

Challenges & Best Practices Matrix

Earlier this year, Mayor Kenney's Historic Preservation Task Force issued a White Paper outlining the state of preservation in Philadelphia. This summer, a second White Paper will be released that will show the continued progress of the Task Force as it seeks to identify the specific challenges and opportunities facing preservation. This second report will also highlight the Best Practices researched by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and will include an in-depth report by the Trust.

The attached matrix is the foundation for this second report. It lists the challenges identified by the Task Force in five topic areas. It also connects the initial "scoping questions" that were posed to the Trust for its research and some of the Best Practices that the Trust identifies in their report. The matrix has four columns:

- **Topic Category:** Five overall topics that characterize the challenges.
- **Challenge/Problem Statement:** Specific issues that the Task Force is addressing in its work.
- **Scoping Questions:** Questions posed to the National Trust that were the basis of its best practices research.
- **Best Practice:** Preservation and related activities in other cities that the Task Force is reviewing as it considers how to solve the challenges set forth. More details can be found in the Trust's report. Not every challenge has a best practice listed; however, the best practices are only one component of the Task Force's methods to address challenges.

Once the Task Force has issued the Best Practices White Paper, it will begin to consider recommendations to address each challenge. In September, it will host a citywide public meeting to get input into the possible recommendations and implementation of those strategies.

HP Task Force Challenges / Best Practices to review

Topic Category	Challenge / Problem Statement	Scoping Question (posed to the National Trust)	Best Practice (when applicable)
1 - Assessing and Protecting Philadelphia's Historic Resources	<p>1.1 There is a desire, but not a process, nor staffing capacity to do a city-wide survey and inventory, hence there is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ limited uneven, and incomplete survey data and historic inventory of Philadelphia's historic structures, buildings, sites, objects, interiors, and archaeological resources; ○ no city-wide inventory and no city-wide agency sharing plan; and ○ no current digital inventory management system to collect and track historic resource data. 	<p>What do we know about Philadelphia's historic assets, the current state of knowledge, and survey data (and systems in place for managing this data)?</p>	<p>Inventory Management Systems and Survey Methodology (New York Landmarks Preservation Commission; L.A. Office of Historic Resources)</p>
		<p>What are the merits of comprehensive, traditional, lot-by-lot survey research vs. newer techniques?</p>	<p>Future needs for the inventory and survey, including categories such as "cultural significance" (Survey LA; Cultural Mapping - San Antonio, TX)</p>
		<p>How can neighborhoods and the interested public share in the identification process and the resulting data?</p>	<p>Staffing needs (volunteer approach - Alexandria, VA; Detroit, MI; Muncie, IN; community input - SurveyLA)</p>
	<p>1.2 There is no survey methodology, inventory, and regulatory process for identifying possible archaeological sites</p>	<p>Should the protection of archaeological resources be codified?</p>	<p>Archaeological ordinance and review procedure (Alexandria, VA)</p>
2 - Designation of Philadelphia's Historic Resources	<p>2.1 There is not a clear and universal understanding of how the historic designation process and ultimate nomination to the Philadelphia Register protects historic resources.</p>		<p>Proactive education and outreach at neighborhood meetings and events to provide information for residents (Washington, D.C.)</p>
	<p>2.2 A one-size-fits all historic designation process is insufficient.</p>	<p>Should specific documentation be required for each property in the document process to guide future regulatory review?</p>	
	<p>2.3 The impacts to historic designation are not readily apparent to property owners.</p>		<p>Center for Urban Pedagogy: Citizen Handbooks</p>

HP Task Force Challenges / Best Practices to review

Topic Category	Challenge / Problem Statement	Scoping Question (posed to the National Trust)	Best Practice (when applicable)
3 - Regulatory Protections for Philadelphia's Historic Resources	3.1 The current regulatory framework for historic resources is perceived as rigid for both individually listed historic resources and districts, but has more flexibility than is currently exercised.	To what extent should we modify and clarify the ordinance and rules and regulations to address current and future needs?	Design guidelines for clear explanation of the ordinance process (Pittsburgh, PA)
		Are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards the appropriate framework to use in the review of all alterations at all properties?	
		Is it possible to modify / provide a modified regulatory framework that allows historic preservation to exist in Philadelphia's neighborhoods without imposing unrealistic and costly regulatory burdens on homeowners and neighborhood businesses? What modifications can be made to the ordinance and historical commission procedures to ease regulatory and financial burdens on designated properties?	Differentiated designation and regulation system (Chicago, IL)
		Is there a better way to address appeals to Historical Commission decisions?	
	3.2 Demolition of historic resources damages the cohesion and compatibility of historic character aspects of this include: o When adjacent to individually designated historic resources; and o When infill on these sites is not regulated.	Should the ordinance be modified to allow review of undeveloped properties in historic districts vs. review and comment?	
		Is it feasible / practical to establish a demolition delay process?	
	3.3 High density zoning discourages preservation of undesignated historic properties		

HP Task Force Challenges / Best Practices to review

Topic Category	Challenge / Problem Statement	Scoping Question (posed to the National Trust)	Best Practice (when applicable)
<p>4 - Incentives to Promote Historic Preservation</p>	<p>4.1 There is little to no city-sponsored financial assistance for and tools to promote and support residential and commercial historic preservation activities; restoration, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse.</p>	<p>What activities should the Task Force try to incentivize, and how do we determine who receives incentives?</p>	<p>Other Cities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expedited Review • Flexible Codes • Waiving Fees • Flexible Uses • Expedited Entitlements • Zoning Alignment
		<p>What are the incentives, monetary and non-monetary, that can be used, and under what circumstances? (What incentives are currently available in Philadelphia / How can these incentives be adapted to meet current preservation needs?) (What incentives are available in other cities? How can these tools be adapted to Philadelphia?) (What are the impacts / outcomes of these incentives, how are these impacts measured?)</p>	<p>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) / Density Bonus program</p> <p>Adaptive Reuse Ordinances (ARO) (Los Angeles, CA & Phoenix, AZ)</p> <p>Programs to encourage historic building reuse and homeownership (Baltimore City Vacants to Value (V2V) (Chicago Historic Bungalow Initiative and Greystone and Vintage Home Program)</p>
		<p>What are the costs and benefits of preservation, both for the property owners and the broader community, and how can incentives defray these costs and maximize these benefits?</p>	
	<p>4.2 The historic preservation of existing building stock can be a sustainable development strategy that may require incentives and education to compete with new construction depending on circumstances.</p>	<p>Many programs, such as conservation, sustainability, and history are all related to historic preservation. How have these related programs come together in peer cities?</p> <p>How should sustainable improvements be reviewed in the context of the historic preservation regulatory review process?</p>	
<p>5 - Community and City Government Support for Historic Preservation</p>	<p>5.1 There is historic preservation activity that happens in other city offices and agencies, but currently these activities are not linked or leveraged and historic preservation is not well represented on the many boards and committees within City government and within other development organizations.</p>	<p>What programs have peer cities used to educate and promote preservation among elected officials, the building industry, and the public?</p>	<p>Have representatives from different perspectives sit on the different organizations' boards (DC)</p> <p>Preservation used as tool across departments to reduce displacement of existing residents and encouraging equitable development (Atlanta, GA & New Orleans, LA)</p>
	<p>5.2 Preservation education and outreach struggles to recognize the city's diverse cultural heritage and engage Philadelphians in historic preservation in their neighborhoods.</p>	<p>What programs have proven effective to build a constituency for preservation efforts in peer cities?</p>	<p>Held discussion groups with preservation advocates and professionals (DC)</p> <p>Cooperated and were proactive in neighborhood meetings and events (DC)</p> <p>Held presentations on preservation with groups with hands-on experience (DC)</p>

HP Task Force Challenges / Best Practices to review

Topic Category	Challenge / Problem Statement	Scoping Question (posed to the National Trust)	Best Practice (when applicable)
<p>5 - Community and City Government Support for Historic Preservation</p>	<p>5.3 There are not enough resources dedicated to building a constituency for historic preservation. Philadelphia needs more tools (in-person and online) to engage citizens and to help them access information.</p>	<p>How have other communities gained input on what is historic and what is preservation?</p>	<p>Preservation Resource Center of New Orleans has a full staffed Education and Outreach Program (New Orleans, LA)</p>
		<p>City agencies that exemplify people-centered preservation (Atlanta, GA, Washington, D.C., & Baltimore, MD)</p>	
		<p>Engaged with citizens during whole designation process (New York City, NY)</p>	
		<p>Reached out to constituents (Atlanta, GA & Chicago, IL)</p>	
		<p>How can the Task Force create an outreach process that engages the public in a meaningful way with its limited resources, both during the 18-month process and beyond?</p>	<p>Two-way presentations (Boston, MA)</p>
		<p>Locations for citizen outreach (St. Louis, MO)</p>	
	<p>5.4 Outreach efforts don't always reach all members of Philadelphia's diverse constituency.</p>	<p>How does the Task Force ensure that outreach efforts reach an audience reflective of Philadelphia's diverse constituency?</p>	<p>Walking and trolley tours for the city's history and architecture (Baltimore, MD, Chicago, IL, & New Orleans, LA)</p>
			<p>E-newsletters and social media for communication (Buffalo Niagara)</p>
			<p>A well-designed and user-friendly website (New Orleans, LA & Washington, D.C.)</p>
			<p>A diverse and broad constituency and ensure historic sites tell full stories of city's heritage (Buffalo Niagara & New Orleans, LA)</p>
<p>Relationships with people who have not traditionally been part of the conventional preservation movement (Boston, MA & New York)</p>			
<p>Worked with non-profit historic preservation organizations (Washington, D.C.)</p>			
<p>An "affinity group" centering on preservation to provide a forum for constituents (Baltimore, MD)</p>			
<p>Partnered with schools, congregations, and after-school programs to instill interest in cultural and historical assets (Atlanta, GA, New Orleans, LA, & St. Louis, MO)</p>			