintaining the character of the historic district.

cultural resource: Includes, but is not limited to, any building, area, place, record or manuscript, site, structure, street furniture, monuments, object, district, or landscape evaluated as historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of Philadelphia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the nation.

cultural resources inventory: A set of data, such as a list of historic resources generated through a Historic Resource Survey.

cultural resource survey: The process of systematically identifying, researching, photographing and documenting archaeological or historical resources within a defined geographic area or setting.

demolition: The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I): Provides the services that help people comply with building safety standards and other code requirements in the City of Philadelphia (source: Phila.gov)

Department of Planning and Development (DPD): Makes sure Philadelphia has well-planned neighborhoods, with affordable housing options and access to public art. This department oversees historic preservation to honor the City's unique history; helps developers move their projects forward; creates citywide and neighborhood plans; and implements zoning. Includes the Divisions of Planning and Zoning, Development Services, and Housing. (source: Phila.gov)

design guidelines: Design Guidelines detail the character defining features that are unique to a particular landmark or historic district. Design Guidelines are used to evaluate the appropriateness of projects that may result in alteration, construction, relocation or new construction of a landmark or historic district.

development: The division of a parcel of land into two or more parcels, the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alterations, relocation or enlargement of any building or other structure, and any use or change in the use of any building or other structure, or land or extension of use of land, for which permission may be required. Also known as real estate development.

district: A geographically defined area possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of buildings, structures, sites, or objects united by past events, plan, or physical development. A district may comprise an individual site or individual elements separated geographically but linked by association, plan, design, or history.

Division of Development Services: Provides information about permits and approvals for developments. It also helps individual projects navigate the approval process in the most efficient way possible. It answers questions, provides feedback, makes connections with City departments, and helps solve new or unique issues on complicated projects.

entitlements: Legal rights conveyed by approvals from governmental entities to develop a property for a certain use, intensity, building type or building placement.

Federal Preservation Officer: A qualified official responsible for coordinating a federal agency's activities as required by Section 110(c) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Geographic Information Systems (GIS): A system designed to capture, store, manipulate, analyze, manage, and present spatial or geographic data.

gross floor area: The total floor area contained within the building measured to the external face of the external walls.

hearing: A formal public meeting of the Commission, pursuant to quorum, where the Commission takes an action affecting the rights of a property owner as authorized by Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Hearings shall be held on the proposed designation of buildings, structures, sites, objects or districts and on applications for permits to alter or demolish. The formal submission of reports, testimony, and recommendations shall occur at these hearings. Hearings shall be publicized and open to the public as established by law.

high-density zoning: A regulated area of land where high-rise (high-density) buildings are permitted the local land use authority.

historic building: A building or complex of buildings and site, or the public interior portion of a building, which is designated pursuant to a Designation of a Historic Structure or District or listed by the Historical Commission under the prior Zoning Code or the prior historic buildings ordinance approved December 7, 1955.

historic context: A unit created for planning purposes that groups information about historic properties based on a shared theme, specific time period, and geographical area.

historic district, object, site, or structure: A district, object, site, or structure, or a public interior portion of a structure, which is designated by the Historical Commission pursuant to a Designation of a Historic Structure or District or designated under the prior Zoning Code.

historic fabric: For a historic building, it is the particular materials, ornamentation and architectural features that together define the historic character of the building. For a

historic district, it is all sites, building, structures, historic landscape features, objects, infrastructure improvements and related design components that together define the historic character of the district.

historic preservation: According to the National Historic Preservation Act, includes identification, evaluation, recordation, documentation, curation, acquisition, protection, management, rehabilitation, restoration, stabilization, maintenance, research, interpretation, conservation, and education and training regarding the foregoing activities or a combination of the foregoing activities.

historic property: A district, site, building, structure or object significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archaeology or culture at the national, State, or local level.

historic resource: see *historic district*

historic resources inventory: A database list of buildings surveyed from street by professional historic preservation consultants that ranks their visible architectural value. Some of these buildings may be eligible for local, state or national designation. The purpose of this list is for public agencies to consider potential cultural resources in their planning activities.

historic review: The Historical Commission exercises jurisdiction over the entire exterior envelopes of buildings, including all facades and roofs, not only front facades. The City's historic preservation ordinance requires that the property owner or an authorized representative of a property listed on the Philadelphia Register seek and obtain an approval from the Historical Commission and a building permit from the City's Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to commencing any work that would require a building permit and/or would alter the exterior appearance of the building(s), site, or permanent site features such as fences or walls of the historic property. These such projects undergo a review of their design

historical significance: Determines why, where, and when a property is important. Historic significance is the importance of a property with regard to history, architecture, engineering, or the culture of a state, community, or nation. The key to determining whether the characteristics or associations of a property are significant is to consider the property within its historic context. Properties can be significant for their association or linkage to events or persons important in the past, as representatives of manmade expression of culture (design/construction) or technology, or for their ability to yield important information about history or prehistory.

Historic Tax Credit: A provision under tax law which allows the amount of money invested in capital rehabilitation to be deducted from personal income taxes owed, specifically the provisions for certified National Register structures. The federal program is the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program and the state program is the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program.

Historical Commission: The Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC)

Housing Preservation Loan Program (HPLP): A program of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (PRA) that provide loans to low-, moderate-, and middle-income homeowners in Philly to make home repairs.

incentive: A payment or concession offered to stimulate greater output or investment, such as a tax incentive

individually listed property: A property that has been officially recognized as having historic and/or cultural importance as part of the Nation's, state's, or local municipality's heritage, in which it is located, that ought to be preserved.

inventory: A list of historic properties determined to meet specified criteria of significance

listing: The formal entry of a property in the local, state, or National Register of Historic Places; also referred to as designation, certification, or registration.

maintain: To keep in an existing state of preservation or repair

massing: The general shape, form, and size of a building

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA): The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470-470t), as amended. Established the National Register of Historic Places program and extended national historic preservation programs to properties of state and local significance.

National Register of Historic Places: The official inventory of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architectural, archaeology and culture, maintained by the Secretary of Interior under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (amended) (16 U.S.C. 470-470+, 36 C.F.R. Sections 60, 63).

National Register Criteria: The federally established standards for evaluating the eligibility of properties for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

National Trust for Historic Preservation: A privately funded nonprofit organization that works to save America's historic places.

nomination: Official recommendation for listing a property on the local, state, or National Register of Historic Places

nomination form: A standard document used to nominate a building, structure, site, or object.

non-contributing building, structure, site, or object: A building, structure, site, or object within a district that does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the designation.

non-contributing: A building, site, or property that is geographically situated in a historic district but because of age, style, function, or changes to the architectural fabric is not considered to possess integrity, or does not presently contribute to understanding the significance of the district.

Office of Property Assessment (OPA): Determines what every piece of property within Philadelphia is worth. The assessed dollar value is used to calculate the property's real estate tax due.

Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, and Sustainability (oTIS): oTIS leads a portfolio that includes the Streets Department's Divisions of Transportation and Sanitation, the Philadelphia Water Department, the Office of Sustainability, and oTIS's Office of Complete Streets and Office of Transportation and Engagement to provide cost-effective quality services with a focus on the resident. oTIS directs the policies and practices that improve quality of life in Philadelphia's diverse communities through safe and sustainable infrastructure.

ordinance: A local statute enacted to protect buildings and neighborhoods from destruction or insensitive rehabilitation

Organization of World Heritage Cities: An international non-profit, non-governmental organization of 250 cities in which sites of the UNESCO World Heritage list are located.

Pennsylvania History Code: It is hereby determined and declared as a matter of legislative finding and policy that:

- (1) Section 27 of Article I of the Constitution of Pennsylvania makes the Commonwealth trustee for the preservation of the historic values of the environment.
- (2) The conservation of Pennsylvania's historic and natural heritage and the preservation of public records, historic documents and objects of historic interest, and the identification, restoration and preservation of architecturally and historically significant sites and structures are duties vested primarily in the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
- (3) The irreplaceable historical, architectural, archaeological and cultural heritage of this Commonwealth should be preserved and protected for the benefit of all the people, including future generations.
- (4) The preservation and protection of historic resources in this Commonwealth promotes the public health, prosperity and general welfare.
- (5) The rapid social and economic development of our contemporary society threatens to destroy the remaining vestiges of our historic heritage.
- (6) It is in the public interest for the Commonwealth, its citizens and its political subdivisions to engage in comprehensive programs of historic preservation for the enjoyment, education and inspiration of all the people, including future generations.

Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO): A bureau within the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission which administers the state's historic preservation program.

Phila2035 plan: A comprehensive plan for managing growth and development in the City of Philadelphia. The staff of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission(PCPC) creates the plans through an open process that includes outreach to citizens, business associations, institutions and other city agencies. The Commission itself then adopts the Plan. Once adopted, government agencies, elected officials, and community partners put the plan into action.

Philadelphia Archaeological Forum: A non-profit organization dedicated to the protection and preservation of archaeological resources in the City of Philadelphia

Philadelphia City Planning Commission (PCPC): Comprised of nine members, the Commission addresses issues of community and economic development, public health and environmental sustainability, and multi-modal transportation policy. Particular emphasis is placed on humanizing the scale of the city through urban design. The Commission also operates the Citizens Planning Institute (CPI), the agency's education and civic engagement arm, to more actively involve citizens in the planning and development process.

Philadelphia Historical Commission (PHC), also known as the Historical Commission: The City of Philadelphia's regulatory agency responsible for ensuring the preservation of historically significant buildings, structures, sites, objects, interiors and districts in Philadelphia.

Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, also known as the "Philadelphia Register": A comprehensive, dynamic inventory of buildings, structures, sites, objects, interiors, and districts that the Philadelphia Historical Commission has designated as historic. When the Historical Commission designates resources as historic, it adds them to the Register.

preservation: The maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time

regulatory framework: A system of rules and regulations governing actions by the City and the public.

restoration: The act or process of accurately recovering the form and details of a property and its setting as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of later work or by the replacement of missing earlier work. It is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code- required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

scale: Proportional elements that demonstrate the size, materials, and style of buildings.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards: Guidelines published by the National Park Service in use throughout the United States. It defines four treatment approaches: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, and describes appropriate treatments for each. Covering various building components, the guidelines make recommendations that are useful for building owners, and mandatory for buildings designated as historic as well as using federal tax credits.

setbacks: When an upper story of a building is set further back than the lower story

significance: see *historical significance*

significant building, structure, site, or object: A building, structure, site, or object within a district that warrants individual listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under the criteria established in Section 14-2007(5)(a)-(j) of the Philadelphia Code.

site: The location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure—whether standing or vanished—where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure. Examples include a battlefield, campsite, designed landscape, shipwreck, ruins of a building or structure, natural feature, trail, rock carvings, or ceremonial site.

tangled titles: Problems related to the legal ownership of real estate, especially pertaining to families in which one generation has ownership of a property and gives ownership to another generation without proper deed changes.

tax abatements: A temporary reduction or elimination of taxes. Often a tax abatement applies to real estate and, in some cases, the personal property that a local government or district taxes.

transfer of development rights (TDR): A voluntary, incentive- based program that allows landowners to sell development rights from their land to a developer or other interested party who then can use these rights to increase the density of development at another designated location.

World Heritage Fund: The Fund for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal Value, called "the World Heritage Fund", was established under Art. 15 of the World Heritage Convention. Its resources consist primarily of assessed contributions by the States Parties of the Convention and may be used only for such purposes as the World Heritage Committee shall define.

Acknowledgements

Technical Advisory Partner



Philadelphia Historical Commission Staff

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Carol Ingald, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

Philadelphia City Department of Planning and Development Staff

Martha Cross, Deputy Director, Division of Planning and Zoning
Andrew Meloney, Senior Planner, Implementation
Abby Poses, GIS Specialist, GIS
Sarah Richardsen, City Planner, Urban Design Division
Elizabeth Bechtel, Intern
Ashley Losco, Intern
Amanda Stevens, Intern

Funding Partner



The William Penn Foundation provided grant funds to support the preparation of this report. The views expressed are those of the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Task Force and do not necessarily reflect the views of the William Penn Foundation.

Historic Preservation Task Force

Members

Chair

Harris Steinberg, Chair, Lindy Institute of Urban Innovation, Drexel University

Vice Chair

Dominique Hawkins, Preservation Architect-Planner, Preservation Design Partnership

Members Listed by Subcommittee

SURVEY

Co-Chairs

Nan Gutterman, Preservation Architect, Vitetta

Randall Mason, Preservation Academic, University of Pennsylvania

Oscar Beisert, Preservationist, The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Jon Farnham, Philadelphia Historical Commission

Cory Kegerise, Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office

Scott Maits, Community Representative

Doug Mooney, Archaeologist, representing Philadelphia Archaeological Forum

Reina Murray, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Aparna Palantino, Department of Parks and Recreation

Mike Powe, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Bob Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects, Philadelphia Historical Commission

REGULATORY

Co-Chairs

Dominique Hawkins, Preservation Architect-Planner, Preservation Design Partnership

Matt McClure, Real Estate Attorney, Ballard Spahr LLP

Leonidas Addimando, Alterra Property Group, LLC, representing Building Industry Association

Will Cook, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Carl Dress, Heritage Design Collaborative, representing the American Institute of Architects, Philadelphia Chapter

Mike Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections

David Hollenberg, Institutional Representative, University of Pennsylvania

Justino Navarro, Community Representative, Spring Garden Civic Association

Fon Wang, Community Representative / Preservation Architect, Ballinger

Seri Worden, National Trust for Historic Preservation

INCENTIVES

Co-Chairs

Peter Angelides, Financial Analyst, Econsult

James Wright, Community Development Corporation Representative, People's Emergency Center

Di Gao, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Duane Bumb, Commerce Department

Catherine Califano, Department of Planning and Development

Lorraine Gomez, Community Representative

Roland Kassis, Developer, Kassis Ventures

Shawn McCaney, Foundation Community, William Penn Foundation

Councilman Mark Squilla, City Council Representative

Anthony Veerkamp, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Co-Chairs

Trapeta B. Mayson, Community Representative, formerly Historic Germantown

Laura M. Spina, City Planning Commission

Denise Gilmore, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Julia Gutstadt, Dranoff Properties, representing Urban Land Institute

Bob Jaeger, Partners for Sacred Places

Lou Iatarola, Community Representative, Historical Society of Tacony

Elhadji Ndiaye, Neighborhood Program Coordinator, Department of Housing and Community Development

Rob Nieweg, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

*Consultant

phlpreservation.org

Philadelphia
Historic
Preservation
Task Force



National Trust *for*
Historic Preservation



The William Penn Foundation provided grant funds to support the preparation of this report. The views expressed are those of the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Task Force and do not necessarily reflect the views of the William Penn Foundation.