

**THE MAYOR'S TASK FORCE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, VICE CHAIR**

**MEETING MINUTES  
THURSDAY, 15 MARCH 2018, 8:30 A.M.  
1515 ARCH STREET, 18<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR**

**PRESENT**

Task Force Members

Dominique Hawkins, vice chair  
Peter Angelides  
Oscar Beisert  
Duane Bumb  
Catherine Califano  
Julia Dranoff Gutstadt  
Carl Dress  
Mike Fink  
Patrick Grossi  
Nan Gutterman  
David Hollenberg  
Lou Iatarola  
Bob Jaeger  
Roland Kassis  
Cory Kegerise  
Randall Mason  
Trapeta Mayson  
Shawn McCaney  
Matt McClure  
Doug Mooney  
Justino Navarro  
Elhadji Ndiaye  
Aparna Palantino  
Laura Spina  
Bob Thomas  
Seri Worden

Members of the Public

Fred Baumert  
Kathy Dowdell  
Michael Fichman  
Leah Silverstein  
Cara Ferrentino  
J.M. Duffin  
Juanda Myles  
Lori Salganicoff

Amy Lambert  
Roger Ashodian  
Starr Herr-Cardillo  
Julie Donofrio  
Molly Lester  
Lucia Esther  
Chuck Bode

#### **ALSO PRESENT**

Jon Farnham, Philadelphia Historical Commission  
Laura DiPasquale, Philadelphia Historical Commission  
Allyson Mehley, Philadelphia Historical Commission  
Megan Cross Schmitt, Philadelphia Historical Commission  
Elizabeth Okeke-Von Batten, Context Ventures  
Rob Nieweg, National Trust for Historic Preservation

#### **PRIORITY-SETTING EXERCISE**

Attendees arrived to large print outs with lists of issues that had been identified through public comment and through the work of the Task Force to date. Each attendee was given 12 stickers (one color for Task Force members, another color for members of the public) to place next to the issues they thought to be the most important. After the exercise was complete, Vice-Chair Dominique Hawkins opened the meeting.

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice-Chair Dominique Hawkins called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Elizabeth Okeke-Von Batten, Founder and Principal of Context Ventures, introduced herself as the new Task Force consultant.

Julie Donofrio of PennPraxis discussed the new Citizens Engagement Toolkit that PennPraxis has received grant funding to develop. She explained that PennPraxis has initially identified 20 people to host small group conversations in neighborhoods throughout the city to discuss citizens' understanding, concerns, and desires regarding preservation, and the vocabulary that those communities would find most clear and engaging. With that input, PennPraxis will develop a toolkit that can be put to use by the Citizens' Planning Institute and others. The work will support and enhance that of the Task Force's Outreach and Education subcommittee. Ms. Donofrio explained that they want to receive input from the Task Force and public regarding the types of questions they would like to ask the community members. Mr. McClure asked if builders and developers are being considered as part of these community discussions. Ms. Donofrio responded affirmatively, noting that a variety of stakeholders will be included in the discussions.

The Task Force members discussed how to assign issues that had been identified as the most important as a result of the Priority-Setting Exercise. Some suggested that the issues be distributed among the already existing committees, while others expressed their desire to be more flexible so that there could be interactions across committees. Mr. Kegerise suggested that smaller groups could come together to try and figure out how to involve the other

subcommittees. Ms. Hawkins asked if the Co-Chairs would be willing to assign members of their subcommittees. Mr. Mason commented that the entire group should be empowered to discuss all of these issues. Mr. Kegeerise said that certain members of the subcommittees would be required to attend certain discussions, but that attendance could be open to anyone who wishes to attend. Mr. Hollenberg asked if a shared calendar could be created so that everyone could stay informed of all of the meetings. Ms. Gutstadt suggested that they should attempt to see which issues can be combined so they can be discussed at the same meeting. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Regulatory subcommittee had decided up front to hold closed meetings only. Mr. Grossi opined that the most important thing is to allow Committee members to have a broader conversation. Ms. Hawkins expressed concern that issues that had received many votes would be left unassigned. She said that it was important for her and the other Task Force members to know what was going to be discussed when so they could arrange their schedules accordingly.

After discussion, the issues with the most votes were assigned to the following subcommittees:

- Issue #3: Survey (12 total votes; 3 Task Force, 9 Public)
- Issue #5: Regulatory; Survey (16 total votes; 4 Task Force, 12 Public)
- Issue #6: Incentives (20 total votes; 4 Task Force, 16 Public)
- Issue #7: Regulatory; Survey (8 total votes; all Public)
- Issue #9: Regulatory; Survey (16 total votes; 2 Task Force, 14 Public)
- Issue #10: Incentives; Regulatory (9 total votes; 1 Task Force, 8 Public)
- Issue #11: Outreach (16 total votes; 5 Task Force, 11 Public)
- Issue #14: Regulatory; Survey (20 total votes; 4 Task Force, 16 Public)
- Issue #15: Identified for Implementation Plan (9 total votes; all Public)
  - o Ms. Hawkins requested clarification on Issue #15 *Managing change as a major theme of the work*. Mr. Hollenberg explained that it was more of a comment intended to set the tone of the written document that comes out of the Task Force. He said it was not supposed to be assigned to any particular subcommittee, but that he did not want to idea to get left out.
- Issue #16: All subcommittees (23 total votes; 2 Task Force, 21 Public)
- Issue #17: Incentives (19 total votes; 5 Task Force, 14 Public)
- Issue #18: Incentives; Outreach (16 total votes; 4 Task Force, 12 Public)
- Issue #19: Regulatory; Survey (20 total votes; 7 Task Force, 13 Public)
- Issue #20: Outreach (15 total votes; 2 Task Force, 13 Public)
- Issue #21: Outreach (5 total votes; all Public)
- Issue #22: Outreach (13 total votes; 5 Task Force, 8 Public)
- Issue #24: Regulatory (16 total votes; 4 Task Force, 12 Public)
- Issue #26: Regulatory; Survey (Incentives at the table) (9 total votes; all Public)
  - o Mr. Hollenberg explained that Issue #26 *Creation of a variety of types of resources* should actually read “variety of types of tools.” Mr. Thomas added that he thought the wording should be, “Creation of a variety of types of resources for preservation.”
- Issue #27: Incentives; Regulatory; Survey (12 total votes; 5 Task Force, 7 Public)
- Issue #28: Incentives; Regulatory (11 total votes; 1 Task Force, 10 Public)
- Issue #29: Incentives (20 total votes; 5 Task Force, 15 Public)

Ms. Hawkins announced that the public could vote on these issues online until April 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hollenberg responded that it would be interesting to see if there was an uptick in votes for any of the issues. Ms. Gutterman asked if the subcommittees should be ready to report back on their conversations at the June meeting. Ms. Hawkins responded affirmatively, stating that all of the conversations identified at the meeting must happen before June.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Task Force members to define, "What are we preserving? What are we trying to save?" Members took turns offering their opinions.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia questioned why the Regulatory subcommittee meetings are closed to other Task Force members and members of the public.

Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy commented that she was struck at the Phila2035 Upper Northwest District Planning meeting held the night before that the City Planners administering the meeting seem restricted in their thinking to current regulations. She suggested that adaptive reuse of commercial buildings and large houses should be encouraged, and Planners should think beyond current zoning regulations. She opined that it would be wonderful if the last district plan could benefit from the incentives. She suggested that the district plan strive, change, and move forward with dimensional incentives.

Chuck Bode commented that 15 to 20 years ago, he rode the train across the country, and was dismayed to see that every town looked the same. He noted that Philadelphia has things that people want to see, and the Task Force should think about what is unique about Philadelphia, and the quality and craftsmanship of older and historic homes. He suggested that quality new construction that fits in with the neighborhood should be encouraged or required. He explained that it is important to think about the insignificant in the aggregate. He encouraged the preservation of all buildings, and the retention of the character of neighborhoods. He noted that a rowhouse by itself may be insignificant, but the character of blocks of compatible rowhouses is.

Jim Duffin commented that, as a citizen preservationist, he approaches preservation from a practical standpoint. He explained that he has spent most of his life in Mount Airy and Germantown, and understands the challenges that people are facing in their neighborhoods. He noted that he talks to people and they have pride in where they live. He suggested that the Task Force look at how to create incentives that will not create more regulations, but which will help financially-challenged people make necessary repairs to their homes and buildings.

### **FINAL COMMENTS**

The May Task Force Meeting will be held on 17 May 2018 at Northeast High School (1601 Cottman Avenue) from 6:30-8:00 p.m.