

Management Strategies for Lower Makefield Township's Historic Resources



Patterson/Brown House

April 5, 2006



85 Old Dublin Pike
Doylestown, PA 18901
(215) 345-7020
(215) 345-4328
www.heritageconservancy.org



Patterson/Satterthwaite Farm

Management Strategies for Lower Makefield Township's Historic Resources

I.	Introduction	1
	Goals and Objectives	1
	Methodology	2
II.	Historic Resources	1
	Criteria for Listing in the National Register.....	1
	Property Summaries	2
	Infrastructure Assessment & Feasibility.....	13
III.	Management and Policy Framework	17
	Current Ownership and Easements.....	18
	Social Context	19
IV.	Management Alternatives.....	21
	Management and Maintenance Considerations.....	21
V.	Recommendations	25
	Summary	25
	Strategic Recommendations.....	26
VI.	Acknowledgements	31

I. Introduction

With local natural and historical preservation efforts increasing nationwide, growing numbers of municipalities are faced with the unexpected challenges of caring for complex groups of properties. These properties have local significance or importance, but may not have been protected with a clear vision for future use either by the municipality or a private organization. Each municipality must provide some measure of stewardship of these properties. In the broadest sense stewardship means planning for, and taking the necessary actions over the long term to successfully preserve and protect the resources we have the responsibility of caring for. A part of the process must include determining the significance of each of the resources. Good stewardship is also about prioritization in managing limited resources while maintaining the texture and character that makes Lower Makefield a desirable place to live.

The township must further identify its goals in owning historic resources. In many cases, acquisition is a reaction to the threat of demolition. Once the immediate threat to a building's preservation is eliminated, future goals must be established. Does the township see its historic resources as showcases of local history and architecture or as "gateways" into the township? If so, what are the ongoing financial implications of these goals?

It is interesting to note that no Bucks County municipality has a Historic Preservation Manager within the Department of Public Works or similar department who oversees contracts for restoration and ongoing property maintenance. And while Newtown has a part-time interpreter/educator on staff to develop programs for the Clark property site, at the county level, the parks department manages most sites.

Choosing the appropriate use for a historic property can be a tricky endeavor, and is very much a site specific task. Currently, Lower Makefield has several properties with historic resources and has been managing them through the township office. Some properties have relationships with nonprofit committees, but there have been concerns that the nonprofits do not always provide the necessary level of maintenance or stewardship to protect and interpret sites. In general, Heritage Conservancy advocates using easements and other alternatives to permanent public ownership as the best solution for stakeholders and for preserving the resources, but also recognizes that local government should have some responsibility for deciding who should have the stewardship role for public sites.

Goals and Objectives

Faced with a constrained budgetary climate, and an increasing public mandate to make efficient and effective use of public resources, including historic buildings, Lower Makefield has initiated an investigation into outlining a future use for several of its township-owned historic resources. Heritage Conservancy was contracted to research and analyze the potential of each property, including historical significance. The goal for the study is to offer the township an analytic evaluation of the alternatives for future use of the historic properties. These alternatives will be used to guide the township's decision-making process.

Methodology

Heritage Conservancy was contracted to accomplish several tasks for the township including a historic resource inventory, a National Register evaluation, and the development of management strategies. The conservancy began by inventorying all historic properties the township owns. This included identifying the location of the property, its current use and zoning, condition, year built, length of time owned by the township and any other pertinent information.

After the inventory was collected, the historic significance of each structure was evaluated, including its current National Register status. The historic resources of six sites were evaluated: the Patterson/Brown Farm, the Patterson/Satterthwaite Farm, Elm Lowne, the Warren/Farringer House, the Dalgewicz/Slack House, and the Five Mile Woods Nature Center. If a building was not currently listed on, or been declared eligible for, the National Register, an opinion of National Register eligibility was made. Other registers of historic places, such as Heritage Conservancy's register of historic places, provided context for the review. An architectural evaluation and a brief history of the property are provided for those properties that lack such information.

After completing the inventory and historic register evaluation, the conservancy outlined management options for three specific sites. The Patterson/Brown Farm, Patterson/Satterthwaite Farm, and Elm Lowne were further evaluated for future use and ownership options. Determining how best to manage the properties involved working with township officials, partners, and others to collect information about the properties as well as comparable properties that might be used as models.

One aspect of this evaluation was the consolidation of financial data on each property. The conservancy collected financial information, including the initial cost of the property, source of the funds used to purchase the property, income generated by the property, monthly maintenance expenses and future capital expenditures for Elm Lowne and the Satterthwaite House in order to present the township with the economic impact of ownership.

As part of the study, the conservancy reviewed ownership status and planning documents for the properties in order to provide a comprehensive report on the property (this document). Recommendations for restoration, rehabilitation, or renovation are detailed below in this document. Though this does not include any structural analysis, prior analyses were reviewed and incorporated into the final report.

Finally, the conservancy developed a strategic plan for each property in order to help the township craft specific business plans to help assure the preservation of each property. The strategic plan recommendations include suggested sources for in-depth business and market analysis, and detail needs for more detailed architectural or structural analysis, or for more detailed historic research.

As with similar projects, this evaluation involved significant work with partners, including a committee formed by the township. The conservancy met with the

township manager and others, including the committee, regularly to develop the management alternatives for the sites.

As part of the process, Heritage Conservancy met with a variety of township stakeholders and held public workshops to try to determine which properties, and what aspects of the individual properties, the were relevant to the public.

II. Historic Resources

Lower Makefield Township owns six historic resources: The Patterson/Brown House, the Patterson/Satterthwaite House, Elm Lowne, the Warren/Farringer House, the Dalgewicz/Slack House and the Five Mile Wood Nature Center House. The following is an inventory of the historic resources located on these properties and an assessment of their historic significance based on criteria for listing historic properties in the National Register of Historic Places. Site visits were made to each property in order to evaluate its historic significance, and historical information about each property was obtained from National Register documents, the Lower Makefield Historical Commission and other local history sources. **The information in this report is also based on our own research and expertise and differs from previous assumptions and conclusions regarding the dating of several structures.**

Criteria for Listing in the National Register

In order to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a historic resource (districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects) must retain historic integrity. The historic property must look something like it looked when it was constructed or achieved its significance. The resource should possess aspects of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; however, not all of these characteristics need to be present. In addition, the historic resource has to be significant by meeting one or more of the following criteria:

- A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (meaning that the resources is associated with a single event in history or associated with a general historic theme); or
- B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, (meaning architecturally significant) or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (such as resources in a historic district); or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (meaning it has archaeological significance).

Generally, a historic resource needs to be 50 years old or older to be considered for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. A historic resource can also be included in the National Register if it is less than 50 years old if it is highly significant. Historic resources do not have to be nationally significant to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The resource can be important locally, or at the state level. A historic resource that is nationally significant is designated a National Historic Landmark, as well as listed to the National Register.

Property Summaries

Patterson/Brown House



Living room fireplace in Patterson/Brown House

Patterson/Brown House



The Patterson/Brown House, located at 949 Mirror Lake Road, has previously been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). In 1998 the PHMC determined that the property was eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a result of a study completed to comply with federal historic preservation regulations resulting from the re-construction of the interchange at I-95 and Route 332. The Patterson/Brown House retains historic integrity and was determined to be significant by PHMC for its association with the development of agriculture in Bucks County (Criteria A) and as a representative example of rural vernacular buildings (Criteria C). According to the documents filed with PHMC, the oldest section of the house was constructed c.1731 and an addition was built onto the original section of the house in 1837. Heritage Conservancy's evaluation of the data finds no definitive evidence of the earlier date.

The 1731 date noted in the PHMC survey card corresponds to the date that John Brown, Senior purchased the property from Thomas Janney. This attribution is based on the land transaction rather than physical evidence. The nomination goes on to state that the entire three story section dates to this period. This is most likely an incorrect assumption. No similar early 18th century construction is documented in the county. While the history of the land has been thoroughly researched, the research did not establish a definitive construction chronology for the house. Prior to 1820, the property was over two hundred acres and included several old stone houses, most notably the Patterson farm, and the house at 930 Stony Hill Road, now separated from the Patterson property by Route 95. In 1798, a federal tax

indicates that there were two houses on the property already; however, it appears that they were small structures and not the stone houses that are there today. This is suggested by the fact that each of them was assessed at only \$150, while 82.9% of houses in the township were assessed at \$200 or more.

The 1837 date comes from a datestone on the house. It appears that there was a dwelling on the property as early as 1830. A survey of partition for the property from April 1830 shows two small buildings, one of which (with chimneys on either gable end) appears to represent a house at the approximate location of the current house. In November 1841, prior to a sheriff's sale, a brief newspaper advertisement appeared in the *Bucks County Intelligencer*. The only description of the improvements located on the 115-acre property at that time was a "stone mansion house" measuring 28 by 30 feet. There was no mention of a kitchen wing or outbuildings. This does not mean the kitchen section of the house did not exist. The mansion house was most likely the 1837 section of the current house. The distinction between the residential portion of a house and the kitchen was not unusual during this era; however, it does suggest that it was not a significant structure. The current kitchen wing may have replaced an earlier, simpler house.

The house is an excellent example of vernacular Georgian architecture. It is constructed of stone with distinctive corner quoins and jack arches with keystones over the windows. The interior of the house features Georgian and Federal Style woodwork, a large cooking fireplace, and wide plank flooring. Also on the property are a large Pennsylvania barn, a small tenant house, a drive-through corn crib, a hay barn, a garage with a workshop, a small garage, a large garage, and a shed.

The small tenant house was rumored to be an older house and was investigated thoroughly during several site visits. The interior support structure visible in the basement of the tenant house consists of roughly hewn support beams, which indicate that it may in fact pre-date the house. However, the interior of the tenant house has been drastically updated and modernized and strong evidence of its potential early construction has been removed. It is possible the tenant house was a small outbuilding that was crudely constructed and later converted to residential use.

The barn and other outbuildings on the property are excellent examples of farm out buildings of the 19th and 20th centuries, and they add greatly to the historic significance of the property. The barn fits into the general category of a Pennsylvania Bank Barn. It is a two-level barn with a rough-cut, irregular coursed stone foundation. The upper levels of the barn are timber-frame construction covered with vertical siding. This siding is a relatively recent alteration. According to a long time farm employee, the barn was formerly covered with shingle siding. This older siding is still visible on the south gable end below a shed roof. There is a cantilevered forebay facing east. Approximately half of the forebay (northern portion) is enclosed with a stone wall. The stone wall has two sets of sliding wagon doors and a 12-light sash window. The forebay is supported by the stone end wall and two square posts. The upper levels have a single 6/6 sash window and double threshing doors. In the north gable is a large hay door system. The hay doors are protected by a projecting hay hood. The presence of the hay doors and hay hood reflects post Civil War technology. The barn was either constructed or altered after the introduction of the hay track system in c. 1867. There is evidence in the

Patterson/Brown House

stonework of the stable that this northern bay was a later addition. A straw shed previously extended out into the barnyard from the addition.

There are two earthen ramps providing access to the upper level of the barn from the west elevation. The ramps are widely separated from each other and represent a departure from the standard bank barn form that traditionally has a centrally located bank leading to a threshing floor situated between hay mows. The northerly of the two ramps leads into the barn extension.

A one-story shed roof addition is attached to the barn's southern gable end. The east elevation of the shed section is flush with the forebay. The addition spans the entire south gable end but extends out beyond the east wall and wraps around a portion of the east elevation from the south gable end to one of the earthen ramps. A potato cellar is located below this section of the barn. There is a long hip at the intersection of the two wings of this section.

Due to its size, large interior space, and aesthetic appeal, this structure represents a significant historic resource and has great potential for adaptive reuse. The township needs only to review the *Master Plan for the Barn at Elm Lowne* to understand many of the opportunities.

In addition to being determined eligible for the National Register, the Patterson/Brown House has been listed on Heritage Conservancy's Register of Historic Places. The property is in excellent condition and is highly significant to the history of Lower Makefield Township. The fact that Heritage Conservancy's research does not confirm the very early construction dates of previous studies does not alter the fact that the properties are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Patterson/Satterthwaite House



Front view of Patterson/Satterthwaite House

Located at 909 Mirror Lake Road, the Patterson/Satterthwaite House is adjacent to the Patterson/Brown House. It also has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission as a result of the I-95 exit reconstruction project. The property retains its historic integrity and is significant for its role in agricultural development in Bucks County (Criteria A) and as an excellent example of vernacular Federal style architecture (Criteria C). The house is constructed of frame and sheathed with wood siding. The original section of the house, small house that faced perpendicular to Mirror Lake Road, was constructed around 1760. Around 1850, a large addition was constructed perpendicular to the original house facing Mirror Lake Road. The interior of the house features original woodwork including eared and architrave trim that is typical of Federal style.

The outbuildings, which include a barn, a large frame garage, a small cement block garage, a wagon shed, and a tractor shed, are all good examples of surviving farm outbuildings, which add to the historic significance of the property. The barn is another variant of a Pennsylvania barn. It is a timber frame barn resting atop a stone, ground-floor stable. The barnyard elevation is dominated by a large projecting forebay. The forebay is supported by a stone wall extending out from the main barn, the eastern side of which has a large sliding door designed to accommodate farm machinery.

As is the case with the barns at the Patterson/Brown House and Elm Lowne, the barn on this property has the potential for adaptive reuse, as well as use in support of the agricultural operations of the farm.

Patterson/ Satterthwaite House



Patterson/Satterthwaite House main hall and stairway



Barn on Patterson/Satterthwaite Farm



*Environmental View of
Patterson/Satterthwaite Farm*

*Patterson/
Satterthwaite
House*

At the site visit, the house was judged to be in fair condition and could be restored when appropriate funds become available.



Lateral view of Patterson/Sattethrwaite House

Elm Lowne



Elm Lowne Farm House

Elm Lowne is located at 1324 Dolington Road. The property includes a stone farmhouse, a large barn, a tenant house that was formerly a carriage house, a springhouse and a corn crib. The property has not been determined eligible for, or listed on, the National Register of Historic Places. This does not mean that the property could not be listed to the National Register, rather application forms for National Register listing have not been filed with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Based on historical information and observations of the architectural integrity of the property, it is the opinion of Heritage Conservancy that the property retains historic integrity and meets the criteria for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. The house was constructed in several sections beginning in the late 18th century. The documentary evidence suggests that the main house was constructed by Edward Yardley. He took title to the property in 1827, and when he advertised the property for sale in December 1835, the house was noted as being “new” and built “agreeably to the modern style.”¹ Just over ten years later when William Cadwallader had the property advertised for sale, the house was described as “nearly new” but still “built in the modern style.” These references do not necessarily mean that the entire structure was new, but only that the main living section (the “house” in eighteenth/nineteenth century expression) was new. The

¹ The December 9, 1835 *Pennsylvania Correspondent* newspaper stated: “The improvements are a new Stone House, 30 by 36 feet, built agreeably to the modern style, with folding doors between the parlors; marble mantels &c. finished in the best manner, with a stone kitchen adjoining, dining room, wash house, &c. and a good spring house over a never failing spring of water, near the door--there are also, all the necessary out buildings, requisite for a farm of the above dimensions. The buildings are situated on a commanding eminence, within view of the river Delaware and the city of Trenton...”

Elm Lowne



Large cooking fireplace in Elm Lowne House



Springhouse on Elm Lowne property.

original house may have been relegated to use as a kitchen as part of the new construction and was the adjoining “stone kitchen” noted in the advertisement.

Documentation of the barn is less precise. As one can imagine in a farming community, newspaper advertisements typically emphasized the size and attributes of a barn. The fact that the 1835 newspaper advertisement goes into such details about the house, but merely states that the property had “all the necessary out buildings, requisite for a farm” of its size is curious. However, a description in November 1836 of a “**barn and hay house stone stable high**” seems to describe the main section of the barn.² In 1846, the barn was described as a “large frame barn and hayhouse.” The hayhouse may have been the frame bridge side extension of the main barn, but the term is more typically associated with an addition such as the rear “L”.

The property appears to be significant for its association with agricultural development in Bucks County (Criteria A). It also may be significant for its association with various members of the Yardley family who owned the property in the late 18th and early 19th century and is also associated with Anthony Veiller, a significant screen writer from 1930 through 1950, who purchased the property in 1937 (Criteria B). Anthony Veiller wrote and narrated parts of the *Why We Fight Series* of World War II propaganda films with Frank Capra. Other films include *Stage Door* (1937) and *The Killers* (1946) for both of which he received an Oscar nomination for Best Adapted Screen Play. He was the writer, producer and an actor for the film *Red Planet Mars* (1952). He also worked with John Huston on *Night of the Iguana* (1962).³

In addition to its association with Veiller, the house appears to be an excellent example of vernacular Georgian architecture (Criteria C). The outbuildings add to the architectural integrity and historic significance of the property. The interior of the house includes a large cooking fire place, Georgian, Federal and Colonial Revival style woodwork and wood flooring. The property is in excellent condition.

As noted under the *Infrastructure Assessment & Feasibility* section of this report, the township has had an extensive study of the barn completed. The *Master Plan for the Barn at Elm Lowne* by Susan Maxman & Partners Architects (SMP) examined the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the barn as an educational and performing arts center. The project completed three tasks.

Task I – historical and structural condition assessment

² On November 16, 1836 Edward Yardley attempted to sell the land on the east side of Dolington Road. This tract was described by Yardley as “the farm whereon I lately resided, and now in tenure of John Tomlinson, containing 103 acres”. The advertisement indicates that the improvements on the 103 acres were a **good stone Dwelling House, and kitchen, barn and hay house stone stable high, stone wagon house and spring house near the door**, and concludes with, “As this property was advertised last fall, and about one half sold without the buildings, a further description is deemed unnecessary as it is presumed those desirous of purchasing a property of this kind would be likely to call and view for themselves”.

³ A complete filmography can be found at <http://www.vh1.com/movies/person/102094/filmography.jhtml>

Task II – conceptual designs for the adaptive reuse of the barn in a phased development plan

Task III – preparation of an estimate of costs

Heritage Conservancy recognizes that thoroughness of the study, including its public participation component. The township must now consider the economic and social costs and benefits of implementing the plan.

The project as outlined by SMP is predicated on the assumption that the township will retain ownership of the property. An alternative to this option is the sale of the property. The property is suitable for several uses; it can accommodate residential use or perhaps limited commercial use of the barn and grounds.

Many communities have made the decision that historic barns are an important part of their heritage and that even if farming is no longer a viable option, a municipality must encourage property owners to convert barns in commercial or residential subdivisions into community centers, residences, or space for businesses. When considering alternative uses, focus must be on the scale and intensity, as much as the use. The municipality must make a clear statement of what it does and does not want. (*See the Divestment section under Summary and Recommendations.*)



Elm Lowne Barn

*Warren/Farringer
House*

Warren/Farringer House

Warren/Farringer House



The Warren/Farringer House has little or no potential for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. It is located on a narrow strip of land between Stony Hill Road and the Edgewood Village Shopping Center. As a result its setting has been compromised resulting in loss of historic integrity. Jesse Palmer once owned the property, and it is a good example of vernacular Georgian architecture; however, the loss of integrity greatly reduces the potential for listing it to the National Register. The house is constructed of stone and has a wood sided, modern addition. The house contains an office and a retail store. The house is in excellent condition.

Dalgewicz/Slack House



Dalgewicz/Slack Farm House

Located on the Makefield Highlands Golf Course at 1950 Woodside Road, the Dalgewicz/Slack House has some potential for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. The construction of the golf course has compromised the historic integrity of the property by the demolition of the associated barn and the alteration of the farm fields. The house, however, is a good example of vernacular Federal style architecture and is associated with Thomas Slack. The house also retains important interior features including a fireplace with eared architrave trim, original staircase and flooring. There is a shed nearby that adds to the historic value of the property. The house is currently vacant and is in good condition.

Dalgewicz/Slack House



Fireplace and built-in cabinets in Dalgewicz/Slack House



Stairway from main hall inside Dalgewicz/Slack House.



Outbuilding located on Dalgewicz/Slack property.

*Five Mile Woods
Nature Center*

Five Mile Woods Nature Center



Five Mile Woods Farm House



Five Mile Woods House

The house at the Five Mile Woods Nature Center is a stucco-covered former farmhouse that appears to have been constructed in the late 18th century. Due to modern exterior and interior alterations, the house has lost its historic integrity and has little potential for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. The house has hand hewn basement support beams that indicate its date of construction. Also located on the grounds of the Five Mile Woods Nature Center, a considerable distance from the farmhouse, there are the ruins of a second house. This house may or may not be related to the farmhouse. Additional research may reveal details about the houses and their owners. The house is in excellent condition.

Infrastructure Assessment & Feasibility

Lower Makefield Community Center Proposal

In addition to the evaluation of the Satterthwaite House, in 1999, the township contracted with Clarke Caton Hintz to evaluate a proposed Lower Makefield Community Center at Elm Lowne. The contractors completed a Preliminary Findings Report that characterized the conditions at Elm Lowne, in particular evaluating the potential use of the Stone Manor Farm House and Barn. Their findings indicated that conversion of the Manor House to a senior center would be difficult due to several factors. First, the house has an existing floor plan with multiple levels, which would be an impediment for seniors. In addition, there are important ADA requirements that would be challenging to implement. Finally, any expansion would likely be visually disruptive. Regarding the barn structure, the contractor emphasized the large costs to upgrade the barn to a performing arts facility including either demolishing large portions of the barn or construction of an adjacent, new facility on site. At the time of the study, the construction estimate for creating the performing arts center and senior center was \$2.3 million, plus \$2 million for additional site improvements, fees, furniture and equipment.

Master Plan for Adaptive Reuse of the Barn at Elm Lowne

In the spring of 2005, the firm Susan Maxman & Partners Architects was contracted to create a master plan for adaptive reuse of the Elm Lowne barn. The report has been submitted to the township and includes a multi-phased reuse of the barn into an educational and performing arts cultural center for Lower Makefield Township. While a number of potential users were included in the process, it does not appear that a formal market analysis for the need of this use for the building was completed.

The plan suggests that the main barn be rehabilitated and hay barn extension be dismantled and reconstructed. The report concludes with a cost estimate of six phases of an adaptive reuse plan with a total budget of \$3,697,000.

Summary and Recommendation

The six properties evaluated represent a range of conditions, both structurally and with regard to historic significance. Table 1 provides consolidated information on the six properties including age, zoning, structures, etc. while Table 2 provides historical significance and status data.

Lower Makefield's historic resources represent a variety of historical ages, styles and settings. Of the six properties, four are Georgian in style, while the remaining two are representative of the Federal style. The buildings range from fair to very good condition. With the exception of Warren and Elm Lowne, they all have significant acreage (greater than 50 acres) associated with them. In total there are 417 acres on these six properties combined.

On the Warren, Dalgewicz, and Five Mile Woods properties, the main house is the only important structure associated with the property, though there are remnants of a second house at Five Mile Woods and a shed at the Dalgewicz site. The remaining three sites all harbor a number of farm-related structures including sheds, barns,

corn cribs, garages, etc. In total, the structures on all six properties yield over 30,000 square feet of space. Three properties – the two Patterson structures and Elm Lowne – are of high historical integrity and significance. While Warren and Five Mile Woods have low historic integrity and low significance, there remains significant potential for utility to the community.

The following are specific recommendations regarding National Register listing for each of the Township's properties. These recommendations are based primarily on the historic evaluation and the condition assessment by the conservancy's historic preservationist.

- **Patterson/Brown House:** Pursue listing the Patterson/Brown House to the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Patterson/Satterthwaite:** Pursue listing the Patterson/Satterthwaite House to the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Elm Lowne:** Pursue having the property determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and subsequently listed to the register.
- **Warren/Farringer House:** Do not pursue listing the Warren/Farringer House to the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Dalgewicz/Slack House:** Conduct a detailed historic research and an in depth architectural study of the house and then possibly pursue listing the Dalgewicz/Slack House to the National Register of Historic Places.

Lower Makefield Township - Historic Resource Inventory and Historic Evaluation

Table 1. Inventory of Township historic resources

	Patterson/ Brown Farm	Patterson/ Satterthwaite Farm	Elm Lowne	Warren/ Farringer House	Dalgewicz/ Slack House	Five Mile Woods Nature Center	• Five Mile Woods:
Location	949 Mirror Lake Rd	909 Mirror Lake Rd	1324 Dolington Rd	684 Stony Hill Rd	1950 Woodside Rd	Big Oak Rd	Conduct historic research of the property. If desired and affordable have an archeological study conducted around the ruins of the second house
Tax Parcel Number	20-16-49	20-16-46	20-64-72	20-16-62	20-3-27	20-32-45	
Current Zoning	R1	R1	R1	C1	R1	R1	
Years owned by Township	7	7	6	13 (leased)	9	25	
Approximate number of buildings	9	7	5	1	2	1	
Buildings on the property	Stone Farm House Barn Tenant House Corn Crib Hay Barn Garage/workshop Small Garage Large Garage Shed	Frame Farm House Barn Large Frame Garage Small Cement Block Garage Wagon Shed Tractor Shed	Stone Farm House Barn Tenant house Springhouse Corn Crib	Stone Farm House	Stone Farm House Shed	Stuccoed Farm House Ruins of a second house	
Current Use	House is currently vacant. Tenant house is occupied. Barn and other outbuildings used by farmer who leases land.	House is currently occupied. Garage used by tenant. Barn and other outbuildings used by farmer who leases land.	House and grounds used for special events. Tenant house occupied. Barn and springhouse vacant. Springhouse being restored.	House is in shopping center used for retail and office.	House is located on golf course and is vacant. Shed is vacant.	House is located at nature center and is occupied by a tenant.	
Approximate size of large buildings	House - 60' by 30' - 2 1/2 Stories - 3,500 square feet. Barn - 70' by 40'. Tenant house - 30' by 16'. Garage/workshop - 30' by 75'	House - 50' by 40' - 2 1/2 stories - 4,500 square feet. Barn - 60' by 50'. Wagon Shed - 40' by 30'	House - 60' by 30' - 2 1/2 stories - 1,500 square feet. Barn - 60' by 75'. Tenant House 60' by 20'	House - 50' by 20' - 2 stories - 1200 square feet	House - 50' by 30' - 2 1/2 stories - 2,300 Square feet.	House - 50' by 25' - 2 stories - 2,300 Square feet.	
Condition ⁽¹⁾	Excellent	Fair	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	
Approximate acreage	127.6	99.3	11.7	NA	63.5	115.3	

Table 2. Historic evaluation of Township resources

	Patterson/ Brown Farm	Patterson/ Satterthwaite Farm	Elm Lowne	Warren/ Farringer House	Dalgewicz/ Slack House	Five Mile Woods Nature Center
Year Built	c.1731/1837	c.1760/1850	c.1795/1830	c.1790	c.1790	c.1780
Architectural Style	Georgian	Federal	Georgian	Georgian	Federal	Georgian
National Register Status	Eligible	Eligible	Undetermined	Undetermined	Undetermined	Undetermined
Heritage Conservancy Register Status	Listed	Listed	Listed	Undetermined	Undetermined	Undetermined
Historic Integrity	High	High	High	Low	Medium	Low
Historic Significance	High	High	High	Low	Medium	Low
Heritage Conservancy Evaluation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Not significant	Needs further study	Not significant

Sources: Bucks County Board of Assessment, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, National Register of Historic Places, Heritage Conservancy Register of Historic Places and Archives, Lower Makefield Historical Commission, Ralph N. Thompson.

⁽¹⁾ Condition assessment is based on observations made by a person qualified in the area of historic preservation and is not an assessment of the structural condition of the building as could be made by a qualified structural engineer, architect, or building inspector.

III. Management and Policy Framework

Townships, for the most part, are not well suited for owning and maintaining historic structures unless they are part of a larger project or plan, i.e. economic development, land conservation, farm preservation. The requirements of owning and managing historic structures often puts a burden on municipal staff, both administrative and hourly workers, and financial support for maintenance and management further dilute limited municipal funding. For example, capital improvements, routine maintenance, property management, insurance and liability, strategic planning, marketing, and staffing for events are a few of the responsibilities associated with managing a set of historic buildings. While traditional “friends” organizations can help defray some of these costs through grants and volunteers, these partnerships can also require supervision that will offset some of the benefits.

Historic resources are an irreplaceable non-renewable resource. When in public ownership, they can provide access for opportunities for enjoyment and education including examination and historic research. There is a strong contingent that advocates that once in public hands, these buildings should remain in the public domain as sanctuaries for research, education and the enjoyment of the public for present and future generations. This requires a balance between a township’s desires to provide these opportunities and the costs to do so.

A township’s historic resources are pieces of American heritage and history, which are owned by an institution that isn’t as invested in its history as others might be. It is a difficult balance to preserve a historical landmark and fulfill other responsibilities. A township is forced to find a use that justifies their expenditures. Quite simply put, a township should strongly consider avoiding high maintenance costs and better allocate resources towards their other goals. Because historic structures are publicly owned “historic structures,” certain guidelines regulate the way repairs are done, which, in turn, make rehabilitation more expensive than if owned by private owners.

Township-owned historic properties fall into two general categories – those located within a Township park, open space or golf club and those that are stand-alone sites. Elm Lowne has a citizen advisory board that aids in the stewardship of the property. With many publicly owned historic properties, decisions about restoration objectives, how the property will be interpreted or used, modifications to buildings and landscape, are commonly delegated to an advisory group through a written agreement with the Township. The advisory bodies are composed of volunteers that may or may not have the necessary level of expertise in historic preservation.

All sites are subject to regulations adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The building(s) and underlying land is owned by the Township. Any improvements to these properties, even if funded entirely by the volunteer organization, become the property of the Township.

For the most part, the township manager serves as the staff liaison to the advisory groups. He also procures and administers professional service contracts for site and building assessments, engineering studies, construction, and maintenance of the

properties. Funding for historic properties has been largely through the annual township budget process and occasional grants. The properties are eligible for funding through the county CDBG program. The Township has appropriated matching funds to facilitate acquiring grants but has been limited to fully fund restorations due to budget constraints.

The historic properties are either used as rental properties, vacant, or interpreted as historic sites. Adaptive reuse of the Patterson farm buildings is currently in the planning stages.

Current Ownership and Easements

Lower Makefield Township has ownership of five of the six properties under evaluation (see Table 1). The Warren/Farringer House is leased by the Township. There are currently conservation easement restrictions on the Patterson Farm, which restrict the development and use of a portion of the property. There are currently no conservation easements on any of the other five properties evaluated in this study.

In the case of the Patterson Farm, the township took title to the 232.8844 acres by virtue of a deed dated June 30, 1998 from Thomas S. and Alice E. Patterson. The deed included the following provision:

And the grantee, for itself acknowledges and agrees that the conveyance is under and subject to the restriction that the use of the property shall be limited to agricultural and horticultural uses; active and passive recreation; and open space; except, however, the Township may subdivide the parcel and/or parcels for the purpose of selling certain of the existing improvements to third parties subject to the restrictions that any parcel created shall not be further subdivided, the parcels shall not exceed five (5) acres in size, and the uses shall remain as a single-family dwelling. Furthermore, no new structure shall be constructed on the parcel or parcels unless said structure is related to an improved [sic] use.

And the Grantee, for itself, by acceptance of this Indenture, agrees with the Grantor, that the restrictions shall be enforced as it relates to the use of the property for the benefit of Grantor during their natural lives.

Since both grantors are now deceased, it appears that the restrictions are no longer enforceable. However, on December 27, 1999 the township entered into a declaration of covenants, conditions, and restrictions on 71 acres of the property along Route 95 and Newtown-Yardley Road. This covenant, although later amended with the interchange expansion to include only 50 acres, indicates the following:

- The property uses are perpetually limited to use as “wildlife refuge, sanctuary, open space, agricultural, recreational, historical, cultural or natural resource conservation purposes.”
- Management of the property cannot harm any state or federally recognized rare, threatened, or endangered species

- The Township may limit public access as long as it is in agricultural production. If the use changes, the public can access the property, though the township can restrict access on portions still under agricultural production, while permitting access on portions not under production.
- Under Article VII, Extinguishment and Proceeds, the Township can sell the land or extinguish the “Declaration” if “circumstances arise in the future such as to render the Conservation Purpose and Land Use Restrictions of this Declaration impossible to accomplish...” It must be done in accordance with state law and approved by the County Commissioners, as would “diversion or dispersal” of the property.

Social Context

In order to address stakeholder interests in Lower Makefield’s historic resources, as part of this study, Heritage Conservancy collected stakeholder feedback on issues related to reuse of township historic structures. Members of the Lower Makefield Historic Architecture Review Board (HARB), Historical Commission, Lower Makefield Supervisors, Lower Makefield Planning Commission and Friends of the historic buildings the township owns were included. Through these stakeholder meetings, a process and framework was created that the township supervisors could use in their decision-making regarding managing the historic resources that the township has accumulated.

The following is the list of factors that stakeholders felt should be considered in developing alternatives for reuse of the structures. In parentheses, the number of stakeholders indicating each factor’s importance (within the top three factors) is totaled.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Historic Significance (13) | 9. Opportunity Costs (2) |
| 2. Expenses/Costs and Potential Income (11) | 10. Community Awareness |
| 3. Agricultural Past (7) | 11. Flexibility of Use |
| 4. End Use – Museum/Rental (5) | 12. Agricultural Viability |
| 5. Educational Use (5) | 13. Impact on Neighbors |
| 6. Public Access (3) | 14. Benefit to Neighbors |
| 7. Sense of Place (2) | 15. Enjoyment/Aesthetics |
| 8. Sense of Community (2) | 16. Alternative Costs |
| | Potential Uses Gained/Lost |

Clearly, historical significance was identified as the top concern among stakeholders. However, it is interesting that the second and third rated issues, respectively, were agricultural past and management expenses. This suggests that the public is indeed aware of the costs to own and maintain historic structures and would perhaps be open to solutions that directly address management costs. Stakeholders also indicated that education and public access were important and the use of the resources as museums or farm museums displaying implements of past farming practices could be a viable economic use for historic resources.

IV. Management Alternatives

Currently, the management of the several properties is quite distinctive. Each comprises a very different set of conditions (infrastructure, historical, public access, etc.), and as such the township has been utilizing a very site specific approach to management.

Management and Maintenance Considerations

Tenancy and Leasing

A residential tenancy program can offer great stability as well as a steady income stream to the management of historic buildings. With the right tenants, some operating costs can be reduced or even recouped if market leasing rates and demand are high enough. However, there are important balances to be considered in determining whether to charge market rate or offer a discount to a “caretaker.” It has been Heritage Conservancy’s experience that from a financial and management basis it is better to charge market rate for a property and take care of maintenance issues (with the exception of routine lawn mowing and snow removal) than to depend on the tenant to take care of the property, in contrast to offering a discount rent in exchange for the tenant providing “sweat equity” to help maintain the property. At the current time, there does not appear to be the opportunity for “live-work” arrangements where museum or historical site employees with a personal investment in the maintenance and protection of the property are permitted to live on site.

A residential tenancy program would have to clearly delineate where maintenance duties (if any) were ascribed to the tenant. Given the physical infrastructure considerations at many of the historic sites evaluated here, this would be a critical element of providing for long-term stability of the historic resources. A particularly important issue for residential tenants is the existence of lead-based paint. If the Township chose to abate the paint, it would be extremely costly, costs which would not likely be recouped through existing rental rates. If the Township did not abate the situation, then a significant portion of the rental market – families with children – would be inaccessible. With rental rates clearly higher for the entire house, the Township would be better positioned to generate revenue if the entire house was available to a broader portion of the rental market.

Currently, the Township rents several of the buildings on its several historic properties, though not all. Tenants occupy the house at Patterson/Satterthwaite, where the garage is also being used by the tenant. The farmer, who leases the property’s land for agricultural production, utilizes the farm outbuildings for storage and uses associated with farming. The outbuildings at the Brown farm are also used by this farmer. At the Brown Farm, the tenant house is occupied, though the main house is vacant. The Township could put a tenant in the main house at the Brown Farm in the addition. There is also a tenant occupying the house at Five Mile Woods. There are no current tenants at the main house at Elm Lowne, but this may not be practical due to the special events held on site. There is a tenant at the carriage house on the property. The springhouse on the property is currently being restored and might provide additional square footage when complete. The

Warren/Farringer House is leased to corporate tenants. This seems an appropriate use, and we do not recommend occupying the Warren/Farringer house with residential tenants, since it is located in a shopping center parking lot and would not likely attract residential tenants. We do not recommend occupying the Dalgewicz/Slack house, which is adjacent to a golf course and is currently vacant, unless there is a golf-related adaptive reuse for the house.

In contrast to residential tenancy programs, a corporate or community-directed program may provide similar or increased benefits, without some of the drawbacks. Corporate clients are likely more reliable, especially with financial management, and so the Township would probably see fewer problems related to the leasing contract. While there could be “fairness” issues with selection of a corporate tenant, and the corporate tenant may desire greater oversight over the physical infrastructure and construction changes, a professional relationship between the Township and a local business is likely to be more consistent and easier to manage than a Township-resident relationship. Corporate tenants without a strong need to alter the buildings to suit their needs would be most appropriate. Tenants should also be selected – where possible – that provide some community benefit. In addition, a special need identified by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) is live-work facilities for artists and artisans. The Township may find support for this specific type of tenant at the state level through grants.

A related opportunity for the Township may be special arrangements with nonprofit or community organizations that Township officials view as having a positive effect on the community. These relationships can be very beneficial, particularly augmenting the “ownership” of the buildings and improving maintenance and operations. Unfortunately, nonprofit organizations and community groups may not be able to pay market rates. Although, as occurs in other municipalities with excess office space, offering below market or free occupation can help the Township enable these groups to achieve their goals. For example, elsewhere in Pennsylvania, seniors groups, Boy Scouts, and similar community groups have been offered municipal office space as a semi-permanent for supporting the organization.

Special Events

Susan Maxman and Partners have completed a master plan for the barn at Elm Lowne which includes its potential adaptive reuse as a cultural center. Currently, these uses are limited to the grounds of the property. The Township administers the program and chooses which events to host. While the facility is very large for a barn, it is not especially large as a performing arts venue. Still, there is a strong market for smaller venues in the region, and to date the Township has been successful in attracting events to Elm Lowne.

Most sites that provide a similar service have several key attributes in common including adequate parking, ADA accessibility, visibility within in the community (e.g., one or more high profile events), and consistent booking. Infrequent scheduling can be severely detrimental to the financial condition, and makes maintenance and operations difficult. Seasonality is also an issue at some locations where summer events are very popular, but the location can become little-used

during the winter months. A robust, year-long program of events is most beneficial to keep the community engaged.

The size, location, and availability of buildings at the Patterson Farm makes the site a likely candidate for special events. The township is currently soliciting for rental of the farmland and any activities must be designed to avoid conflict with this use.

Part of the analysis of using historic properties for special events should be a conscious effort to determine the true costs of such uses. Many times these projects show an artificially balanced budget but are not assessing the total operating costs of owning a property. Instead, they presume that the township owns the property and would cover ongoing expenses anyway. Properties whose overall budget is dependent on only spending what they get from the rental of the property often show uses that are thought to be “profitable” are actually strongly subsidized.

Divestment

Stakeholders have expressed interest in how changes in ownership of the properties might improve both the financial status and the efficiency of managing the historic properties. With four of the six properties having significant land, one approach to managing the historic resources would be to separate the historic structures from the open space. Though the open space is currently agricultural production, and this management approach could continue, there could be financial gains through subdividing the properties. One approach would be to section the homes away from the open space acreage, with the intention of resale of the homes. This, in combination with a façade or conservation easement on the homes, would likely result in significant revenue. Clearly this option would have to be considered in light of the current easements, ownership structure, and political climate. Still, if the argument was made for a greater benefit to the Township, its residents, and the historical integrity of the properties, a divestment or subdivision option could work.

Any sale of Township-owned historic resources should be subject to several conditions. First, the Township should ensure that the purchaser has a “preservation or renovation plan” and the funding necessary to implement it. A preservation or renovation plan is a written preservation, maintenance and rehabilitation proposal submitted by the purchaser that is in compliance with standards and guidelines for rehabilitation and rules adopted by the State Historic Preservation Officer or a review committee established by the township that may consist of the Historic Commission, HARB or other individuals.

Second, the sale should include either a short- or long-term agreement that outlines the terms of the relationship. A short-term agreement would describe the public-private partnerships that make municipally-owned buildings and land available for non-governmental uses that are consistent with township goals and are granted for less than a five-year period on a renewable basis. On the other hand, a long-term agreement covers the buildings, and a designated portion of land necessary to enjoy them, making available for the use and occupancy of a partner for a fixed term up to 25 years.

Finally, the township should adopt ordinance-based incentives for promoting the preservation and reuse of historic properties that is compatible with the municipality's historic landscape. For example, Doylestown Township's ordinance allowed the Aldie Mansion to be used for offices and the Oscar Hammerstein House to be used as a bed and breakfast.

Many communities have made the decision that historic properties are key elements in maintaining a community's identity. However, in a changing cultural landscape many historical properties represent difficult and expensive challenges for preservation. Many municipalities are looking for methods to provide owners with flexibility in uses. This type of program would be especially valuable for the Elm Lowne property. If the property were sold, allowing future property owners to have an economic return on their investment while staying within residential character of the surrounding use would encourage the preservation of the buildings, particularly the barn.

It is important to note that the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code provides the tools to preserve historic barns and other significant buildings. The key element to enacting a historic preservation overlay to protect historic properties and give them incentives for appropriate adaptive reuse is to complete a township-wide inventory of historic sites. By analyzing resources on a township-wide basis, the traditional concern that the designation of non-adjacent historic resources would be "spot zoning" has been avoided.

If a property owner is given distinct benefit in the form of specific relief from local regulations to preserve a barn or other significant historical resource, it would be reasonable that the municipality consider imposing a façade easement on the building to ensure that the building continues to retain its historic appearance.

In all cases, the rehabilitation should respect the traditional character and appearance of the buildings. The buildings must be capable of adaptation without altering their particular character, setting or landscape value and without extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension. At the same time, the new use must be appropriate for its location and minimize the impact of the new use on surrounding properties.

V. Recommendations

Summary

The review of the history the township's acquisition of its collection of historic resources suggests that acquisitions were not part of a comprehensive program by which the township identified its most significant structures and acquired them to ensure their preservation.

Instead, in most cases, it appears that the acquisition of historic structures was a byproduct of other programs unrelated to historic significance. The Patterson farm acquisition was primarily motivated by the desire to protect strategically located, highly visible open space. Agricultural preservation and historic preservation aspects of the property only enhanced its open space values. The structures on the golf course were not a key element in the acquisition of the property and were not major components in the design of the golf course.

Through this study, the conservancy has come to the conclusions that the township should strongly consider divesting itself of several structures in order to expand its stewardship role within a modified management structure of those historic resources that require ownership to provide benefits to the community.

The township has done an excellent job in preventing the demolition of significant structures. Now it is time to reevaluate the situation. Lower Makefield is not alone in learning that after the initial preservation of a threatened building is completed, ongoing ownership of multiple historic resources often results in buildings that are:

- unwanted
- unneeded
- inappropriate to retain

For the most part, the township can preserve its historically significant resources without the responsibilities of ownership. The township can pursue a policy of regulation and preservation vs. acquisition. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code provides the tools to preserve historic resources. Heritage Conservancy is involved with the creation of preservation ordinances in many communities. These regulatory ordinances, when bundled with incentive-based ordinances, provide both a "carrot and stick" approach to historic preservation.

The township could address its ongoing historic preservation issues and responsibilities in several ways using:

- Township staff -- creating a part time position to deal with property management. This would provide continuity, address all historic structures, and work through the township budget process
- Consultant -- retaining a consultant to help direct activities.
- Volunteers -- using individual volunteer groups or a single historic commission or similar citizen advisory body, which would be comprised of individuals with expertise in various aspects of preservation.

The township has a Historic Commission, but the enabling resolution does not include these responsibilities. A new or different Historic Commission ordinance giving the commission specific responsibilities would have to be enacted. The new or different commission would help create stewardship policies and ensure that those policies were consistently applied to all Township-owned sites. On the site-specific level, the commission could use its expertise to advise Township staff on stewardship decisions for individual properties. There would be Township resources dedicated solely to the management of cultural resources and acting as a liaison with the commission. Each property would have a stewardship plan to manage both its immediate historic resources, as well as any broader management issues on the property (agriculture, forestry, etc.). A financial plan and a public education program would be important parts of this expanded stewardship role for the Township. We believe that this approach would achieve improved stewardship through:

- The dedication of staff to property management;
- The creation of a funding plan for Township-owned properties; and
- A cohesive public education program.

This approach would benefit from a commission working to ensure public participation in stewardship of public properties. It would also add another level of resource protection since major stewardship decisions would be made jointly by Township staff and the commission. The commission would also help ensure unified management of all public properties and could provide continuity between Board of Supervisor's terms if the commission had staggered terms.

On the other hand, this approach adds an additional layer of management. It may take longer to make management decisions, and the process of reaching agreement may be more cumbersome. The effectiveness of the stewardship program could be impacted by how and when transition of the committee membership occurs. Empty posts could leave gaps in the oversight committee. Also, a transition to new committee members could involve a change in policy direction that could impact on-going preservation projects. Having Township staff specifically dedicated to historic preservation would necessitate funding new positions and appropriating an annual operating budget.

Still, the conservancy recommends this approach because it ensures a unified management approach for all historic Township-owned properties in addition to site-specific stewardship plans that will outline management, funding, and public education programs. This option also offers the benefit of a heritage commission that, working in collaboration with the Township, provides expertise and consistency in policy implementation.

Strategic Recommendations

Our broad recommendations for managing the properties are outlined below. In addition, we have developed preliminary site specific recommendations for the properties. Each Township property should have a professionally designed plan for major maintenance, preservation, and limited restoration. Without this plan (typically part of a Historic Structures Report) the township will react to crisis after crisis without regard for their overall, long-range implications.

Further, the Township should develop a township-wide systematic approach to the management of its historic resources, including identifying a goal or purpose for each historic structure as well as the Township's management of those structures. This would provide a foundation for decision-making that includes relative priorities for purpose and use of the structures (e.g., preservation at all costs, financial sustainability, maximum public services, and minimum township management costs). This should be used to guide the overall management of the township's properties and should include criteria for acquisition *and disposal* of its properties.

As a complement to a strategic plan for managing historic resources, for those properties that the Township expects to manage with a business-like approach (e.g., a performing arts center), a business plan should prove useful to clarify specific objectives both programmatic and financial. A business plan would also offer the Township the necessary information for any financing necessary for implementation of its strategic plan.

The township should institute these recommendations before acquiring any more historic resources. The township should seriously consider a shift from acquisition of new properties to a program of sustainable stewardship of the historic resources it owns.

Define a Strategic Approach for Acquisition

The Township currently has a Purchase of Development Rights Program where, through a set of ranking criteria, the Township targets specific properties for preservation by purchasing the development rights from the property owner. This program protects these properties from future development; however, the Township has no stewardship role in the management of these properties.

Although the Township has been able to successfully preserve some historic properties by outright purchase – usually as a partner with concerned citizens – acquiring properties has often been by chance, rather than by design. There is no plan for the strategic acquisition of historic properties. As stated in the previous issue discussion, the Township currently owns several historic properties. These acquisitions occur in one of three ways.

First, historic resources may be located on a park site and are therefore acquired with the purchase of the park property. Examples are the county owned Core Creek Park in Middletown Township and Peter Taylor Farmstead in Newtown Township as well as the township owned Clark Preserve in Newtown Township.

The second situation occurs when community interests target a particular property for preservation. The Township may then “step in” as the recipient of the donated property. An agreement between the Township and the citizen volunteer group typically subjugates preservation decisions to the advisory group. An example of this is the Styer Orchard Property in Middletown Township. The Township acquired the land, and the estate provided an endowment to Heritage Conservancy to help with planning, repair, restoration, and maintenance of the property including the buildings.

The third acquisition method is when a property of historical interest is threatened by development. Through proffer, a land developer can protect a historic property or structure in accordance with plan policies. Proffers may include dedication of land to the Township, avoidance or stabilization of one or more structures, documentation of structures, archaeological surveys, or some combination of these. For example, the Township may use this process in the Edgewood village area. As the Township pursues the revitalization of the village, individual buildings may become the responsibility of the Township in the future.

Prior to any such future activities, the conservancy's recommendation is to outline a selection process, define a strategy for funding, determine the mechanics of transferring ownership, and identify the ultimate intended use of the property, which would be pre-determined in a strategic plan. Priorities for acquisition could be based on the specific policy recommendations of a *Township-wide Heritage Resources Preservation Plan*. Some of the positive aspects of this approach are the following:

- Under the status quo properties are often acquired in a severely deteriorated condition. Most of these properties have been neglected for years because the owner did not have the resources to maintain the structure. If properties were selected for acquisition in conformance with a strategic plan, some of these properties could possibly become Township property before advanced degradation occurs thus salvaging more of the original fabric of the structure and reducing the eventual costs of stabilization and restoration.
- Acquisition decisions would be based on a planned approach – not merely in response to pressure from a particular citizen's group. A balanced, planned approach to acquisition would result in better utilization of finite resources while still achieving pre-determined preservation goals.
- A strategic acquisition plan would include funding options and a defined process for evaluating a potential acquisition. A process that leads to informed decisions about which properties to acquire would result in better stewardship of the resource and of tax dollars.
- Acquiring properties in a planned approach would offer a better opportunity to preserve the historic landscape and context associated with a structure or property. Reactive acquisitions of threatened properties usually can save only remnants of the structure(s).
- A strategic acquisition plan would help Township staff during the review of land development applications and as a tool to guide proffer negotiations. It would also benefit the development community by making the preservation process more predictable.
- This option would implement Township-wide preservation goals.
- Strategic acquisition would allow the Township to build an overarching public education program that promotes stewardship and educates residents on the rich, diverse cultural heritage Lower Makefield offers.

This recommended approach would have some drawbacks. It will require staff and funding to prepare a strategic plan for acquisition of valuable historic properties. Limited staff and fiscal resources would need to be reallocated to this task. This would require a commitment on the part of the Township to designate this plan as a

priority for staff resources and possible contract dollars. At current staffing levels and budget allocations, this would likely divert resources from other Township projects.

In addition, strategic acquisition would require a dedicated funding source to purchase properties once identified and/or provide matching funds for grants. Once acquired, most properties will require either stabilization to halt deterioration or restoration to fulfill the intended public purpose. Stabilization and restoration are very costly, and there are many competing needs for limited Township funds.

Further, with each acquisition comes responsibility for adequate staffing for the operation and maintenance of the properties. This equates to additional staff and a commitment to operational budgets for each site. Finally, historic properties do not provide much opportunity for generating revenue to offset expenditures. Establishing a goal to cover at least operating costs with fees or other types of revenue would be important, but probably ambitious.

Submit Nomination for Three Properties to National Register

The historical evaluation clearly placed the six properties into two groups, those that were viable submissions for the National Registry (Patterson/Satterthwaite, Patterson/Brown, and Elm Lowne) and those that were not (Warren/Farringer, Dalgewicz, and Five Mile Woods). Our recommendation is to submit national register nominations for the appropriate properties.

There are important benefits and limitations that are associated with registration. For example, registration offers access to additional funding through grants available only to listed properties.

If requested, Heritage Conservancy can create a budget to complete the National Register nominations and address potential grant funding.

Continue to Develop Partnerships

The Township should continue to explore mutually beneficial partnerships with organizations that have similar goals and objectives for historic resource preservation. For example, Heritage Conservancy, Delaware & Lehigh Canal Heritage Corridor, Lower Makefield Society for the Performing Arts, Friends of the Delaware Canal, Lower Makefield and Yardley historical societies, and the Bucks County Conference and Visitors Bureau all could continue to provide support and advice on management of the Township's historic resources. Some of these organizations may be willing to provide the programming that the Township desires at selected sites.

Market Analysis

Before the township commits to the expenditure of a significant amount of capital on its properties, it is prudent to examine the potential future uses of the property on an economic basis. The future uses of the property not only have to respect the historic integrity of the buildings, but should be sustainable. A market analysis of the potential future uses of any property should be part of master planning.

- Current needs in the community (housing, arts, community programming, etc.) particularly in relation to the adaptive reuse of the Elm Lowne Barn.
- Competing uses in the community (New Hope, Doylestown, Newtown, Yardley, Princeton, etc.) particularly in relation to the adaptive reuse of the Elm Lowne Barn.
- Visitation to publicly owned and operated house museums such in the vicinity
- Similar properties / example approaches / case studies

Site Specific Recommendations

In addition to the general recommendations noted above, the following are recommendations regarding the next steps for each of the Township's properties

- **Patterson/Brown House:** Pursue lease of the Patterson/Brown House and tenant house; investigate use of the barns for other township uses, non-residential uses, public uses, or agricultural uses in association with the open space.
- **Patterson/Satterthwaite:** Complete a revised and expanded study of the house, stabilize house until determination of future use/restoration is completed.
- **Elm Lowne:** Investigate potential future uses other than performing arts center. Consider transferring management to Friends group or sale. Any sale should include provisions for promoting the adaptive reuse of the historic structures, determine what portion of the property, or rights, the township would want to retain beyond façade easements such as preserving scenic vistas or potential future storm water facilities needs.
- **Warren/Farringer House:** Maintain status quo or determine ability to sell with façade easement or donate to non-profit.
- **Dalgewicz/Slack House:** If the historic research and architectural study of the house do not suggest pursuing listing the Dalgewicz/Slack House to the National Register of Historic Places, investigate any potential golf-related uses for the structures; consider documentation and demolition if no viable use is found.
- **Five Mile Woods:** Maintain status quo.

VI. Acknowledgements

Terry S. Fedorchak, Township Manager
Lower Makefield Township Supervisors
Lower Makefield Historic Architectural Review Board
Lower Makefield Historical Commission
Lower Makefield Planning Commission
Friends of Elm Lowne Committee
Volunteers and concerned citizens who attended a series of Stakeholders' meetings

