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Introduction

The purpose of this plan is to provide Haddonfield Borough with a historic preservation plan element of the master plan. The plan is an attempt to gather and document the essence of much of the borough’s accomplishments thus far in terms of historic preservation. The plan examines past history to provide an appreciation for the series of events that led to the formation of the town. The plan also outlines the chronology that leads up to the enactment of the first preservation ordinance. Goals are outlined in the plan as a statement of continued direction. The existing historic preservation survey has been reviewed and suggested changes are proposed. The legal basis for preservation zoning is outlined both in terms of New Jersey land use law and federal mandates. A comparison with the existing Master Plan of the Borough is provided. Potential conflict between preservation priorities and other borough objectives are discussed. The New Jersey State Development Plan is reviewed regarding Haddonfield. The issue of Centers designation for Haddonfield is stated as consistent with the direction of the state plan. An agenda for future action is provided to outline the means whereby the Borough hopes to maintain its commitment to Historic preservation.
Section 1

Historic Background

In review of the literature of Haddonfield’s evolution, it becomes apparent that certain historical periods can generally be defined by major historical events which influenced architectural and cultural development of the Borough. At the risk of oversimplification, six (6) development periods are important in Haddonfield’s growth as a community.

Early History - Indian Period - to 1660
Colonial Village - Early Settlement Period - 1661 through 1760
Revolutionary War Era - 1760 - 1780
Trade and Commerce Center - 1750 through 1860’s
Railroad Era - 1860 - 1920
Modern Period - 1920 to present

An overview of significant events central to these periods provides further insight into Haddonfield’s development.

Early History - Indian Period
The original settlement of Haddonfield was laid out over a portion of the trail of the Lenni Lenape Indians. The trail ran from Perth Amboy in the north at the mouth of the Raritan Bay to Salem in the south where the Delaware Bay meets the Delaware River. The Indians moved from village to village with the change of the seasons and no doubt passed through what is now Haddonfield in their seasonal migrations.

Colonial Village - Early Settlement Period
The first settlers in Haddonfield were Quakers, persecuted for their religion in England, who sought not only religious freedom in the new country, but a better life and future for themselves and their children. They brought with them the moral values and simplicity of lifestyle that had the most profound influence on the town through more than 300 years.

Among these first settlers, Francis Collins, born in Oxfordshire England stands out. In 1682 Collins purchased 500 acres of land on the west side of Cooper’s Creek which is now the entire southeastern part of Haddonfield.

The house was located on a hill adjacent the main Indian trail which was later to become Burlington-Salem Road. Collins named his plantation "Mountwell". His house stood near the intersection of today’s Centre Street and Cottage Avenue. He soon became Haddonfield’s largest land owner.
King's Highway was laid out in 1681 over a portion of the trail of the Lenni Lenape Indians, running from Perth Amboy to Salem. The Highway was constructed 110 feet wide for the King of England to visit his colony with his entourage.

Haddonfield in 1686 when the Salem Road was completed, was a one-street town and development was along the road, then down the side streets as they were cut through the growing village. The boundary of the historic district was drawn to encompass this historic core of the town.

Elizabeth Haddon whose family owned thousands of acres of land near Cooper's Creek prevailed upon her father to let her come to America to transact business in his name. She arrived in 1701 met William Penn at the port in Philadelphia and took a barge across the Delaware River to meet the Collins and she settled in what later became known as Haddonfield. The area was named New Haddonfield after her father, John Haddon, thus giving the Town its name.

The real founding of the village came later when she and her father deeded in 1721 a piece of land on Haddon Avenue, near King's Highway to the Religious Society of Friends for a meeting house and cemetery. The first meeting for worship was held on December 12, 1721. For the next 97 years it was the only place of worship in Haddonfield. Thus, Haddonfield was established as a convenient place of worship and became a religious center; this was an important factor in the growth of the village.

Colonial Village and Trading Center

At the time of the Revolutionary War, Haddonfield had developed into the largest village and trade center in what is now Camden County. Haddonfield possessed all the ingredients for growth in the colonial village: tidal water for transportation, a fording place of a major waterway for highways, and streams that could be dammed to provide water power for mills.

Also, Haddonfield's location on Haddon Avenue was on the road to Cooper's Ferry. These ferries located on the north end of today's Camden City, provided the most convenient crossing place from New Jersey to Philadelphia, which in the mid-1700's had become the largest business and cultural center in the American colonies, providing a substantial market for all local products.
Revolutionary War Era

In the revolutionary war era, the Friends meeting house on Haddon Avenue was used as a hospital. In 1777, Haddonfield provided a safe meeting place at the "Old Tavern " (later named "Indian King") for the New Jersey legislators to conduct their affairs of state when they were routed by the British from one meeting place to another. Thus, Haddonfield has places which played an important role in the American Revolutionary War.

During the revolutionary war, Haddonfield became a place of some note. The town had joined other colonial towns in their struggle for independence. As a border town, it suffered indignities from both sides. The Friends meeting house was used as a hospital by each side in turn. Revolutionary War military heroes were quartered at the Indian King Tavern and were familiar figures along the streets of Haddonfield.

It was at the Indian King Tavern that the seat of the New Jersey legislature decided on Haddonfield as a safe place to convene. Here the New Jersey Assembly approved adoption of the great seal of New Jersey. On September 20, 1977 it enacted a law substituting the word "state" for "colony" in all commission writs and indictments. Count Dunlop of the British Army was quartered in the Gill House on Kings Highway.

The Guards Houses at 258-260 East King's Highway built in 1732 were used to imprison persons suspected of aiding the British cause. These persons were brought to trial before the Council of Safety, then meeting at the Indian King Inn.

Railroad Era

Early Haddonfield was essentially a farming community. Haddonfield also became a popular location for wealthy merchants to build summer homes away from the city of Philadelphia. Haddonfield also served as residence and place of business for notable and successful men and women.

The advent of the Camden and Atlantic Railroad in 1853 did much to change the character of Haddonfield. The railroad was build across the state to the sea and provided an economical means of transportation for goods produced in southern New Jersey. Jackson Glass works of Atco, John Lucas, paint manufacturer, Judge Porter of Waterford Glass and William Coffin of Windslow glass works formed a corporation, bought the land and laid the tracks. These merchants built their homes in Haddonfield and traveled by train to their businesses in southern New Jersey. The railroads also bought in new trades and tradesmen who built
their homes in Haddonfield.

Significance of Historic District

The Haddonfield Historic District represents a visual history of one of the first Quaker settlements in the old province of West New Jersey. The existing structures present a composite portrait of the prevalent styles of early American Architecture.

The village of Haddonfield grew along the oldest public road in the western division of New Jersey, the Burlington-Salem Road. The road had been from time immemorial the greatest Indian trail from eastern New Jersey and Pennsylvania to the sea.

This great road became the artery for rapid growth. Cooper's Creek was the only thoroughfare to the Delaware River, a highway of commerce. Boats landed with goods from the newly arising commercial center, came up Cooper's Creek as far as the ford. The goods were then unloaded onto wagon trains which traveled the road between Burlington and Salem.

The village of Haddonfield became the center of life for a considerable population. Stores opened, new occupations found foothold. Crafts and industry multiplied as the population grew.

By, 1861 Haddonfield consisted of about 150 dwellings four houses for public worship- Friends, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopal; five mercantile stores, two grist mills, two tanneries and a large woolen factory.

Haddonfield, in 1686, when the Salem Road was completed, was a one-street town and development was along the road, then down the side streets as they were cut through for the growing village. The original boundary of the historic district was drawn to encompass this historic core of the town.
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Historic Preservation Goals

Purpose of Historic Preservation
The mission statement adopted for the Haddonfield Borough Historic Preservation Plan states that the overall purpose for historic preservation in the community is as follows:

*Haddonfield Borough seeks to identify, protect and preserve the community’s historic resources in order to enhance the quality of life and economic well being of current and future generations.*

Summary of Goals
The nine goals outlined below identify the major elements of the historic preservation plan. The ordering of the goals is not meant to indicate a hierarchy of priorities. Instead, it suggests a logical sequencing in order to accomplish the preservation mission. Some of the goals although presently undertaken by the Borough's ongoing preservation effort are restated here formally in this official plan for preservation.

Goals

**Goal 1:** Continue to identify historic resources significant to Haddonfield's past.

**Goal 2:** Continue to review municipal policy for protection of historic resources and continue to implement this policy through effective regulatory and legislative measures.

**Goal 3:** Establish economic incentives to encourage the preservation of historic buildings and neighborhoods.

**Goal 4:** Continue to provide the technical assistance necessary to preserve and improve historic properties.

**Goal 5:** Continue to heighten public awareness of historic preservation in the community and improve preservation education efforts for various audiences.
Goal 6: Maintain and strengthen preservation partnerships between municipal government, state government and federal agencies.

Goal 7: Maintain and strengthen support for historic preservation from individuals, not-for-profit preservation groups, neighborhood organizations, and downtown interests.

Goal 8: Conduct regular review and evaluation of historic preservation initiatives by the historic preservation community.

Goal 9: Adopt strategies to conserve historic neighborhoods which reflect their organic development, historical roles and traditions, modern needs and economic health and stability.
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Past Preservation Efforts

Formation of Preservation Society
The Haddonfield Preservation Society has been at the forefront of the preservation movement in New Jersey. Several forward thinking individuals and the preservation organization have played a key role in making Haddonfield a leader in historic preservation.

Established in 1967, the "Society for the Preservation of Residential and Historic Haddonfield" was incorporated in response to increasing development pressures within the Borough. The 1967-1968 program of the newly formed Preservation Society was as follows
1) To promote new legislation and enforce present laws to preserve Haddonfield's historic and architecturally notable homes and buildings,
2) To maintain and enhance residential property values through out the Borough,
3) To encourage the highest standards of aesthetic beauty in all commercial and residential areas.

Development Pressures - PATCO and Demolitions
Primary development pressures were proposed development of the PATCO high speed line which was envisioned as a threat to the surrounding residential character.

Demolition of several key structures was viewed as a symptom of creeping commercialism. The demolition of an elegant Victorian mansion was a considerable loss to the borough. Containing 28 rooms, this Victorian mansion built in 1873 was demolished in 1964. This elegant mansion was replaced by gas stations, parking lots and buildings of no architectural merit. Also, demolition of the Mac Neil House along King's Highway West in 1967 was another loss to architectural character in the borough. These events created among those sensitive to the cause of historic preservation an impetus to strengthen the resolve to address historic preservation within the Borough.

The historic preservation effort was given impetus by more subtle changes which heightened the fears of creeping commercialism. Alterations which diminished residential quality were permitted under borough ordinances. Residents witnessed erosion of historic character by alterations which permitted asphalt to replace back and front yards and allowed facades to be renovated in ways that diminished original architectural quality.
Striving for Public Acceptance
The preservation society struggled to win public acceptance for historic preservation. One major effort was a symposium entitled "Historic Preservation? Pro and Con". This November 1968 gathering was well attended. Another effort published in March 1970 was a four-page supplement to the Haddon Gazette entitled "Preserving Historic Haddonfield". This pamphlet was distributed to most households in Haddonfield.

The primary goal of the Preservation Society was to promote acceptance of preservation zoning. During the years 1970 and 1971 the Haddon Gazette recounted stories of other historic towns and their experience and success with historic preservation. The stories of New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, Nantucket and Cape May were detailed. The positive experience of these towns served to legitimize and create public support for the preservation effort.

Crisis of Major Demolition
In 1971, the Borough Planning Commission was in the course of updating their Master Plan which contained provisions supporting the Historic Preservation effort. It was during this time that, with the completion of the High-Speed Line, the entire residential block adjacent the line was destined for demolition. This block had been purchased by a Texas real estate conglomerate on a piecemeal basis. Their intention was to demolish the block and create office and apartment uses at high density around the public transportation hub.

The hope of the preservation society was to block the impending demolition through creation of a historic district which encompassed the area and imposition of restrictions on demolition and alteration of historic structures.

A public hearing was held in June 7, 1971 at Borough Hall. There was little opposition and the Planning Board approved the resolution. This decision was forwarded to the Commissioners and despite public support and planning board approval the proposal for a historic preservation district was voted down. The basis for the Commissioners denial was that historic preservation was not legal.

Public Referendum
The Preservation representative then announced that the question would be placed on the November election ballot as a public referendum. In order to qualify for placing on the ballot 700 signatures had to be obtained.

The referendum was held on November 2, 1971 and was approved by 62%
of the vote. As a result of this, the historic district ordinance was passed and halted destruction of significant structures. The district includes nearly 500 homes encompassing the historic core of the town.

National Register Status
The historic district being a locally designated district was still vulnerable to encroachment or destruction by any state, county, or municipally funded or initiated project. For this reason in 1979, the Preservation Society applied for the district to be included in the listing of State and National Register of Historic Properties. This state approval was instrumental in preventing widening of Grove Street and Potter Street. Since these streets are two of the oldest streets in Haddonfield, their National Register status saved them from irreparable alterations to their historic character.

Such designation also enabled qualified properties in the Historic District to obtain tax credits for restoration and rehabilitation.
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Benefits of Historic Preservation

Benefits derived from designating Historic Landmarks and creating Historic Districts are summarized in the following quotation:

"...We seek to preserve because our historic resources are all that physically link us to our past. Some portion of that patrimony must be preserved if we are to recognize who we are, how we became and most important, how we differ from other's of our species.... We preserve historic sites and structures because of their relation to past events, ears, movements and persons that we feel are important to honor and understand... We seek to preserve the architecture and landscapes of the past simply because of their intrinsic value as art.... We seek to preserve our past because we believe in the right of our cities and country sides to be beautiful. (Robert Stipe, Legal Techniques in Historic Preservation. Washington, D.C. National Trust, 10972.)

The importance of historic preservation has been recognized by many preservation experts and the local citizenry of Haddonfield.

Preservation's Impact on the Central Business District
Conversations with local business people regarding the impact of historic preservation on Haddonfield's Central Business District reveal a positive consensus on the benefits of historic preservation.

One local merchant, Stanley Maslowski, proprietor of Jay West along Kings Highway states that he would not have made the substantial investment in improving his place of business within the CBD without the stability ensured by the borough's historic preservation ordinance.

A borough realtor, Guy Elzey III, of Guy Elzey and Son, on Ellis Street states that Haddonfield's business district's success is not an accident. He believes it is the result of the support by the historic preservation commission of a unified colonial theme that exists within the borough central business district. He also commented that in Haddonfield, unlike the suburbs, you don't just live in the house you live in the entire neighborhood.

Merchant Hamid Houshiarnejad, of Kings Highway East stated that the historic character of Haddonfield gives it an advantage over other commercial areas in South Jersey. He commented that it is the only true downtown in South Jersey. The fact that it has retained its historic character and charm gives it an advantage over
other commercial areas in appealing to a more select clientele.

Importance of Local Districts
Landmarks and historic districts that are part of the Federal National Register Program are provided protection from adverse development impacts which may result from projects supported by federal funds.

However, such protection does not extend to privately financed or even other non-federal public agency initiated development activity. The federal program provides no protection from building demolition or inappropriate alterations. Therefore, it is important that locally designated districts be considered to protect significant local historic resources.

One of the broadest views offered in response to the question of why establish a historic district, has been presented by Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. in his book Historic Preservation in Inner City Areas - A Manual of Practice. Mr. Ziegler offers a number of reasons for pursuing the creation of local historic preservation districts which are paraphrased here.

a. Preservation activities are positive in nature and bolster public morale. The recognition of intrinsic value in neighborhoods, supports basic human pride in the person and the living environment.

b. Preservation offers aesthetic satisfaction. The retention of buildings of architectural value offers a pleasant experience for the observer.

c. Preservation provides financial benefits. Restored neighborhoods stabilize property values and therefore tax revenues for a community. Restored neighborhoods and sites also encourage tourism which has been demonstrated in many towns and cities across the country.

d. Preservation unifies community forces. Many diverse factions in a community will unite behind a historic preservation project creating a positive community attitude by uniting public and private organizations.

It is well established that historic preservation efforts result in the stabilization or improvement of property values, stimulates the upgrading and maintenance of structures, provides more employment and less dependence on increasingly scarce resources and generally adds to the quality of life and enjoyment of residents and workers. Many times it is actually less expensive to rehabilitate a structure than it is to build a new one. The consequences of not preserving within a district can result in the loss of a special identity or character. Historic landmarks that are surrounded by new contemporary buildings or left over buildings of little distinction can result in a loss of character.
List of Benefits to Historic Preservation
A letter to the editor of the Haddon Gazette from the Haddonfield Preservation Society Executive Committee dated March 19, 1987 outlines ten top benefits that historic district zoning has brought to Haddonfield. The ten benefits are outlined below.

1. Halted the widening of Potter Street, two feet on each side, and the cutting down of over 100 trees by the State Department of Transportation. Historic District listing on the national Register prohibits using Federal, State or County funds for a negative impact on Historic Districts without a public hearing.

2. Enabled at least four properties to restore and rehabilitate the structures with incentives of 25 percent rehabilitation tax credit (including the historic rehabilitation of Gibb’s Tavern on King’s Highway).

3. Slowed down the "Gambler's Express" to 30 miles an hour through the Haddonfield Historic District to minimize vibration which could damage old foundations of historic properties in the area.

4. Saved the entire residential block on west King's Highway, from Linden Avenue to Estaugh Avenue and back to Euclid Avenue from total demolition for high rise apartments and office buildings.

5. Prevented the historic Carey house #38 Haddon Avenue from being demolished for an enlarged parking lot for an office building.

6. Prevented demolition of a fine Victorian home at #49 Chestnut Street for a 74 car parking lot for a bank which bought this property.

7. Revitalized King’s Highway "Main Street" business area.

8. Halted demolition of historic properties. Five of the most distinguished 19th century houses were demolished in the ten years prior to enactment of the ordinance.

9. Halted inappropriate alterations within the historic district to maintain a harmonious environment.

10. Insured that new construction and additions are compatible with the original structure.

In concrete terms, the above list summarizes the results achieved through historic district zoning in Haddonfield Borough. The benefits of historic preservation within the borough are aesthetic, educational and economic. Haddonfield has been cited as a model in the State. Preservation of the CBD is used as an example of "period integrity" being key to reviving the historic "Main Street". These tributes are a substantial testament to Haddonfield’s historic preservation efforts.
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Historic Resources Survey

Outlining the process for considering historic structures is important because it guards against singling out some owners of historic structures for designation while other owners with equally meritorious properties escape consideration. The courts may call such selective zoning a violation of the fundamental legal principles of "due process" and "equal protection of the law".

Response to Crisis
The process whereby Haddonfield considered areas for designation as landmarks and districts is basically in response to crisis. Historic preservation efforts were originally focused on areas that were considered most endangered. The demolitions along Kings Highway as well as the PATCO High Speed Line's development in Haddonfield were the crisis events that gave the focus and impetus to the historic preservation effort. With abatement of the original crisis situations via enactment of the Historic District Ordinance the borough is now considering other avenues of historic preservation. Thus, the borough is engaged in an ongoing process to survey and eventually consider for designation all potential landmarks and all potential historic districts.

Pre-1929 Historically Significant
The Historic Preservation Commission established 1929 as the date from which to begin evaluating structures as historic. This date was established in response to the National Register cut-off of a 50 year old structure as being the earliest structure considered eligible. Since the National Register status was sought in 1979, any structure 50 years old as of 1979 was included in the survey. The Borough might consider revising this timeline approach to preservation by updating the districts with buildings from 1945, which would be 50 years from 1995.

The Borough's past approach to historic preservation was primarily crisis oriented. The Borough should articulate a more systematic means for addressing historic preservation. The Borough has a history of being pro-active in terms of historic preservation. This pro-active quality should be carried forth into other areas where conservation of local character may be the goal rather than strict adherence to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines.
Guidelines for Evaluating Historic Districts

The Local Historic District Ordinance designates the Haddonfield National Register Historic District as the borough's first historic district. It establishes the following guidelines for expanding the initial district. The building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object or district may be designated for preservation if it:

Criteria for Designation

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object or district may be designated for preservation if it:

a. Has significant character, interest or value as part of the heritage or cultural characteristics of the municipality, state or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past; or

b. Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the municipality, state or nation; or

c. Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style; or

d. Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen; or

e. Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social or cultural development of the municipality, state, or nation; or

f. Contains elements of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

g. Is part of or related to a park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to a historic, cultural or architectural motif; or

h. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to pre-history or history; or

i. Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community.
Recommendation

The language of the ordinance allows for the expansion of the district, but does not address the addition of separate, disconnected districts nor the designation of individual properties. As a result, ten historic properties are presently "considered as part of the District" though they are outside its boundaries. The ordinance language should be modified to provide for designation of other historic districts and individual properties.

The Township should consider taking under a conservation ordinance those districts or streetscapes that abut and buffer the Historic District or those that have unique characteristics or environments but by reason of their later date fail to meet the highest standards for designation under the historic district ordinance.
The National Register District

The Haddonfield Historic District was listed on the State Register in April 1980 and on the National Register in July 1982. The nomination cites the historic district for its significance in Architecture, Commerce, Education, Military, Politics/Government and Religion. It further describes it as one of the finest collection of 19th century buildings in Camden County.

Physical Description

The State and National Register boundaries are those established under local Historic District Ordinance in 1971. The district extends the length of Kings Highway from the Cooper Creek on the north through the commercial area (from Colonial Avenue to Lindon Avenue) to Chews Landing Road on the south. The boundaries widen to include portions of Grove Street and Haddon Avenue on the north and the Victorian residential areas of Washington Avenue and Warlock Road on the south.

It includes 483 predominantly brick and frame buildings on 203 acres representing a cross section of styles from the 18th century through the 1920's. This including fine examples of Georgian, Federal, Greek and Gothic Revivals and the Victorian styles - Italianate, Victorian Gothic Second Empire, Queen Anne - Neo-Classical and Colonial Revival. Of these structures, 98% of the buildings contribute, 80% are residential. Though it includes several early 20th century structures and late 19th century neighborhoods, most reflect the development of the borough prior to 1875.

Four District buildings are individually listed on the State and National Register. They include the Indian King Tavern, constructed in 1750 by Mathias Aspden, Greenfield Hall and the Hipped Roofed House at 343-345 Kings Highway and the Haddon Fortnightly Building (formerly the 1st Methodist Church).
Historical Background

In 1698, John Haddon purchased 500 acres of land on Cooper Creek where the Burlington/Salem Road (now King's Highway) forded the stream. The site had both natural and man-made attributes. In tide, the creek was navigable by flatboat to the Delaware River and Philadelphia; its feeder streams could be dammed for water power. The major intersecting east/west route (later Haddon Avenue) was a well-traveled Lenni Lenape trail.

Haddon sent his nineteen year old daughter Elizabeth in 1701 to occupy the site she later named "Haddon Field". The entourage of servants and tradesmen she brought with her formed the nucleus of a village. In-1702 she married John Estaugh, a Quaker minister and in 1712/13 built a brick mansion where she lived as the matriarch of town until her death in 1762 at the age of eighty-two.

In 1721 John Haddon gave land for a Quaker Meeting House and Burial Ground near Kings Highway and Haddon Avenue thus establishing the formal focus of the village. Though it began as a farming community, Haddonfield had by the Revolutionary War grown to become the largest village and trade center in what is now Camden County.

Because of its location on Kings Highway, Haddonfield was visited frequent by both British and Revolutionary armies moving between battles and in and out of Philadelphia. Light Horse Harry Lee, Generals Anthony Wayne and Dan Morgan, General Nathaniel Greene, Count Pulaski and Marquis de Lafayette were quartered in the Indian King. Count Donlop of the British army was quartered in the Gill House. The Friends Meeting House was used as a hospital by both sides. The Indian King served as a meeting place for the Council of Safety; the seat of the New Jersey legislature during portions of 1777.

Haddonfield experienced modest but consistent growth following the Revolution. In 1853, the Camden & Atlantic Railroad was extended to the village (and later to what is now Atlantic City). A commercial core expanded along Kings Highway and residential subdivisions were soon laid out on adjacent farmland. Designed to attracted a professional and merchant class seeking the pastoral surrounds away
from urban problems, these residential ventures were not widely successful until the fourth quarter of the century. In the decades following its incorporation in 1875, the borough's colonial core became surrounded by suburban development much of which continued to the west and south through the 1920s and 30s.

Although the original National Register nomination focuses on the earliest structures in town, some fine examples of later nineteenth century architecture are included within its boundaries. The residential neighborhoods on Warwick Road and Washington Avenue have a fine collection of Victorian houses from Italianate villas to large Queen Anne and Shingle Style mansions. Many were designed by prominent Philadelphia architects including a house on Washington Street by Samuel Sloane. Later public buildings on Kings Highway include the Neo-Classical Township Building and the Haddonfield Public Library, 1917.

Recommendation

Review and update as necessary the list of contributing buildings found in the original ordinance, delineating Key, Contributing and Non-Contributing structures.
Properties Included within the Initial Ordinance District

East Atlantic Avenue

B37: 10-14
B47: 1

South Atlantic Avenue

B36: 3

Belmont Avenue

B23: 16

Centre Street

B39: 21-31, 31.01-31.06, 32
B40: 1, 11-16, 16.01, 17, 18

Chestnut Street

B34: 32-38, 38.01, 40-43, 45, 52, 53
B35: 8-15
B37: 5-8, 15
B38: 1, 1.01, 2-4, 4.01, 5, 6

Clement Street

B21: 11, 13
B22: 1

Colonial Avenue

B16: 2, 2.01, 3-6, 6.01-6.03
B17: 15, 15.02-15.05, 16-24
B18: 11, 13-21
B19: 9, 11-14, 14.01, 14.02

West Cottage Avenue

B74: 23, 23.01, 24, 24.01, 25

Fowler Avenue

B33: 50
Friends Avenue

B15: 9.02, 11
B16: 1
B18: 1.01-1.10

Grove Street

B11: 7
B13.01: 1.02-1.04, 6-14
B17: 1-5, 5.01, 6-11, 25-27
B19: 3.01, 4, 5, 5.01, 6-8

Haddon Avenue

B15: 2-5
B20: 8.01, 9, 10, 13
B22: 1, 1.01, 2, 3
B33: 8, 9, 59
B33.01: 6.01, 55, 59

Kings Highway East

B13: 24, 25, 27, 28.01, 29, 39.01, 46, 48
B13.01: 1, 1.01, 2, 3
B14: 2
B15: 1, 7-9, 9.01, 10
B18: 1, 1.11-11.13, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 10.01
B19: 1-3
B20: 1-3, 3.01, 4, 5, 12
B21: 1.01, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20
B23: 1-5, 6.01, 7, 8.01, 30
B26: 10, 13, 15, 34, 35, 37, 38
B27: 1, 1.01, 2, 2.01-2.03, 3, 6
B31: 1
B33:  8.01, 10-12, 14-20, 57, 58, 60
B33.01:  1, 1.01, 2, 3, 5, 8, 58
B34:  1, 2, 2.01, 3-10, 46-49
B35:  1-6, 8.01
B118:  72, 72.01, 73, 74.01, 75, 77.01-77.02, 78, 78.02, 7 8.04, 79, 80, 80.01, 95, 97

Kings Highway West

B76:  6-11, 11.01, 12, 12.01, 26
B77:  5-10, 33-35, 61
B94:  1-3
B105:  10-13
B117:  1-3, 5, 9.01, 10.01, 31-33

Lake Street

B11:  3, 3.01, 4.01, 5, 5.01, 6.01, 6.02, 8, 15, 17-23, 26-28
B16:  1, 7
B17:  11, 14, 15.01, 15.06

Lincoln Avenue

B34:  27-31, 51
B35:  16
B36:  3
B37:  1-4, 4.01

Mechanics Street

B20:  6-8, 8.01, 14
B21:  12.01, 13, 17

Morehouse Lane

B26:  12

East Park Avenue

B38:  7.01, 13
B47:  1-7
B48:  18-20

West Park Avenue

B74:  10-12, 12.01, 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potter Street</td>
<td>B75: 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B76: 18.01, 20-22, 22.01, 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B33: 21-23, 23.01, 24, 25, 25.01, 26-32, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Street</td>
<td>B21: 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B22: 1.01, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B118: 1, 1.01, 2, 3.01-3.03, 3.05, 3.06, 58-60, 64, 64.01, 65, 65.01, 66-70, 89, 92, 93, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Road</td>
<td>B72: 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B74: 1-9, 26, 26.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B76: 1-3, 3.01, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B77: 8.01, 11-16, 16.01, 17-19, 21, 22, 24, 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>B73: 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B74: 15-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B75: 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B76: 13-17, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willits Avenue</td>
<td>B18: 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Expansion to the District

The proposed extension of the Historic District is based on a draft National Register nomination prepared by consultants Algie & Regojo and modified by the Historic Preservation Commission in consultation with the Planning Board, Spring 1993. The extension include 809 buildings; 90% are contributing. The vast majority of the structures are residential (10% are twins); most were built after 1875.

The modification extends the present historic district boundaries in four areas - on the west side of the District along Kings Highway West, north across Mt. Vernon Avenue, on the south side extending Warwick Road and Washington Avenue, on the east extending Chestnut and Walnut Streets and to the northeast extending Potter Street and adding Roberts Avenue.

Physical Description

The extension consists of two basic types. Those on the west side include building types and periods represented in the present Historic District, but are generally simpler, more modest vernacular homes of workers and tradesmen. They stand in contrast to the more elaborate, well-preserved, high style residential and commercial buildings in the District.

The extensions on the south and west are middle and upper middle class neighborhoods of single family frame residences on broad, tree-lined streets. These were the homes of businessmen and professionals. They range from the more modest, speculative Victorian houses built on newly subdivided land to larger custom houses built in the late 1880s and early 90s. They include elaborate Queen Anne, Shingle and Colonial and Tutor Revival houses as well as vernacular four-squares and bungalows build through the 1930s.

Historical Background

While the existing historic district is characterized primarily by the development of Haddonfield as a commercial and cultural center in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Extension represents its development as a suburban community after 1875. It portrays Haddonfield as a middle class residential community driven by
improved transportation links to west. It encompasses the large and small scale residential subdivisions that grew up on the edges of the borough as it expanded outward from its base along Kings Highway redirecting its focus to Philadelphia from the surrounding agricultural areas.

Recommendation

Evaluate each structure within the proposed extension areas to determine its significance as a Key, Contributing or Non-Contributing building.
Expansion of the District to the West

- West Haddonfield: Kings Highway from the Speed Line west to Hinchman Avenue, north of Kings Highway on West End, Estaugh and Lindon Avenues to Mt. Vernon Avenue, on Westmont to Elm Avenue. Plus a single property at 35 Chews Landing Road.

This area of the borough was developed after 1893 by the West Haddonfield Land Company on a portion of the Redman family farm. The district is composed predominantly of late-Victorian middle class single family detached, frame houses. Styles include Stick, Queen Anne and Colonial Revival with some 20th century bungalows and four-squares. The larger residences along Kings Highway form the western gateway to the district. Constructed in 1834, the Thomas Redman farmhouse is the earliest property in the district; it is individually cited in the existing District ordinance.

Properties included in the Expansion - West Haddonfield

Avondale Avenue

  B93: 3, 8
  B94: 3.01, 4 - 7

Briarcliff Court

  B116: 5, 5.01-5.03, 5.06-5.14

Chews Landing

  B77: 3

Elm Avenue

  B111: 2
  B122: 3

Estaugh Avenue

  B105: 4-9, 10.01
  B106: 5.04, 5.05?, 5.07, 6-8
  B107: 10.01
  B114: 2, 2.01
  B116: 1, 2, 2.01, 3
  B117: 20 - 30
Euclid Avenue

B94: 8, 9, 11.01, 11.02, 11.03
B95: 2, 21, 23
B104: 1, 14 - 17
B105: 2, 3, 19, 20
B106: 9, 9.01, 10-16
B116: 4-7, 7.01-7.04
B117: 14 - 19
B119: 8.01-8.05, 9 - 13
B134: 11-13, 14.01

Kings Highway West

B92: 1, 3, 3.01, 4, 4.02, 6-10, 15, 11.01, 18, 20
B93: 1-3, 5, 6, 7
B117: 4, 5.01

Lindon Avenue

B115: 7, 7.01
B116: 7.05
B117: 6 - 13
B119: 1.01, 14-20
B134: 1-8

Mt. Vernon Avenue

B107: 1-2, 2.01, 10-12, 14
B108: 5-10
B113: 1.01, 8, 9, 9.01, 10-13
B114: 1, 3-7
B120: 1-3
B121: 4-7

Redman Avenue

B103: 7
B104: 8
B106: 1, 1.01, 2-4, 4.01, 25
B107: 5-9
B114: 8, 8.01, 9, 9.01, 10-12
B115: 1-6
B119: 1-4
B120: 6-8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truman Avenue</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B115:</td>
<td>8-13, 13.01-13.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B116:</td>
<td>3.01, 8, 8.01-8.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West End Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B94:</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B103:</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B104:</td>
<td>8-13, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B105:</td>
<td>1, 13.01, 14-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B106:</td>
<td>17, 18, 18.01, 19-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B107:</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westmont Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B120:</td>
<td>4, 5, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B122:</td>
<td>3-5, 5.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B124:</td>
<td>1, 1.01, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B125:</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B127:</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodland Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B124:</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expansion of the District to the South

- Warwick Road and Washington Avenue: South of District on Warwick to Hickory Lane, on Washington to Jefferson Avenue.

The houses on Washington Street constitute one of the most successful development (from 1875 to 1929) after the introduction of the railroad in the 1880s. The area includes upper middle class housing with large residences on Warwick Road and Washington Avenue and more modest houses on the side streets. Development moved southerly from Kings Highway, progressing from 19th century Italianate villas and Queen Anne houses within the District to early 20th century Colonial and Tutor Revival residences at the southernmost end of the Extension.

Properties included in Expansion - Warwick/Washington

West Cottage Avenue

B71: 6-10
B72: 5, 5.01, 6, 6.01, 7, 7.01, 8, 9, 19

LaFayette Avenue

B66: 5, 6, 10
B68: 5, 7, 9, 11

Mountwell Avenue

B68: 6, 8, 10, 12
B70: 5, 7, 9, 11

West Summit Avenue

B70: 6, 8, 10, 12

Warwick Road

B64: 1, 3, 16, 17
B66: 1-3
B68: 1-4
B70: 1-4
B77: 23.01
B77.01: 22, 23, 24.01, 25, 26
B81.02: 10, 11.01, 13
B81.03: 12, 14.02
B81.04: 14.01
| B65: | 1 |
| B66: | 8, 9 |
| B67: | 1-3, 10 |
| B68: | 13-15 |
| B69: | 1-3, 12 |
| B70: | 13-16 |
| B71: | 1-5 |
| B72: | 10, 11, 11.01, 12, 13, 14.01 |
Expansion of the District to the East

- Chestnut Street and Walnut Streets: South from the District on Chestnut to Cottage Avenue, on Walnut to West Park Avenue

Residences in this area were built in the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century on lots laid out in the 1850s by the unsuccessful Haddonfield Land Improvement Company. The subdivision lay fallow until the 1880s when sufficient demand for housing was generated by the improved railroad service to the borough. They are generally modest frame dwellings decorated with Stick and Italianate details. The smaller, regularly spaced residences nearer the railroad tracks were originally occupied by railroad employees and clerks and salesmen commuting to Philadelphia. Houses east of the tracks were erected rather more haphazardly by numerous smaller developers.

Properties included in the Expansion - Chestnut/Walnut

Chestnut Street

B47: 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25-27
B48: 11-17

Ellis Street

B33.01: 47, 48, 51-54, 54.01, 56
B39: 1-6, 6.01

Lincoln Avenue

B39: 19, 20, 33
B40: 2, 3

East Park Avenue

B40: 9, 10
B45: 1, 2, 25
B46: 1, 2, 2.01, 3, 3.01, 4, 4.01, 5, 5.01, 5.02, 6, 11
Walnut Street

B39: 9.01, 10, 11, 11.01, 12-18
B40: 4, 4.01, 4.02, 5-8
B41: 1.01-1.04, 21, 21.01, 22-24, 24.01, 25
B42: 1-6
Expansion of the District to the Northeast

- Lower Potter Street and Roberts Avenue: South of the District on Potter to Ellis Street, on Roberts Avenue to the curve and Belmont Avenue

This area was developed as a part of the logical growth of Haddonfield in the mid-nineteenth century. Unlike the other areas of town proposed as part of a district Extension, this portion of town was not entirely dependent on the railroad and speculative land subdivision. It was home to tradesmen and skilled workers many of whom maintained shops on the premises. Masons, teamsters and unskilled laborers lived on lower Potter.

Potter Street is one of the borough's oldest street deriving its name from a pottery established there in 1805. Mixed among bungalows built there in the 1920s are some of its earliest residences (dating back to 1813). This area later became the site of a small community of black farm laborers and domestics. Though developed after 1910, Roberts includes three houses relocated from Kings Highway and two properties (the Daniel Fortiner House, 8 Roberts Avenue, 1820 and the Nathan Willits House, 22 Roberts Avenue, 1836) are individually designated as District buildings under the ordinance.

Properties included in the Extension - Potter/Roberts

Belmont Avenue

B23: 6.02-6.04, 11.01, 12, 13, 14, 14.01-14.03, 15

Fowler Avenue

B33: 33, 34, 36, 47
B32: 6, 6.01-6.05, 7

Potter Street

B24: 5, 6
B29: 1-3, 9, 10
B32: 8-14, 17-21, 23-26
Roberts Avenue

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>16, 16.01, 17-25, 26.01, 29, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>8-11, 11.02, 11.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>4, 4.01, 4.02, 16.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individually Designated Structures

The following properties are designated in the present ordinance as district buildings though they lie outside its boundaries.

- William Estaugh Hopkins House, "Birdwood," Hopkins Lane, 1794
- Birdwood Farmer's Cottage, 405 Birdwood Avenue, 1796
- Elizabeth Haddon's Brew House, 201 Wood Lane, 1713

Originally used as a manufactory for medicines, the brick brew is the oldest structure now standing in Haddonfield. It was expanded from a one story structure following a fire in 1842.

- Samuel Wood House, 201 Wood Lane, 1842

This two story brick house was built on the foundations of the original Elizabeth Estaugh Hopkins House which burned to the ground in 1842.

- Campbell House, 540 Coles Mill Road
- Original Gill Country House, 80 Lane of Acres, 1748

The original two-room portion of house has been expanded with two-story wings, one matching the original.

- Needles House, 592 Coles Mill Road

The following properties are presently outside the District boundaries, but fall within the boundaries of the proposed Extension.

- Daniel Fortiner House, 8 Roberts Avenue, 1820
This house was relocated from 202 Kings Highway in 1949 to make room for the Sachs Store in

- Redman House, 140 Westmont Avenue, 1834

- Nathan Willits House, 22 Roberts Avenue, 1836
This house was moved from 428 Kings Highway in 1914
Proposed Conservation Zoning

Conservation Districts are areas, usually residential neighborhoods, with certain identifiable attributes, embodied in architecture, urban design, and history, that are subject to special zoning or land-use regulations. The Conservation District is proposed to protect these areas from inappropriate development by regulating new construction. A Conservation District is proposed to protect neighborhoods or districts that have distinct character but that do not qualify for historic district status or have lost some of their integrity through incompatible additions and new development.

The following areas of the borough contain groups of buildings that either protect the flanks of the District or warrant recognition as local neighborhoods. Two basic categories are included here.

- Stand Alone Districts and Streetscapes

This classification includes those areas of the borough with collections of structures generally within the period of significance of the original Historic District and proposed Extension but which are not contiguous to the District. They may be clusters of building or unique streetscapes containing structures constructed prior to 1940 but which in quality or state of preservation fall short of State and National Register standards. They may, for instance, suffer from a higher percentage of modern intrusions or modified buildings.

- Buffer Zones and View Corridors

This category includes areas immediately adjacent to the District or Extension that act as buffer zones or help define major view corridors or points of entry into the historic district. They may contain a high percentage of modern buildings, but retain a character sympathetic to the historic district or they may define a view terminus from within the district. As a rule, such areas will not be of sufficient historic value to be considered for district designation.

The purpose of conservation zones in this instance is to protect neighborhood rather than individual structures. Proposed work within such areas should be judged by the compatibility design standards presently in the ordinance rather than the stricter Secretary of Interior Standards.

The following areas are generally described only; their precise boundaries need to be refined in detail. These are intended as suggested study areas; final boundaries will likely be considerably more limited, especially in the larger areas identified such as those along and behind Haddon Avenue and Grove Street.
Districts and Streetscapes

- Haddon Avenue to Grove Street, Hopkins to Marne to Maple Avenues

A collection of predominantly 1920s and 30s houses that represent the next phase of suburban development on the western edges of the district. Individual blocks include modern infill buildings, but the tree-lined streetscape is contiguous and uniform. It includes representative examples of middle class bungalows, four squares, craftsmen houses as well as Colonial and Dutch Revival residences.

Properties Included in the Study Area

Ardmore Avenue

B11.12, 11.13, 11.14, 11.15

Hawthorne Avenue

B11.05, 11.06, 11.07, 11.08

Hopkins Lane

B11, 11.01, 11.02

Marne Avenue

B11.14, B11.15, B11.16, B11.17, B11.18

Merion Avenue

B11.03, 11.04, 11.05, 11.06

Rhoades Avenue

B11.07, 11.08, 11.09, 11.10, 11.11

Wayne Avenue

B11.09, 11.10, 11.11, 11.12, 11.13
Windsor Avenue

B11.01, 11.02, 11.03, 11.04

- Hinchman Avenue, Chews Landing Road to Station Avenue

A small collection of substantial, pre-1930, architect designed residences on a tree-lined street. House types include Mediterranean Revival and Coswald Cottage styles not represented in the District.

B79. 80, 89

- Warwick Road to Chews Landing Roads, Summit Avenue to Bellevue Avenue

A collection of predominantly middle class Colonial and Dutch Revival houses that define 1930s suburban development on the southern edges of the District. Individual examples are not outstanding and blocks may contain modern infill buildings, but with its tree-lined streets and uniform setbacks, the neighborhood forms a visual whole.

Properties Included in the Study Area

Bellevue Avenue

B81.04, 81.05, 82, 83, 84

Evans Avenue

B77.01, 79, 80, 81.01

Hickory Lane

B81, 81.04, 81.05

Jefferson Avenue

B80, 81, 81.01

Mountwell Avenue

B77.01, 79, 80, 81.01

Overhill Road

B81.01, 81.02, 81.03
West Summit Avenue

B77, 77.01, 79

• Beechwood Avenue to Windsor Avenue, Grove Street to Brynmaur and Birdwood

A collection of predominantly 1920s and 30s houses in a well-defined suburban setting. Individual blocks contain modern infill buildings, but the tree-lined streetscape is contiguous and uniform. It includes representative examples of middle class bungalows, four squares and Colonial Revival residences.

Properties Included in the Study Area

Beechwood Avenue

B1, 4

Birdwood

B2, 6, 8

Hawthorn Avenue

B5, 7

Maple Avenue

B4, 5

Merion Avenue

B7, 8

Windsor Avenue

B8, 8.01

These following areas were identified by historical consultants Algie & Regojo in their 1993 report as part of an extended district but are not currently proposed for inclusion. Though they are immediately adjacent to the original and extended districts, they are not themselves threatened nor do they offer protection to the edges of the District. They are generally neighborhoods late in the period of significance or of reduced integrity.
These Areas Include

- Lee Avenue
  B27

- Evergreen Lane
  B13, 13.01

- Peyton Avenue to Avondale, Mt. Vernon Avenue to Euclid

Modest 1920s and 30s residential area surrounding and focusing on the Elizabeth Haddon School on Redman Avenue. The Colonial Revival school forms a hub for a collection of bungalow, four-square and Craftsmen houses as well as some earlier Victorian residences. Though the area abuts the proposed Extension, it is late in the period of significance.

Properties Included in the Area

Avondale Avenue

  B91.07, 91.08

(Elizabeth Haddon School)

  B96

Mt. Vernon Avenue

  B97, 102

Peyton Avenue

  B95, 103, 104

Redman Avenue

  B95, 103, 104
Buffer Zones and View Corridors

- South side of Kings Highway West, Chews Landing Road to Hinchman Avenue

This district of predominantly modern residences (with some historic houses intermixed) defines the major southwestern entry into the Historic District. The area faces the District which runs its length on the north side of Kings Highway and with it creates a tree-lined corridor consistent with the historic character of the neighborhood.

B79, 79.01

- Chews Landing Road, Kings Highway to West Summit Avenue

Some historic (period) houses are mixed in among post-depression structures. The whole forms a major entry corridor from the east acting both as a buffer to the District and definition of its edge.

B79, 79.01, 79.02, 80, 81, 81.05, 85, 86, 88.01, 88.03, 88.04

- North side of Ellis Street, Kings Highway to Fowler Avenue

This area fills a void between the existing District and the proposed Extension in the Potter Street/Fowler Avenue area, the eastern portal to the District. Though its structures are not of great merit, it offers some continuity on a major entry street already significantly diminished and defoliated.

B33

- Jefferson Avenue, Warwick Road to east of Washington Avenue

This group of early twentieth century residences has been omitted from the Extension. However, the cluster defines the southern terminus of Washington Street and is highly visible from within the Historic District.

B64, 64.01, 66

- Kings Highway to Euclid, Tanner Street to Linden Avenue

This area includes the PATCO Station and parking lots as well as a few structures on Wilkins and North Atlantic Avenues. While the buildings and surroundings are of little consequence, the area connects a void between
two arms of the Historic District. Though unregulated, it faces onto a highly visible stretch of Kings Highway in the center of the District.

B36, 118, 134
District Photographs

18th c
Indian King 233 Kings
Guard Houses 258-260 Kings
Friends Meeting Lake

Federal
William Githens 19 Potter
John Clement Houses 227 Kings
Henry-Pennypacker House 255 Kings
J.E. Hopkins House 65 Haddon
Greenfield Hall 38 Haddon

Greek
Haddon Fortnightly Club

Italianate
Garret-Reybold House 120 Warwick

Second Empire
Samuel Wilkins Houses 51-53 Kings West

Gothic
Judge John Clement House 264 Kings East
Baptist Chapel 402 Kings East

Victorian
200 Washington (Samuel Sloan)

Gothic
Queen Anne Frederick Sutton House 212 Warwick

Neo-classical
Borough Hall
Haddonfield Public Library
Extension Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stick Style</td>
<td>412 Washington</td>
<td>Henry Scovel House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>247 Kings West John Hillman House</td>
<td>Robert Marple architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle Style</td>
<td>304 Redman Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Colonial</td>
<td>Clement Remington House 221 Euclid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>G. Franklin Davis House 140 West End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Revival</td>
<td>585 Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four square</td>
<td>Clement Britton House 213 Euclid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow</td>
<td>226 Avondale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservation Area Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outlying Areas</td>
<td>Streetscapes with Infills (with Elizabeth Haddon School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchman</td>
<td>Coswald Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zones</td>
<td>Chews Landing, Kings Highway West, Washington Street toward Jefferson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6

Legal Basis for Historic Preservation Plan

New Jersey Land Use Law
New Jersey's Municipal Land Use Law states that historic preservation is optional. However, the state planning act specifically requires that a historic preservation element must be adopted before a community adopts and enforces a historic preservation ordinance. Since Haddonfield presently has a historic preservation ordinance in place a plan is needed to provide a framework for enforcement. Providing the legal basis for the preservation plan helps when later challenges to the plan emerge.

Specifically, the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law requires that if a municipality designates and regulates historic districts, the Comprehensive Plan must contain a historic preservation plan element.

§ C.40:55D-65.1 Historic Designations in Zoning Ordinances
"A zoning ordinance may designate and regulate historic sites or districts and provide design criteria and guidelines therefor. ... After July 1, 1994, all historic sites and historic districts designated in the zoning ordinance shall be based on identifications in the historic preservation plan element of the master plan."

§ C.40:55D-28 - Master Plan Preparation; Contents; Modification
"The Master Plan shall generally comprise ... were appropriate, the following elements... (.0) A historic preservation plan element: (a) indicating the location and significance of historic sites and historic districts; (b) identifying the standards used to assess worthiness for historic site or district identification; and (c) analyzing the impact of each component and element of the master plan on the preservation of historic sites and districts."

Supreme Court Decision
On a broader level, the generally legality of historic preservation zoning was addressed by the Supreme Court in 1978. The case was Penn Central Transportation Company v. New York City, 438 U.S. 104,98 S. Ct. 2646 (1978). In that case, the Supreme Court for the first time recognized that protection of historic resources was a legitimate exercise of "police power". The owners of Grand Central Terminal were denied their proposal to construct a 50 story office building above Grand Central Terminal.

In their decision, the Supreme Court was strongly influenced by the comprehensive way in which the New York City law embodied a comprehensive plan to preserve structures of historic or aesthetic interest wherever they might be found in the city, and, as noted, over 400 landmarks and 31 historic districts had
been designated pursuant to the plan. This decision points to the heightened importance of the historic survey as a tool for validating the historic preservation effort.
Section 7

Master Plan Comparison

Introduction
To assess the impact of each Master Plan component on the preservation of existing and proposed historic sites and districts advanced by this historic preservation element an analysis was undertaken of the Borough’s 1984 Master Plan. Generally speaking, the Borough’s Master Plan elements are complimentary to the preservation of significant historic resources.

The current Master Plan was developed in 1984. The plan contains proposals for the following:
1. Land Use Plan
2. Housing Plan
3. Circulation Plan
4. Business Area Plan
5. Utility Service Plan
6. Community Facilities Plan
7. Energy Conservation and Stormwater Management Plan

These various plan elements are addressed in terms of their impact on historic preservation.

The prior Master Plan completed in 1984 by Carl Lindbloom, gave support to the historic preservation program but did not contain a specific element for Historic Preservation. The previous Master Plan completed in 1972 by planning advisor Herbert Smith Associates also provided support for the establishment of the Historic District zoning.

The Historic District Ordinance was enacted in November, 1971. This ordinance required that all demolitions and unsightly alterations of historic or architecturally significant structures be halted within the historic district. All new buildings had to be compatible in terms of basic design. The Haddonfield Historic District, was entered into the National Register on July 21, 1982 and thus was deemed the first Haddonfield National Register Historic District.

Master Plan Elements

1. Land Use Element

The Land Use Plan does not specifically address historic district boundaries although the district was established in 1984, that is, the time the plan was developed. The land use plan describes a typical balanced
community with a core area of commercial, community serving and higher density residential uses surrounded by residential development with higher densities adjacent to the core area services. The historic preservation plan complements this balanced community concept by reinforcing the existing historic settlement pattern of commercial center of town with residential surrounding these uses.

a. Preservation Overlay Zone
The Land Development Ordinance and Master Plan should be revised to detail the boundaries of the historic district as a preservation overlay zone. By delineating an overlay zone both documents be consistent and would formally recognize the boundaries of the historic district.

b. "Contextualism" in Historic In-Fill
The Borough's new construction in-fill guidelines could be strengthened. More specific guidelines which support contextual new development in the Historic District would promote development that is in character with the surrounding neighborhood. In order to address this incompatibility, the Borough might use the following principles for reviewing new construction in historic districts.

New buildings should not imitate past architectural styles; they should reflect the era of their own construction; since it is usually impractical to accurately imitate architecture of the past and since it creates pseudo-old buildings. Since construction in a historic district has usually taken place continuously from the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a variety of building types and styles result, which demonstrates changes in building tastes and technology over the years. New buildings should continue this tradition while complementing and being compatible with other buildings.

Currently, the Borough zoning ordinance contains general regulations for additions and in-fill in the Historic District. A more specific and visual set of guidelines may be provided as an appendix to the zoning ordinance which addresses the scale and volume of in-fill development. Design guidelines should be developed to support "contextualism"; that is new buildings must meld with the old. One such visual guide for in-fill development borrowed from Salt Lake City, Utah's Historic District Design Guidelines for New Construction is outlined below.
Historic District Design Guidelines for New Construction

HEIGHT
Consider - Relating the overall height of new construction to that of adjacent structures. Construct new buildings to a height roughly equal to the average height of existing buildings from the historic period on and across the street.

Avoid - New construction that greatly varies in height (too high or too low) from older buildings in the vicinity.

MASSING
Consider - Breaking up uninteresting box like forms into smaller, varied masses such as are common on most buildings from the historic period. Variety of form and massing are elements essential to the character of the streetscape in historic districts.

Avoid - Single, monolithic forms that are not relieved by variations in massing. Box like facades and forms are intrusive when placed in a streetscape of older buildings that have varied massing and facade articulation.

SCALE
Consider - Relating the size and proportions of new structures to the scale of adjacent buildings. Although much larger than its neighbors in terms of square footage, the buildings shown maintains the same scale and rhythm as the existing buildings.

Avoid - Buildings that in height, width, or massing violate the existing scale of the area. The new building shown here disrupts the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, although it might be appropriate in a different location.

DIRECTIONAL EXPRESSION
Consider - Relating the vertical, horizontal, or nondirectional facade character of new buildings. Horizontal buildings can be made to relate to the more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the facade into smaller masses that conform to the primary expression of the streetscape.

Avoid - Strongly horizontal or vertical facade expressions unless compatible with the character of structures in the immediate area. The new building shown does not relate well to either its neighbors or to the rhythm of the streetscape because of its unbroken horizontal facade.
SETBACK
Consider—Maintaining the historic facade lines of streetscapes by locating front walls of new buildings in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. If exceptions are made, buildings should be set back into the lot rather than closer to the street. If existing setbacks vary, new buildings should conform to historic siting patterns.

Avoid—Violating the existing setback pattern by placing new buildings in front of or behind the historic facade line. Avoid placing buildings at odd angles to the street, unless in an area where diverse siting already exists, even if proper setback is maintained.

PLATFORMS
Consider—The use of a raised platform is a traditional siting characteristic of most of the older buildings in Salt Lake City. This visual "pedestal" is created by retaining walls and terracing up to the building or by high foundation walls and stepped entries.

Avoid—Bringing walls of new buildings straight out of the ground without a sense of platform, i.e., without maintaining the same entry height as neighboring buildings. Such structures seem squat, visually incomplete, and do not relate well to their elevated neighbors. Also avoid leveling off terraced slopes or removing retained platforms.

SENSE OF ENTRY
Consider—Articulating the main entrances to the building with covered porches, porticos, and other pronounced architectural forms. Entries were historically raised a few steps above the grade of the property and were a prominent visual feature of the street elevation of the building.

Avoid—Facades with no strong sense of entry. Side entries or entries not defined by a porch or similar transitional element result in an incompatible "flat" first-floor facade.

ROOF SHAPES
Consider—Relating the roof forms of the new buildings to those found in the area. Although not entirely necessary, duplication of the existing or traditional roof shapes, pitches, and materials on new construction is one way of making new structures more visually compatible.

Avoid—Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally used in the area.
**RHYTHM OF OPENINGS**
Consider—Respecting the recurrent alternation of wall areas with door and window elements in the facade. Also consider the width-to-height ratio of bays in the facade. The placement of openings with respect to the facade's overall composition, symmetry, or balanced asymmetry should be carefully studied.

Avoid—Introducing incompatible facade patterns that upset the rhythm of openings established in surrounding structures. Glass walls and window and door shapes and locations shown in the example are disrespectful to the adjoining buildings.

**IMITATIONS**
Consider—Accurate restoration of or visually compatible additions to existing buildings, and, for new construction, contemporary architecture that well represents our own time, yet enhances the nature and character of the historic district.

Avoid—Replicating or imitating the styles, motifs, or details of older periods. Such attempts are rarely successful and, even if done well, present a confusing picture of the true character of the historical area.
c. Establish Conservation District
The Borough might establish a Conservation District. Such district would not require the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. The applicable standards would be less restrictive in terms of retaining historic character but would emphasize preservation of streetscape, scale and volume of the surrounding area. Standards such as the design guidelines outlined above could be used to evaluate proposed changes in the Conservation District.

2. Housing Element
Census data describes Haddonfield as a primarily owner occupied community with 83% of the population owning their homes and 17% being renters. Haddonfield's population data indicates a continued increase in the median age of Borough residents. The 1995 median age of Haddonfield residents is 40.49 years. This is greater than the median age nationally which is 34 years and greater than the 1980 Haddonfield median of 36 years. Implications for housing this population within the context of historic preservation are discussed.

a. Housing for the Elderly
The increase in older citizens suggests an increasing need of housing for the elderly. This point was addressed in the previous Comprehensive Plan. In terms of historic preservation the Comprehensive Plan policy should be to encourage rehabilitation of existing structures to meet this housing need rather than just planning for the construction of new housing.
3. Circulation/Transportation Element
The Circulation Plan of the Borough's Master Plan addresses a number of improvements which were recommended by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission. Many of these proposed changes impact on areas outside of the Borough boundary but with repercussions for Borough through traffic.

a. Traffic Calming along Kings Highway
The most glaring conflict recommended by the DVRPC proposals is to facilitate traffic flow along Kings Highway at key intersections within the historic district. This proposal may conflict with the goal of preserving the historic character and ambiance of Haddonfield. Haddonfield residents should be concerned with the effect car traffic will have on both the livability of their streets and maintaining historic character.

The Borough should consider adopting the principles known in Germany as *Verrkehrsberuhigung*, which is literally traffic tranquilization or traffic calming. Although not widely accepted in the United States the movement is popular in Europe and would be applicable to a community such as Haddonfield. The movement seeks to achieve a balance of power among auto, pedestrian, cyclist and other vehicles. The concept would apply both to the CBD area to create a more aesthetic and attractive commercial environment as well as to the Borough residential streets.

Typically the focus in commercial areas is on concentrating through traffic on the regions main arteries and blocking Borough through traffic by devices such as rough pavement surfaces, "necked down" entrances, bent alignments, landscaping, lighting and sidewalk treatment.

Residential areas could follow the Dutch concept of *Woonerf*. This concept has been implemented in more than 200 Dutch cities with eager residents requesting more. In a *Woonerf* (residential yard) The street becomes a space shared by pedestrians and cars were traffic destination in limited to the designated spot. The street becomes a space shared by pedestrians and cars, where pedestrians rather than motor vehicle have the dominant role. The automobile is tolerated strictly on the basis of good behavior as its traditional mastery over the street environment is restricted by physical barriers and legal means. For example, although the roadway is shared the right-of-way legally belongs to the pedestrian. Each Woonerf is clearly marked at its entrances and cars that are not destined for the area are strongly induced to confine their movements to peripheral high speed roads.

Haddonfield's Central Business District would benefit more from design efforts aimed at "traffic calming" than hastening the flow of traffic. Design
solutions should reinforce the town as a pedestrian-oriented environment by encouraging visually interesting streetscape and roadway improvements.
b. Alternate Routes around Haddonfield
The Master Plan discussion of promoting alternate routes around Haddonfield would support the historic preservation effort. Use of Crystal Lake Road and extension of Park Drive to Brace Road would both serve to relieve traffic flow through the Borough and contribute to a more pedestrian oriented environment which supports retention of existing character.

4. Business Area Plan
The Business Area Plan contains a number a detailed recommendations for strengthening the image of Haddonfield's Central Business District. The focus of the recommendation is to improve the visual quality of the CBD from the both the Kings Highway streetscape to the parking areas. The recommendations in the Business Plan support preservation of the historic character within the Borough since the focus is on improving the quality of the area through improving pedestrian circulation, landscaping parking areas and site plan review for all facade changes within the CBD.

5. Community Facilities Plan
The Community Facilities Plan supports the historic preservation policies of the Borough. This portion of the plan discusses the Borough's historic preservation policies and recommends eventual expansion of the district to include areas which bear an important relationship to the historic district listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The problem of the review board incurring additional work load is discussed as a disadvantage of expanding the district. The administrative burden of increasing the size of the historic district is an issue that should be addressed.

Borough's Leadership Role
The Borough should demonstrate leadership through preserving and rehabilitating publicly owned cultural resources on Borough owned property.
The Borough policy should be to consider the value of these resources in all projects involving their review. Historic features such as street furniture, street lamps, granite curbstones, street markers and signs should retained and enhanced where feasible. The character of public areas including parking facilities should provide direction to the private enterprises in terms of quality of design and enhancement of character.

The Master Plan addresses the potential for conflict between historic preservation and energy conservation design. The plan acknowledges the advantages of minimizing north facing glass and maximizing south
facing glass, as well as effective use of landscaping and providing for solar access and solar devices. However, in terms of priority the plan gives primary consideration to maintaining the existing form and character of the community particularly in the historic district.

Since the Borough is largely developed, the issue of storm water management is not a key element in the historic preservation process.
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Historic Preservation and the New Jersey State Development Plan

New Jersey State Development Plan
The New Jersey State Development Plan depicts Haddonfield within PA 1 Metropolitan Planning Area. The plan describes such communities as having many things in common: mature settlement patterns resulting in a diminished supply of vacant land; infrastructure systems that generally are beyond their reasonable life expectancy; recognition that redevelopment is or will be in the not too distant future, the predominant form of growth; and a growing realization of the need to regionalize an increasing number of services and systems in the light of growing fiscal constraints.

In terms of state policy regarding historic preservation within PA- 1
The policy is as follows:

Integrate historic preservation with redevelopment efforts in a way that will not compromise either the historic resource or the areas need to redevelop. Haddonfield appears to be consistent with the State plan.

Critical Environmental/Historic Sites
The borough may consider requesting inclusion of the historic district on the state plan as a critical environmental/historic resource. The state plan considers historic resources as similar to sensitive environmental resources. The state requests that such areas of less than one square mile located in any planning area and not currently under regulatory or site plan review, should be identified and mapped as critical/environmental/historic sites in municipal and county plans and ordinances and forwarded to the State Planning Commission for inclusion in the state plan.

State plan policies applicable to critical environmental/historic sites are as follows:

Preserve and enhance historic, cultural, open space and recreational lands and structures by identifying these resources and using preservation, conservation and other programs and techniques to guide growth in locations and patterns that protect them.

The state plan recognizes that there are important natural and environmental resources found in other Planning Areas, so it recommends applying the policy objectives of the environmentally sensitive planning area to these areas. The State Plan accomplishes this end through a policy that provides for the designation of particular resources as "Critical
Environmental/Historic Sites" through the cross/acceptance and municipal master plan process.

Once designated as a critical environmental/historic site, a resource is to be treated as if it were within the environmentally sensitive planning area no matter where in the state plan the resource is located.

Center Designation
The Borough of Haddonfield may consider requesting that it be designated a center. Center designation would permit Haddonfield to seek priority treatment for grants and loans that allow for service improvements and upgrades, i.e., intersection and turning lanes, street reconstruction and resurfacing, park and ride facility, and new water filtering process, implementation of downtown revitalization strategies and recreation and park improvements.

Centers are defined as follows:
1. It functions as a focal point for the economic, social and cultural activities of its economic region, often serving as the county seat, with a compact, mixed use (e.g. commercial, office, industrial, public) core and neighborhoods offering a wide variety of housing types; and

2. It has an urban or community-level infrastructure system serving the community development area.

3. It has within the Community development boundary, an existing population of more than 10,000 people in planning Areas 1, 2, and 3 and more than 5,000 people in planning areas 4 and 5; and

4. It has a gross density of approximately 5,000 persons per square mile (or approximately 3 dwellings per acre.) or more within the community development boundary.

5. It has, within the Community Development Boundary, an employment base of more than 10,000 jobs in planning area 1, 2, and 3 and more than 5,000 jobs in planning Area 4 and 5.

6. It is near a major public transportation terminal, arterial intersection or interstate interchange capable of serving as the hub for two or more modes of transportation.

Communities of Place
The state plan provides the following description of communities of place.

"We know them when we enter them, and we know them when we leave them. Whether they are located in our most densely populated metropolitan suburbs or in our most sparsely settled rural areas, they are
distinct from their environs. They have evolved and been maintained at a human scale, with easily accessible central core of commercial and community services. They have recognizable natural and built landmarks that provide a sense of place and orientation.

Haddonfield is foremost a "Community of Place" as identified in the state plan. The Borough should explore the benefits that may incur by formal state plan recognition as a Center with critical historic resources.
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Incentives to Promote Historic Preservation

Tax Incentives
Preservation can be an economic catalyst. It is likely that many historic preservation projects undertaken in the last 23 years in the United States were undertaken by sponsors who had little interest in preservation but who were eager to take advantage of the Historic Preservation Tax Credit, which has become one of the most basic financial preservation tools.

Historic Preservation has long been a tradition in the United States. Congress adopted the Antiquities Act of 1906, extending protection to historic sites on Federal Properties. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 established the National Historic Landmark Program which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to use the Historic American Building's Survey to document, evaluate and acquire and preserve archaeological and historic sites. The National Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic places, a list of buildings, sites, structures, and objects, significant in American history, architecture, archaeology and culture, that is probably the most familiar and significant tool in Historic Preservation planning today.

It was not until 1981, in the Economic Recovery Act of 1981, that Congress enacted the first tax incentives to provide financial incentives to encourage the preservation of historic structures (actually to equalize the balance of then available incentives for new construction. Currently, the historic preservation tax credits 10% of rehabilitation expenditures for commercial buildings built prior to 1936 or 20% for certified historic structures (those listed on the National Register of Historic Preservation).

Assumed depreciation period is 31.5 years for commercial properties and 27.5 years for residential properties. At least 20% of the property must be used for income-producing property, either residential-rental, commercial or industrial. Generally, an owner must use the credit annually to offset income derived from real estate and up to $7,000 of tax owed on other income. The rehabilitation work must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and must be certified by the National Park Service.
National Trust Main Street Program

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has developed a program that has been tremendously successful in assisting communities redevelop their historic Main Streets by simultaneously revitalizing their commercial centers and restoring their historic architecture. The Main Street Programs of the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office and the National Trust offer many services to assist communities in establishing and maintaining Main Street Programs. They include: training products such as publications, videotapes, slide shows, and computer software, on-site technical assistance, ranging from assessment visits to comprehensive, ongoing services.

Other incentives for preservation of historic buildings are included in the Appendix.
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A community's historic buildings are the tangible links with its past and reflect its unique character; various Federal laws now exist to encourage the preservation of these irreplaceable resources. Since 1976 the Internal Revenue Code has contained incentives to stimulate capital investment in income-producing historic buildings and the revitalization of historic communities.

October 22, 1986, the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (PL 99-514) was signed into law, making comprehensive changes to the Internal Revenue Code. The intent of the law is to reduce inequities in the tax system; reduce personal and corporate tax rates; broaden the tax base by eliminating or reducing a number of deductions, tax credits, and special benefits; and restore economic factors rather than tax consequences as the primary impetus to business and investment decisions. A number of the changes directly affect the rehabilitation of historic buildings.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 establishes:

- a 20% tax credit for the substantial rehabilitation of historic buildings for commercial, industrial and rental residential purposes, and a 10% tax credit for the substantial rehabilitation for nonresidential purposes of buildings built before 1936.
- a straight-line depreciation period of 27.5 years for residential property and 31.5 years for nonresidential property for the depreciable basis of the rehabilitated building reduced by the amount of the tax credit claimed.

The 10% tax credit is not available for rehabilitations of certified historic structures, and owners who have properties within registered historic districts and who wish to elect this credit must obtain certification that their buildings are not historic. (See "Certifications of Significance, Properties within Registered Historic Districts."

In general, the provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 are effective on January 1, 1987. (See "Transition Rules" and "Provisions of Prior Tax Laws.") These provisions may affect the tax benefits from rehabilitation projects already completed and certified, as well as pending and future projects. Because the provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 are complex, individuals are strongly encouraged to consult legal counsel, a professional tax advisor, or the appropriate local Internal Revenue Service (IRS) office for assistance in determining the tax consequences of the provisions described in this booklet. The descriptions herein are provided for general informational purposes only.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND REHABILITATIONS AFFECTED BY THE TAX PROVISIONS

Preservation tax incentives are available for any qualified project that the Secretary of the Interior designates a certified rehabilitation of a certified historic structure. Certification requests are made through the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); certifications are issued by the National Park Service (NPS). To qualify for the tax incentives, property owners must have certification both of the historic structure and of the completed rehabilitation. A two-part Historic Preservation Certification Application (NPS Form 10-168) is available for this purpose from the appropriate SHPO or NPS regional office, at the addresses printed at the end of this booklet.

Under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code:

- A certified historic structure is any building that is listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places, or located in a registered historic district and certified as being of historic significance to the district.
- A registered historic district is any district that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or designated under a state or local statute which has been certified as containing criteria which will substantially achieve the purpose of preserving and rehabilitating buildings of significance to the district and which is certified as substantially meeting all of the requirements for the listing of districts in the National Register.
- A certified rehabilitation is any rehabilitation of a certified historic structure that is certified as being consistent with the historic character of the property and, where applicable, the district in which it is located.

The Internal Revenue Code limits the tax credits for rehabilitation to depreciable buildings, i.e., buildings used in a trade or business or held for the production of income, such as commercial or rental residential properties. For purposes of charitable contributions only, certified historic structures need not be depreciable buildings to qualify.

Owners of properties either listed individually or within districts in the National Register of Historic Places are eligible to apply for certifications. Owners of properties located in state or local districts may also apply for certifications, if the statutes under which the districts were established have been certified. The districts themselves must also have been certified as substantially meeting National Register Criteria for
or required to be incurred pursuant to a contract that
was binding on March 1, 1986; or
3. were listed specifically in the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

Such certified rehabilitation projects must be placed in
service prior to January 1, 1994. For rehabilitations of non-
historic buildings which meet this transition rule, 10% and
13% tax credits will be substituted for the 15% and 20% tax
credits, respectively.

Alternative, shorter depreciation methods apply to prop-
erty that was subject to a binding contract for acquisition or
construction as of March 1, 1986, or was significantly under
construction as of March 1, 1986, if such property is placed in

Retention of External Walls
Effective January 1, 1987, certified rehabilitations do not have
to meet a specified physical test for retention of external walls
or internal structural framework other than NPS rehabilita-
tion certification requirements. Certified rehabilitations,
ever, generally should satisfy the external wall retention
given below. In appropriate instances (e.g., when existing
external walls detract from the historic character of the struc-
ture, or the historic district in which it is located, or when
such walls have lost their integrity due to deterioration), the
rehabilitation may be certified notwithstanding the loss of or
alteration to the external walls or structural framework. For
rehabilitations of non-historic buildings, the Tax Reform Act
of 1986 requires that during the course of rehabilitation,

- at least 50% of the building’s existing external walls must
  be retained in place as external walls, and
- at least 75% of the building’s existing external walls must
  be retained in place as either external or internal walls,
  and
- at least 75% of the building’s internal structural frame-
  work must remain in place.

Claiming the Investment Tax Credit
The tax credit must be claimed for the tax year in which
the rehabilitated building is placed in service. For
phased projects, the tax credit may be claimed before
completion of the entire project on the basis of “quali-
fied progress expenditures” if construction is planned for
two or more years. The IRS requires that a copy of the
final NPS certification of completed work be filed with
the tax return claiming the tax credit.

In the event final certification has not yet been
received when the taxpayer files the tax return claiming
the credit, a copy of the first page of the Historic Preser-
vation Certification Application — Part 2 — Descrip-
tion of Rehabilitation, with evidence that it has been
received by either the SHPO or the NPS (date-stamped
application or other notice is sufficient indication of
receipt) should be filed with the tax return. In such
cases, the taxpayer has up to 30 months after the date of
the tax return claiming the tax credit to submit final
certification of the rehabilitation to the IRS.

Recapture of the Credit
Generally, if a qualified rehabilitated building is held by
the taxpayer for longer than five years after the rehabili-
tated building is placed in service, there is no recapture
of the tax credit. If the owner disposes of the property
after a holding period of less than one year after it is
placed in service, 100% of the tax credit is recaptured.
For properties held between one and five years, the tax
credit recapture amount is reduced by 20% per year.
The NPS may inspect a rehabilitated property at any
time during the 5-year period and may revoke certifica-
tion if work was not undertaken as presented in the
Historic Preservation Certification Application or if
further unapproved alterations have been made. The
NPS will notify the IRS of any such revocations.
Preliminary Determinations of Significance

A Part 1 application, as described above, may also be used to obtain preliminary determinations of significance for buildings which appear to meet National Register criteria but are not yet listed in the National Register or which are located in potential historic districts. Property owners may request preliminary determinations as to whether such buildings may qualify as certified historic structures when and if the building or potential historic district is listed in the National Register. Such determinations are not binding and become final as of the date of the listing of the building or historic district in the National Register.

Such a preliminary determination may also be obtained by using a Part 1 application for a building in a registered historic district that is outside the period or area of significance of the district as documented with the NPS. These preliminary determinations become final when the district documentation on file with the NPS is formally amended.

Certifications of Rehabilitation

Property owners seeking certification of rehabilitation work involving a certified historic structure must submit a Historic Preservation Certification Application, Part 2 — Description of Rehabilitation, according to instructions included with the application. Part 2 may be completed at any time during the course of the rehabilitation work, although owners are strongly encouraged to submit proposed work for approval prior to construction. A Part 2 application also receives a thorough review by the SHPO prior to being forwarded to the NPS for a certification decision.

A project does not become a certified rehabilitation eligible for the tax incentives until it is completed and so designated by the NPS. When a project which has received a preliminary approval of proposed work is completed, the owner must submit a Request for Certification of Completed Work. If preliminary approval has not been requested before completion of a rehabilitation project, the Part 2 and the Request for Certification of Completed Work must be submitted simultaneously.

All rehabilitation projects that owners wish certified for purposes of Federal tax incentives are reviewed and evaluated in accordance with "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation." These ten Standards (printed elsewhere in this booklet) are used to determine whether the historic character of a building is preserved through the process of rehabilitation.

Although rehabilitation assumes that some repair or alteration of the historic building will occur to provide for an efficient use, the project must not damage or destroy the material and features, both interior and exterior, that are important in defining the building's historic character. The entire project (including any new construction on the site) is reviewed and is certified only if the overall rehabilitation project meets the Standards.

Processing Fees

Application processing fees are charged by the NPS for reviews of requests for certification of rehabilitation except for projects under $20,000. Payment should not be sent until requested by the NPS, and applicants will be notified of the amount to be submitted by return mail. Final action will not be taken on an application until payment is received. Fees are not refundable.

The fee review of proposed or ongoing rehabilitation work for all projects over $20,000 is $250. The fee for review of completed rehabilitation work is based on the dollar amount spent on the rehabilitation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Size of Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$20,000 to $99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$100,000 to $499,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a review of proposed or ongoing rehabilitation work has been made prior to submission of the Request for Certification of Completed Work, the NPS will deduct the $250 from the total owed for review of completed rehabilitation work.

In general, each rehabilitation of a certified historic structure will be considered a separate project when computing the amount of the fee.

Certification of State and Local Statutes and Historic Districts

A building located in a state or local historic district can also qualify for preservation tax incentives if the statute or ordinance creating the district has been certified; if the district has been certified as substantially meeting National Register criteria; and if the property is certified as being of historic significance to the district.

To be eligible for certification, statutes establishing a district or districts must contain criteria that substantially achieve the
Passive Credit Exemption

Tax credits from rental property activities can be used to offset the tax owed on up to $25,000 of "active income." The exemption is not a $25,000 credit but computation of a credit on the tax on up to $25,000 of "active income." (Referred to above as the deduction equivalent.) Furthermore, the $25,000 amount is first reduced by losses from rental real estate allowed under the "active participation" rule, above. The passive credit exemption is phased out in the same manner as the passive loss exemption.

Passive Credit Rules for Certified Rehabilitations and Low-Income Housing

The $25,000 allowance for credits (but not losses) from certified rehabilitations and low-income housing is available to taxpayers (including limited partners) without regard to the active participation requirements and is phased out for individuals with incomes between $200,000 and $250,000.

Transition Rules for Pre-Enactment Investments

The passive losses/credits rule will be phased in over five years for taxpayers who have invested in passive activities prior to October 22, 1986. In this case, investment in a passive activity means that the property was owned by the taxpayer or was the subject of a binding contract on October 22, 1986, and that the passive activity was being conducted as of that date. An investment in a passive activity commencing after October 22, 1986, qualifies for the pre-enactment phase-in provisions if the property was acquired pursuant to a binding contract in effect on August 16, 1986, or was under construction on or before August 16, 1986. Investors who meet the pre-enactment tests for passive activities may take 65% of their existing tax benefits (losses and credits) in taxable year 1987; 40% in taxable year 1988; 20% in taxable year 1989; and 10% in taxable year 1990, with full elimination of passive losses/credits in 1991. Unused passive losses and credits can be carried forward indefinitely and can be applied against gains upon disposition of the property.

At-Risk Rules

Section 503 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (IRC Section 465) extends the at-risk rules to real estate investments made after December 31, 1986. Under this provision a taxpayer will be able to deduct losses and obtain credits from a real estate investment only to the extent that the taxpayer is "at-risk" for the investment. The amount that a taxpayer is "at-risk" is generally the sum of cash or property contributions to the project plus any borrowed money for which the taxpayer is personally liable, including certain borrowed amounts which are secured by the property used in the project. In addition, in the case of the activity of holding real property, the amount "at-risk" includes qualified non-recourse financing borrowed from certain financial institutions or government entities.

Alternative Minimum Tax

Section 702 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (IRC Sections 55-59) increases the alternative minimum tax rate from 20% to 21% and increases the number of tax preference items that must be used to calculate alternative minimum taxable income. Alternative minimum taxable income is computed from regular taxable income with certain adjustments and the addition of all appropriate tax preference items. New tax preference items include:

1. Excess depreciation — For property placed in service after December 31, 1986, the difference between the depreciation allowance using the straight-line method over a 27.5/31.5-year period and the depreciation allowance using the straight-line method over a 40-year period.

2. Untaxed gains on charitable contributions — The appreciated value of property donated as a charitable contribution that has not been subject to a capital gains tax.
PROVISIONS OF PRIOR TAX LAWS

Tax Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-455) provided: 5-year amortization of qualified expenditures incurred in the rehabilitation of certified historic structures or, alternatively, accelerated depreciation of substantially rehabilitated historic structures; denial of deduction for costs of demolishing a certified historic structure; restriction to straight-line depreciation of buildings constructed on the site of a demolished or substantially altered certified historic structure.

Revenue Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-600) provided: a 10% tax credit for qualified expenditures incurred in the rehabilitation of a building that had been in use for a period of at least 20 years before the commencement of the rehabilitation.

Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-34) provided: a 25% tax credit for certified rehabilitations of certified historic structures, a 15% credit for rehabilitations of structures over 40 years old, and a 10% tax credit for rehabilitations of structures 30-39 years old combined with 15-year straight-line depreciation.

Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-248) required: reduction in the depreciable basis of buildings rehabilitated utilizing the 25% tax credit by one-half of the amount of the credit.

Tax Reform Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-369) provided: lengthened depreciation periods of 18 years, subsequently 19 years; denial of tax credits to rehabilitations of tax-exempt use property, permanent requirement that cost of demolition of all buildings to be added to basis of and where building was located before demolition.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING SIGNIFICANCE WITHIN REGISTERED HISTORIC DISTRICTS

1. A building contributing to the historic significance of a district is one which by location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association adds to the district's sense of time and place and historical development.

2. A building not contributing to the historic significance of a district is one which does not add to the district's sense of time and place and historical development; or one where the integrity of the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association has been so altered or has so deteriorated that the overall integrity of the building has been irretrievably lost.

3. Ordinarily buildings that have been built within the past 50 years shall not be considered to contribute to the significance of a district unless a strong justification concerning their historical or architectural merit is given or the historical attributes of the district are considered to be less than 50 years old.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use the property for its originally intended purpose.

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.

4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.