

## ***CHAPTER 4***

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES PROTECTION PLAN***

Franklin Township’s cultural resources consist of scenic resources, which include natural and man-made features appreciated for their aesthetic quality, and historic resources – the old homes, barns, outbuildings, and other structures that comprise Franklin’s architectural heritage. While there is significant overlap between the two, this chapter treats each set of resources separately, in part because strategies for their protection differ, but also because what is scenic is not always historic and *vice versa*. Both are vital to the Township’s cultural identity and important contributors to its quality of life.

### ***SCENIC RESOURCES***

#### ***INTRODUCTION***

Despite the subjective attributes of scenery, residents are generally united in their appreciation for the aesthetic quality of Franklin Township. Results from the 2004 Community Values Survey underscore the importance of scenic quality to Township residents. When asked why they chose to live in Franklin, “rural, quite lifestyle” and “scenic beauty” were the top two reasons selected. Additionally, “retention of rural atmosphere” and “conservation of scenic landscapes” were among the top three issues survey respondents urged the Township to consider in future planning efforts.

Concerns about retention of rural atmosphere and scenic beauty were later reinforced in three public workshops held in early 2005. To an extent, workshop participants acknowledged that scenic resource protection is closely tied to agricultural preservation and natural and historic resource protection. Yet they also acknowledged the impact development can have on scenic resources in particular, and established as a goal, “Preserve, protect, and promote the rural character and landscape of Franklin Township” (See Chapter 2, Goal 2). The objectives derived by workshop participants and later refined by Task Force members further confirms community interest in protecting the Township’s remaining scenic assets, including its prominent views, historic structures, and woodlands.

Resources defined as “scenic” – which include vistas, open fields, roads, woodlands, historic structures, and streams – are “visually significant” landscapes or features that are characteristic of early and pre-settlement Franklin. From the standpoint of the public interest, they are also resources visible from public vantage points (primarily roads). This section describes the general attributes of the Township’s scenic resources and identifies their location based on windshield surveys conducted by Task Force members and planning consultants (See Figure 4-1).

Once scenic resources have been identified and described, proper siting and screening of future development can ensure their visual quality is maintained or enhanced. Accordingly, this Chapter also analyzes the degree to which Franklin’s scenic resources are threatened given existing land use regulation. Chapter 13, “Implementation Strategies,” includes both short and long term actions to better protect the Township’s scenic resources.

## ***CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPES***

Like most of Chester County, Franklin is situated in the Piedmont, a physiographic region characterized by hilly topography. As a result, Franklin's visual landscape is most strongly influenced by two factors: a relatively dense network of streams and broad uplands conducive to agriculture and development. Settlement in Franklin has responded to and taken advantage of these landforms in a variety of ways: major roads, farms, and residential subdivisions tend to be located in uplands because of their level terrain, well-draining soils, and prominent views, while development in stream corridors is generally low density and linear due to flooding, hydric soils, and/or the presence of steep slopes.

Generally, Franklin has three characteristic landscapes: broad uplands, stream valleys, and woodlands. These have evolved over time as a result of natural processes and settlement patterns unique to Franklin. Recognition of the broader context in which perceptions of the landscape are organized is important when planning for the protection of scenic resources, at both landscape and site scales.

### ***Broad Uplands***

Open and relatively flat, uplands are found throughout Franklin. Because uplands are ideal for farming, woodlands – which were historically dominant – were largely removed during settlement. As a result, views from public roads in uplands are often lengthy, providing travelers visual access to open fields in addition to the site-specific features common in rural landscapes such as hedgerows, farm complexes, small streams, ponds, and wetlands.

Historically, Franklin's agricultural economy resulted in a low density network of farm clusters and villages. Yet the same qualities that give agriculture an edge in Franklin are especially attractive to developers, who place premiums on the views, terrain, and soils offered in upland landscapes. Most, if not all, development that has occurred in the last 10 years has taken place in uplands.

### ***Stream Valleys***

Stream valleys are linear landforms that include streams, adjacent floodplains and wetlands, and the sloping hillsides or valley walls that mark the transition to upland areas. Though not as visually prominent as the upland landscape, stream valleys are an important component of Franklin's "characteristic" landscape. Perhaps more than any other natural feature, Franklin's high density of streams makes it visually unique among other Chester County communities.

In contrast to the Township's higher elevation neighbors, the streams that crisscross Franklin vary in channel size. As a result, mills were established early in the Township's history along the wider, heavier volume branches of the White Clay and Big Elk Creeks (the ruins of some of these mills are still visible today). With the exception of Route 896, many roads cross streams or run parallel to them, greatly enhancing their scenic quality and the scenic quality of nearby homes.

### ***Woodlands***

Woodlands may be found throughout the above mentioned landscapes, but are more commonly associated with stream valleys, steep slopes, and other areas not suitable for agriculture or development. There are, however, a few important exceptions to this including the Natural Land Trust's Foote Farm, portions of the Strawbridge property along Big Elk Creek, Crossan Park, and lands recently protected by homeowners' associations in clustered housing developments. Woodlands may also be found in narrow swaths adjacent to roads and between properties, enhancing aesthetic value or functioning as visual buffers between incompatible uses.

Generally comprised of tulip poplar, white and red oak, hickory, and beech, Franklin's woodlands are relatively young (50 to 70 years old). Though the dense undergrowth found in young woodlands can impair views from public roads (often a result of invasive species growth), woodlands add greatly to rural character. Where present in large contiguous patches, woodlands appear as a discrete landscape type, offering a stark and aesthetically pleasing contrast to the open fields and subdivisions found in much of Franklin's uplands. They also frame views, as in the case of the woodlands adjacent to vistas along Route 841 (see Figure 4-1).

### ***CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS***

Characteristic landscape elements are discrete, visually significant features set within each of the previously described characteristic landscapes. Natural or manmade, often small in scale and detail, these elements are an essential component of overall visual quality.

#### ***Scenic Water Elements***

Water bodies are almost universally appreciated as scenic elements. As noted above, streams make strong contributions to scenic quality as a result of their winding and partially wooded, partially open appearance. Similarly, wetlands – historically perceived as unproductive and hence worthy of draining for agriculture – contribute greatly to scenic quality, especially where visually prominent. Those found along Creek Road adjacent to the middle branch of White Clay Creek serve as excellent examples. As flat, open water bodies, ponds offer a sharp visual contrast to rolling uplands and steep-walled valleys. From an ecological perspective, ponds with natural shoreline vegetation have greater biotic value and support a healthier ecosystem than do ponds lacking shoreline vegetation. Yet for many viewers, both types of ponds may be aesthetically pleasing and perceived as tranquil or calming.

#### ***Farmstead Clusters***

Many of the farmsteads in Franklin Township represent almost idealized rural scenes. Surrounded by open fields, they are often visible from great distances. The barns are typically old, and are usually surrounded by a cluster of smaller outbuildings (hence the term “farmstead cluster”). These structures are built from a diversity of materials and are of obviously different ages, reminding observers that farms evolve and change through time. Silos, while not massive, are strong vertical elements that dominate the landscape and may also serve as points of

reference. Not infrequently, roads bisect farmstead clusters, with barns and outbuildings on one side, and the house on the other.

A few common characteristics of farmstead clusters are described as follows:

- Few farm clusters are visible at any one time. From any given point on a public road, the perceived density is very low.
- Farm clusters, because they are relatively compact, are viewed as singular objects in the context of an overall agricultural landscape. By contrast, residential subdivisions, as they are usually configured, are designed at a density too low to be perceived as a distinctive place, but too high to retain a sense of openness.
- Building placement in farm clusters is irregular. Setbacks from public roads vary, as does the spacing between buildings.
- Buildings adjacent to and within a few hundred feet of a public road usually “address” the public road; i.e., there is an obvious relationship between the road and the direction the building faces – usually parallel or at a right angle to it.

Along with the few “working” farmstead clusters of Franklin are several “gentleman farms” that contribute greatly to landscape quality. In many cases, the rolling landscapes of open fields, hedgerows, and woodlands of farms devoted to equestrian uses provide unique aesthetic value and complement the farms and rural residential lands found elsewhere in the Township.

### ***Villages and Crossroads Clusters***

Franklin Township has two historic population centers: Kemblesville and Chesterville. In contrast to Chesterville, Kemblesville is a proper village, with a mix of residential, institutional, and commercial uses. Generally, lot sizes and setbacks are smaller than those found elsewhere in the Township and buildings are sited to address the road and each other.

Much of Kemblesville is historic and the Township recently adopted a Historic District Ordinance to preserve its character (See “Historic Resources,” below). Although the Kemblesville Historic District is not listed on the National Register, it has received a Determination of Eligibility (DOE) for listing from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), which essentially qualifies it for listing should the Township decide to apply (if not altered substantially in the meantime). Clearly, Kemblesville represents one of Franklin’s most scenic and historic assets; feedback in planning workshops underscores the value of Kemblesville as a visual focal point.

Comprised of only several structures, Chesterville is more accurately characterized as a hamlet or “crossroads cluster”. As in Kemblesville, buildings are clustered around a significant historic intersection, offering the visual impression of a single landscape unit. Also like a village, buildings in Chesterville are generally sited to address the road and each other. Rural land uses,

including the Hocking Farm and nearby North Creek Nursery, help give Chesterville its hamlet feel by framing it within a larger rural landscape.

### ***Historic Structures***

The built environment forms a vital component of our perception of the landscape. In Chester County, older buildings and other prominent structures (such as bridges) were generally constructed of field stone or field stone covered by stucco. Log, frame, and brick buildings are also found in the rural landscape. Historically, the placement of structures was often derived from the character of the landscape itself, rather than for example, adherence to zoning codes. They were often sited to gain protection from the elements; a house nestled in a hollow serves as an example.

Figure 4-2 (page 4-22) identifies Franklin Township’s historic resources, including all structures 50 years and older. Though each of the Township’s historic resources are not necessarily scenic, many of the historic structures identified in Figure 4-2 have scenic qualities or are a component of a larger scenic element, such as farmstead and crossroads clusters. Particularly scenic historic structures are displayed on Figure 4-1 as visual accents.

### ***FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP SCENIC ASSESSMENT***

To complement the general description of Franklin’s scenic resources described above, windshield surveys were conducted by Task Force members and planning consultants to identify and map the locations of Franklin’s most scenic or “visually significant” resources. To be considered scenic, resources must be or contribute to one or several of the characteristic landscapes and landscape elements described above. Specifically, this section identifies and maps the approximate location and/or extent of the scenic resources described below (see Figure 4-1):

- **Vista Points** – Mapped along public roads, vista points are points where relatively long and undisturbed directional views of the landscape are attained. Broad views of stream valleys, woodlands, and farmsteads are examples.
- **Visual Accents** – Visual accents are landscape elements characteristic of Franklin’s early-settlement landscape. Accents include crossroads and farmstead clusters, specimen vegetation, and historic bridges, buildings, and other structures.
- **Visual Intrusions** – In contrast to accents, visual intrusions are atypical of Franklin Township’s early-settlement landscape. Intrusions include junkyards, abandoned and/or deteriorating structures, above-ground utility lines, and cell phone towers.
- **Scenic Roads** – Scenic roads provide visual access to open spaces, farmsteads, and other scenic landscape elements and are relatively free from visual interruptions or intrusions. Expressive of the topography they traverse, scenic roads often link other scenic resources together and border a diversity of characteristic landscapes.
- **Scenic Rivers** – Scenic rivers are watercourses that have received special designation by state or federal authorities for their outstanding scenic, recreational, and ecological value. In the

## Franklin Township Comprehensive Plan

---

case of Franklin, these include the East, Middle, and West Branches of the White Clay Creek.

- Woodlands – As described earlier, woodlands are a valuable scenic resource for the buffering and screening functions they provide in addition to being scenic themselves. Franklin has

approximately 2,245 acres of woodlands, excluding fragments of woodlands and individual trees not captured during the mapping process. Readers are referred to Chapter III for more information on the character and condition of local woodlands.

### ***Vista Points***

Franklin has 22 vista points scattered throughout the Township. For the most part, these provide visual access to open fields, though some overlook or provide views within stream valleys. Examples of the former include the broad views attained along Old School House Road and from Crossan Park. Vistas overlooking or within stream valleys include the view at the intersection of Old School House Road and Route 841 and the atypical but visually significant view of the East Branch of White Clay Creek from Laurel Bridge Road, near Franklin's border with New Garden Township.

At the time of this writing, views from three of the 22 vista points are threatened by development projects that have either been approved or are in the plan review process. Views from the remaining vista points are not assured, with the partial exception of the vista point in Crossan Park. In contrast to other Chester County communities where agriculture plays a more dominant role in the local economy, Franklin lacks the critical mass of protected lands needed to preserve the pastoral views attained from most vista points.

### ***Visual Accents and Intrusions***

Figure 4-1 depicts the location of 29 visual accents and four visual intrusions. These are listed and further described on the following page in Table 4-1. Noteworthy accents include several historic homes and barns, the Village of Kemblesville, a house which once served as a stagecoach stop, mill ruins, and several heritage trees (trees of exceptional girth, principally sycamores).

To be considered a visual intrusion, an object must be both atypical of Franklin Township and be located in such a way as to provide a strong negative or intrusive focal point for the public view. Franklin has four visual intrusions, two associated with electric lines, one cellular phone tower, and one abandoned mushroom house near Crossan Park. The mushroom house will likely be demolished as a result of land development.

The protection of Franklin Township's visual accents is not assured, with the partial exception of structures located in the Kemblesville Historic District. Other visual accents may be modified or removed at the discretion of landowners. Moreover, even if visual accents are preserved, their quality may be degraded as a result of insensitive development in adjacent areas.



Franklin Township Comprehensive Plan

---

1. Visual Accent: Wesley Methodist Cemetery with nearby vista.	2. Visual Accent: Historic red brick barn with diamond designs in brick.
3. Visual Accent: Historic brick farmhouse.	4. Visual Accent: Historic brick miller's house and farmhouse.
5. Visual Accent: Old mill/raceway (John Tweed Mill, c. 1780).	6. Visual Accent: Ruins of Mt. Olivet Church (1848).
7. Visual Accent: Kemblesville Historic District.	8. Visual Accent: Kemblesville Methodist Church and Cemetery.
9. Visual Accent: Historic farmhouse and barn (Louden Barn).	10. Visual Accent: Prominent stone barn surrounded by open landscape.
11. Visual Accent: Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings (McMillan Farm).	12. Visual Accent: Farmstead cluster (Nowland Farm).
13. Visual Accent: Historic farmhouse and barn (c. 1750).	14. Visual Accent: Plough and Harrow Farm (barn/old stagecoach stop).
15. Visual Accent: Farmstead cluster (Joseph Pierce Farm).	16. Visual Accent: McKean Farm (colonial farmhouse and outbuildings).
17. Visual Accent: Historic mill and farm (John K. Steele Mill).	18. Visual Accent: Lisle Barn (converted barn with old house ruin).
19. Visual Accent: Specimen vegetation (large sycamore) next to scenic pond.	20. Visual Accent: Historic red barn (Joseph E. Pennock Farm).
21. Visual Accent: S.A. Pennock Mill (brick).	22. Visual Accent: Specimen trees in open, sloping field.
23. Visual Accent: Specimen trees (sycamores) along creek.	24. Visual Accent: Farmstead cluster (Thomas Marvel Farm).
25. Visual Accent: Federal style stone house (late 18 <sup>th</sup> century).	26. Visual Accent: Farmstead cluster.
27. Visual Accent: Stone farmhouse and barn (Laurel Bridge Farm).	28. Visual Accent: Chesterville – crossroads cluster.
29. Visual Accent: Federal-style house (Thomas Hindman House).	30. Visual Intrusion: Cell phone towers in Crossan Park.
31. Visual Intrusion: Abandoned mushroom house.	32. Visual Intrusion: PECO transmission line.
33. Visual Intrusion: Utility junction box.	

**Table 4-1. Visual Accents and Visual Intrusions**

### ***Scenic Roads***

Scenic roads in Franklin generally fall into one of two categories: roads through broad uplands or roads through stream valleys. As defined in this plan, they satisfy some (but not necessarily all) of the following criteria:

1. The roads provide visual access to a particularly scenic landscape, including visual accents and vista points;
2. The roads offer a pleasant sense of movement through the landscape, or a heightened awareness of adjacent landforms, and/or;
3. The roads are relatively free from visual interruptions or intrusions.

Figure 4-1 displays 18 individual segments of scenic roads totaling 16.2 miles. Some of these roads traverse uplands, including Old School House Road, Appleton Road, and the southern portion of Route 841. Others wind in and out of stream valleys, such as Creek Road, Mount Olivet Road, and the northern portion of Route 841. Each road segment identified in Figure 4-1 is further described and correlated with roadway classification in Table 4-2. Significant potential exists to create a longer, interconnected scenic corridor composed of several road segments.

### ***Scenic Rivers***

As previously noted, Franklin's streams contribute greatly to scenic quality. While each of the Township's watercourses have scenic attributes, three streams in particular – the East, Middle, and West Branches of the White Clay Creek – have received National Wild and Scenic River designation by the Federal government.

Recognized for its “outstandingly remarkable” historic, scenic, geologic, and biological resources, the White Clay Creek National Wild and Scenic River was added to the National Wild and Scenic River System by Congress in 2000 (Public Law 106-357). Though the management plan jointly prepared by the National Park Service, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the State of Delaware, and local municipalities applies to the entire watershed, official designation (in terms of the area in which Federal review standards apply) is limited to second-order tributaries and extends 250 feet on either side of streams (or to the limits of the 500-year floodplain, whichever greater). This places approximately 720 acres of Franklin Township within the White Clay Creek Wild and Scenic River corridor. Designated reaches and their corridors are displayed in a hatched pattern in Figure 4-1.

The White Clay Creek Wild and Scenic River is classified by the National Park Service as a “Partnership” Wild and Scenic River. Management of Partnership Rivers is the joint responsibility of local, state, and federal authorities. While Wild and Scenic status prohibits the Federal government from assisting in water resources projects (issuing permits, funding, construction, etc...) that would have adverse effects on the White Clay, implementation of the Watershed Management Plan's local land use recommendations is voluntary. Though the plan doesn't discuss scenic resources *per se*, it does offer municipalities a series of goals, guidelines, and actions for the



Franklin Township Comprehensive Plan

<b>Roadway Classification</b>	<b>Scenic Road Segment*</b>	<b>Scenic Attributes</b>
Minor Arterial	(None Scenic)	
Minor Collector	Route 841 - from Twp. line to Liberti Lane, between Old School House and Flint Hill Roads, and from Chesterville to Twp. line.	Provides critical visual access to scenic, rural farmlands. Links several accents and vista points. Northern segment parallels Middle Branch of White Clay Creek.
Local Distributor	Chesterville Road	Views of woodland/floodplain along Middle Branch of White Clay Creek.
	Flint Hill Road, in southeast corner of Twp. and from Twp. line to Route 841.	Open, farmed landscape in southeast. Scenic, wooded roadside with visual access to historic house near intersection with Route 841.
	Appleton Road, from Twp. line to Strickersville Road	Broad views of rural landscape; access to vista points and accents.
	Strickersville Road	Provides visual access to farmland; terminates at historic cluster along Big Elk Creek.
	Mt. Olivet Road	Dirt road providing scenic views of Big Elk Creek tributary; links visual accents.
	Hess Mill Road	Broad, open views facing northeast.
	South Guernsey Road, from Hess Mill Road to Hillcrest Drive	Roadway offers pleasing sense of movement through wooded/floodplain landscape.
	Pennock Bridge Road, from S. Guernsey Road to Route 841	Open, farmed views and access to visual accents.
Local Road	Peacedale Road, between Walker Road and Big Elk tributary	Broad views of open land and visual accent, visual access to woodland/Foote farm.
	Old School House Road	Numerous vista points; views of uplands and stream valleys.
	Church Hill Road	Vista across Middle Branch of White Clay Creek; 2 visual accents.
	Landenberg, Creek, and Church Hill Roads – from Twp. Line to Queens Lane	Roadway offers pleasing sense of movement through wooded/floodplain landscape.
	Laurel Bridge Road	Views of farm, open field, and East Branch of White Clay Creek; steep, winding road near Twp. line.
	Elbow Lane	Broad views of rural landscape.
* For reference only; see Figure 4-1 for location of specific scenic road segment		

**Table 4-2. Scenic Roadway Classification**

protection of water quality, stream habitat, open space, and historic, cultural, and archaeological resources. Representatives from Franklin Township participated in the preparation of the Watershed Management Plan and ongoing municipal participation in the Watershed Management Committee – the inter-agency, inter-municipal organization charged with implementing the Management Plan – is encouraged. Indeed, the plan could not be implemented without municipal cooperation.

### ***IMPLICATIONS***

Recent development patterns underscore the impact insensitive development can have on Franklin’s scenic resources. For example, new subdivisions in upland landscapes can block views obtained from vista points and erode rural character. Development in and adjacent to Kemblesville – if not designed to replicate and complement its architectural style and density – can detract from the Village’s historic character and result in a visually non-distinct environment.

As stated earlier, the protection of Franklin’s scenic resources is not assured, with the partial exception of structures in the Kemblesville Historic District. Moreover, the broad views of Franklin’s characteristic landscapes attained from many vista points are not guaranteed, in part because so little land in Franklin is protected in open space, either through regulation or voluntary land conservation. While Franklin Township has several tools in place to prevent the wholesale destruction of its scenic assets, the protection of scenic quality is largely up to individual landowners, and to a lesser extent, Township officials charged with the review of development proposals.

Franklin’s existing land use regulations and related policies and programs can be used to preserve scenic resources. The Township has two sets of tools to protect scenic quality – regulatory tools (the Zoning Ordinance, the Historic District Ordinance, and the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) and non-regulatory tools (including municipal open space acquisition and landowner education).

Franklin’s Zoning Ordinance (ZO) includes a variety of regulations explicitly aimed at protecting rural character and scenic quality. Open space design, for example, is currently required on all tracts greater than 15 acres in the majority of the Township, and standards for open space subdivisions require the maximum, “conservation of site features identified as having particular conservation value, historical significance, or recreation value,” including matures trees, hedgerows, and historic sites and structures (ZO Section 1510.F.1.a.2). Section 1510 also requires that buildings in open space subdivisions be situated below ridgelines to preserve existing vistas. Other noteworthy examples of regulations in the ZO that protect scenic resources include: Article 24 (“Natural Resource Protection”), which limits the clearing of woodland for development, prohibits development on steep slopes, and requires protection and replanting of riparian buffers; and Section 1501 (“Screening and Landscaping”), which requires that screening be installed between incompatible structures or uses. Sign regulations, also contained within the ZO, have a significant impact on scenic quality. Signs for commercial uses in the Village District, for example, must be one of three types, each designed to promote the attractiveness of Kemblesville.

Similarly, Franklin's Historic District Ordinance, described in greater detail below, was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2003. Designed to protect the character and condition of the Kemblesville Historic District, the Historic District Ordinance established Franklin's Historical

Architectural Review Board (HARB). The HARB gives recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the issuance of “Certificates of Appropriateness” in connection with exterior architectural alterations, demolitions, and new construction for all structures in the District.

While the ZO protects scenic resources as they relate to land use, density, and the massing of structures, provisions in the Township’s Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) have an important impact on the protection and maintenance of scenic resources at the site level. For example, Section 610 of the SLDO (“Screening and Landscaping”) describes in greater detail than the ZO the landscaping requirements for subdivisions and land developments. Among other standards, this section requires the inventory and preservation of large caliper trees and that the majority of new landscaping be native to the area.

One non-regulatory tool available in Franklin to protect scenic resources is the Township’s open space fund. Franklin’s open space committee is in the process of prioritizing parcels for open space acquisition, many of which have scenic value in addition to environmental and recreational value. The type and location of scenic resources identified in Figure 4-1 are components of the open space prioritization plan, which is nearing completion at the time of this writing.

The preceding discussion illustrates the complexities involved in scenic resources management; namely, that because scenic resources span several scales (from entire landscapes to specific structures), a variety of tools are needed to protect them. While the Township already has several tools in place, some are inadequate and others are missing. For example, structures of historic (and scenic) value outside the Kemblesville Historic District may be modified or demolished without the input of Franklin’s Historical Commission. Standards for the protection of the Township’s scenic roads are also missing in its land use regulations. Additionally, input from public workshops and the Community Values Survey suggests many residents are unhappy with the Open Space Design development option preferred by the Township. According to some respondents and workshop participants, open space design – though an improvement on conventional design – still results in the fragmentation of scenic landscapes and often protects land of little scenic or recreational value.

Yet even if all the necessary regulatory tools were in place, successful scenic resources protection is still largely dependent on the attentive review of development proposals. While generic standards grant the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors broad discretion in the review of development plans, they often fail in providing reviewing bodies with specific criteria to hold applicants against. Thus, appeals for scenic resource protection are often likely to trigger non-cooperation on the part of applicants, a situation further complicated by the subjective quality of the term “scenery.” This underscores the importance and value of submitting sketch plans and holding preliminary meetings with applicants (which the Township currently encourages), adequately mapping scenic resources on “existing features plans,” conducting site walks, and utilizing consultants with experience in scenic resource protection in development review.



## ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

1. Consider adopting scenic or rural road protection standards for the scenic roads identified in this Plan. These standards should require, to the maximum extent practicable, the preservation of those elements that contribute to rural character. These standards should be linked to the functional classification and ownership of the Township's roads or Zoning Districts.
2. Consider adopting a Scenic Rivers Overlay District along designated reaches of the White Clay National Wild and Scenic River. The extent of the Scenic River Corridor should be based on the *White Clay Creek and its Tributaries Watershed Management Plan* (2001). Development on sites within the Scenic River Overlay should be limited to areas not visible from within the river corridor and should protect external views of the corridor from public roads. Structures should be situated below ridgelines to preserve existing vistas and standards for retention and replacement of vegetation should be modified to protect a higher proportion of existing woodland than currently required by Article 24.
3. Consider inclusion of lands comprising significant scenic resource areas as Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) sending areas if a TDR program is adopted by the Township. Scenic resources include vista points, scenic roads, and visual accents. Lands with scenic resources in designated growth areas (i.e., Kemblesville) could also become TDR receiving areas if standards for scenic resource protection are developed.
4. Periodically review the adequacy of landscaping and screening regulations to ensure they protect and enhance scenic resources. Assess the adequacy of screening requirements as recently-built developments age. Evaluate whether particular areas, such as the White Clay Creek corridor, should have more stringent landscaping standards. Consider requiring woodland replacement in addition to street tree and ornamental landscaping where woodlands are disturbed in the course of land development.
5. Encourage the use of conservation easements to protect visual accents and frontage along scenic roads.
6. Utilize the conditional use process to achieve scenic resource protection objectives. Subdivisions and land developments requiring conditional use approval are often designated as such because their impacts are district-wide and may affect the entire community. As a result, these developments require close scrutiny by the Board of Supervisors, which may require additional safeguards to ensure impacts – including those to the public viewshed or other scenic resources – are minimized. Where reasonable, conditions of approval should always include the protection of scenic resources and cite specific actions applicants must take to do so. The Township may also consider expanding conditional use designation to other uses based on their perceived impacts to scenic resources.

TDR = Transfer of Development Rights

## Franklin Township Comprehensive Plan

---

7. Consider adopting the proposed Historic Preservation Zoning Article, or a modified version of it, to protect the scenic quality of historic resources located outside the Kemblesville Historic District.
8. Prepare a National Register Nomination for the Kemblesville Historic District (see recommendations in “Historic Resources,” below).

## ***HISTORIC RESOURCES***

### ***INTRODUCTION***

Settled by European immigrants as early as the 1720s, Franklin Township's history is rich, colorful, and closely tied to the success of agriculture. While the majority of historic structures in the Township reflect its early development as a farming community, they span the full gamut of architectural styles commonly found in the region, from Colonial to Craftsman. These resources provide valuable public benefits. Collectively, they tell the unique story of Franklin's development and help foster a sense of community identity. They also greatly contribute to the Township's rural appeal and scenic quality.

Yet as the demand for new homes increases, so too does pressure to demolish old structures, in part because historic structures are perceived as liabilities and/or too costly to rehabilitate, but also because options for their reuse may be limited. Already, development has left an indelible mark on Franklin's historic fabric. Between 1982 and 2002, the Township lost approximately one tenth of its historic resource base to land development.

Several recent Township actions attest to the community's growing concern over the loss of historic resources. Thanks largely to the work of Franklin's Board of Supervisors and Historical Commission, the Village of Kemblesville is now a Pennsylvania Certified Historic District, a HARB has been established in Kemblesville, and a detailed inventory of all structures in Franklin 50 years of age and older was completed in 2004.

Results from the 2004 Community Values Survey further underscore community interest in historic preservation. Retention of rural atmosphere (of which Franklin's historic farmsteads and landscapes are a critical component) ranked first among the most important planning issues selected by respondents. "Changes in unique local character" ranked a close third behind "area becoming over-developed" and "taxes too high" in the list of factors that might cause residents to move out of the Township. Participants in the Comprehensive Plan visioning workshops also emphasized their interest in historic preservation and established historic and cultural resources protection as one of the Plan's principal goals.

Following a broad overview of Franklin's history, a summary of the 2004 Historic Resource Survey is presented along with a map identifying and classifying parcels according to their historic value. As of this writing, few communities in Chester County have an inventory of this depth. An assessment of the Township's current historic preservation policies and programs and whether or not they meet the objectives of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan is also provided to serve as a baseline for future planning efforts.

### ***COMMUNITY HISTORY***

Officially created in 1852, Franklin Township was named in honor of Benjamin Franklin, who was thought to have owned a 160-acre parcel of land in the Village of Kemblesville and frequented the area while living in Philadelphia. Not unlike many other Chester County

communities, Franklin's development is closely intertwined with the success of agriculture, the gradual construction and

improvement of roadways, and more recently, suburban growth in Chester County and the Wilmington-Newark metropolitan area.

To understand the landscape of Franklin today, it is important to review the historic trends that shaped the land, the built environment, and the community over time. The following, modified from the 1991 Comprehensive Plan and supplemented with information from Franklin's recently completed Historic Resource Survey and Historical Commission, provides a broad overview of the Township's history.

### ***Original Settlers***

The earliest inhabitants of the area now known as Franklin Township were Indians of the Lenni Lenape tribe, which had many settlements throughout the Delaware River Valley. Although the Lenni Lenape were joined as a confederacy, they were largely independent and governed by their own chiefs. The only documented site associated with the Lenni Lenape in the area is the village called Minquannan on the White Clay Creek in adjoining London Britain Township. The peaceful Indians of this area were often the targets of raids by the Susquehannoks and other warlike tribes such as the Minquas, Iroquois, and Shawnees.

Though the PHMC has no archaeological records for Franklin, the Commission has rated certain sites as having "high probability of pre-contact [Native American] artifacts," particularly in recently plowed fields and areas within approximately 50 feet of a stream or creek.

### ***European Settlement***

The land area that comprises the northeastern portion of Franklin today was once part of a 65,000 acre parcel extending from the Delaware River to the Chesapeake Bay known as the London Tract. The remainder of Franklin Township to the south and west was originally located in a number of small grants of land.

The London Tract, originally owned by William Penn, was sold in 1699 to the London Land Company, a group of four men from London, England, who were to control the Tract for 124 years. Much of this land originally leased for a term of years, with stipulations that a certain number of acres be cleared and plowed yearly. According to an advertisement circulated in the 1720s, the leases generally comprised 50 acres per person with 10 families required to settle together on every 5,000 acres for the purpose of promoting "good neighborhood convenience."

Settlers within the London Tract began to obtain deeds to their lands in 1722 and 1723 from the London Land Company. This marks the beginning of settlement in Franklin. These deeds were prepared in England using the metes and bounds technique. Consequently, individual parcels were irregular in shape due to the random settlement of the Tract.

During the early part of the eighteenth century, the portion of the London Tract within Chester County was divided into individual townships to provide more effective political representation. London Grove was formulated in 1723, New London in 1724, and London Britain in 1725. At that time, Franklin was part of southeastern New London Township and would remain so until

1852. Municipal boundaries followed parcel lines, resulting in irregular shaped townships. This is apparent in the northern and eastern borders of Franklin.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the land now contained in Franklin was the location of large farms with widely dispersed farmsteads. Most of the first residences were one-story buildings with a single interior room, sometimes with a loft. Though few exist today, some examples remain, including the Susan Fury House on Den Road. Other early eighteenth century houses were log buildings, which were often enlarged and added on to in subsequent years. The Cornelius Lynch House on North Creek Road, demolished in March 2005, was possibly the last example of this early colonial architecture in Franklin.

Another example of a house design during the first wave of the Township's settlement is exemplified by the McKean Farmhouse (pronounced "McCane"), constructed c. 1720 for the wealthy Susannah McKean. Its side-hall plan – though common at the time in Philadelphia – is one of the earliest examples in rural Pennsylvania. Franklin-born Thomas McKean (1734-1817), son of William and Letitia Finney McKean, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence and the only continuous member of the Continental Congress. He later served as Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and Second Governor under the 1790 Constitution. As a result of its architectural integrity and historical significance, the McKean Farmhouse was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 1984, the only such individual distinction in the Township.

Milling also began to grow in prominence during the eighteenth century and would remain so through the nineteenth century. At that time, farmers would transport grain to mills to be ground into flour. While most mills were grist mills, many were equipped with a saw or paper mill. Breou's Atlas of 1883 shows six different mills in Franklin situated on the West and Middle Branches of the White Clay Creek and on Big Elk Creek. Of these, three remain standing today, one of which, the John K. Steele Mill on Hess Mill Road, was built c. 1749.

By 1750, the road from Lancaster to Newark, Delaware, was laid out. Now called New London Road (Route 896), it was a major route for the transportation of agricultural products from Chester County farms to markets in Delaware. Roadway improvements led to the establishment of inns and stagecoach stops, including the Plough and Harrow Inn (c. 1758) and Kemblesville Hotel (c. 1763) as well as Franklin's villages – Kemblesville (originally called Fox Chase) and Chesterville.

### *Nineteenth Century*

By the early 1800s, Fox Chase was a prosperous and busy village along the road from Newark to Lancaster boasting three mills, a hotel, and a pottery works (Darlington Cope's pottery). By 1816, Fox Chase was renamed Kimble, and later Kimbleville, after the prominent John J. Kimble family who settled in the area in 1783. John's youngest son, George, was a storekeeper who opened the village's first post office in his shop in 1823 and served as postmaster for 33 years. George's brother Samuel, whose house stands on the southern limits of Kemblesville, operated the hotel and tavern, which became the local polling place. Family members spelled the name "Kimble" or "Kemble," and throughout the nineteenth century the name of the village vacillated between "Kimbleville" and "Kemblesville."

The Presbyterian Church in Kemblesville was constructed in 1852 under the sponsorship of New London Presbyterian Church. One acre of ground was purchased from Samuel Kimble, Sr. and

his wife for \$50.00 for the Church's construction. The original building burned in 1990 and has been replaced by the current structure. On December 6, 1868, permission was given to the Flint Hill Methodist Church – which had a church and cemetery in southeastern Franklin on Flint Hill Road

– to hold services at the Presbyterian Church on the second and fourth Sunday of each month. The Flint Hill congregation became increasingly strong throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century and in 1899 purchased the Presbyterian property in Kemblesville.

The original Flint Hill Methodist Church and cemetery remain as ruins. Ruins of the Mt. Olivet Church and cemetery (Plummerite Baptist) are also visible today along Walker Road. The Auburn Baptist Church (south side of Auburn Road in northeast Franklin) was also built in the mid-1800s. This Church remains active today, and though its core is historic, it has undergone alterations and additions since 1980.

Chesterville, another settlement in Franklin, was a compact village with several buildings. A post office opened there in 1848 in a store operated by Samuel Byles. On the opposite corner was the William Missimer Farm. Missimer, whose house remains standing on the corner today, operated a wheelwright and blacksmith shop. Chesterville was never as large or important to the Township's economy as Kemblesville and today lacks the historic setting it once had as a result of demolition and modern residential development.

Generally, residential architectural styles in the nineteenth century reflected the prevailing styles throughout Chester County. The Federal Style was a refinement of earlier architectural trends. Fifty examples were documented in the 2004 Historic Resource Survey (see below). Perhaps the best example in Franklin is the Thomas Hindman House on Flint Hill Road, with its three stories, shallow roof slopes, and double brick chimneys. By the mid-nineteenth century, the prevailing architectural style for new construction in Franklin became Gothic Revival. These residences are characterized by a centered cross-gable on the main elevation which lights the third floor/garrett space.

Agriculture continued to be a profitable enterprise throughout the nineteenth century in Franklin. Increasing output of grain in the early decades of the century led to the construction of larger barns. The common English Lake District barns of the eighteenth century gradually gave way to double-decker barns in the early nineteenth century. This new barn type represented a means of accommodating larger grain harvests. The ramp system became a more visible feature, leading over a passageway to a threshing floor on the third level. The hay mows on each end were two-story elements above the stall. A variety of historic farm outbuildings, including springhouses, corncribs, and sheds, may also be found on nineteenth century farmsteads. Franklin's Connecticut-style corncribs are unique among other Chester County corncribs because of their extended gables found on the end wall where the doors were located.

Lastly, schools became more common throughout Pennsylvania in the mid-nineteenth century. Before the 1830s, most schools were subscription organizations funded by parents. In the 1830s, however, the "Common School System" was introduced, which required municipalities to be divided into local school districts each served by its own schoolhouse. Franklin was divided into seven school districts, with the majority of districts building one-room schoolhouses. Of the first round of schoolhouses, only the Spencer School House on Old School House Road remains. Four one-room schoolhouses were in operation between 1875 and 1956, when the Kemblesville Elementary School was built and the system became part of the Avon Grove School District.

### *Twentieth Century*

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Kemblesville became increasingly important as a commercial center. Dr. J.G. West became one of the leading citizens of the village. A medical doctor, West lived in a brick house facing New London Road. He added a wing onto his house in the late 1800s where he operated a drug store and post office. Another leading citizen, C.T. Richards, opened a saddlery shop and owned a half interest in the village's blacksmith shop.

Modern conveniences of the early twentieth century became available in Franklin Township at this time. Gas lines and steam heat were installed in the Kemblesville Hotel in 1905 and electricity arrived in the village in 1908. When telephone lines came to Kemblesville the exchange was established in the West Drug Store. In subsequent decades, phone lines and electricity were extended throughout the Township. In 1911, a stagecoach service carried mail and passengers between Kemblesville and Newark twice a day. In 1920, the Franklin Township Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution to borrow \$30,000 for improving New London Road (Route 896) from London Britain to New London. This was completed in the spring of 1922.

Residents petitioned and voted to have Franklin Township declared "dry" in 1933, the same year Congress adopted the 21<sup>st</sup> amendment to the U.S. Constitution repealing the national prohibition on liquor. It has been implied that before then, Cecil County was "dry" and workers from Elk Mills found Kemblesville to be a lively spot on Saturday nights.

The earliest residences in the twentieth century reflected the American Foursquare Style. This low-cost building type was made possible in part by mail-order businesses, which shipped a kit of materials and directions for its construction. An example of this type is found in Kemblesville, a two-and-a-half story, two-bay building with a pyramidal roof, sleeping porch, and typical hipped-roof dormers. A second Foursquare house constructed on Strickersville Road came with a special machine used to produce "cast stone," a concrete block with a molded face for the exterior wall. In addition to American Foursquare houses, another building type of the early twentieth century was the Craftsman or Bungalow Style. This was also a "kit" house, selected from a catalog of various house plans and types.

The widespread use of the automobile beginning in the twentieth century left an indelible mark upon Franklin Township, as elsewhere. Historic roads were upgraded and widened to accommodate growing traffic. Unlike earlier decades, new residential construction reflected the one-story tract housing of the time; the most common styles were Ranch and Minimal Traditional. The latter represented a break with the traditional housing assumptions; it consisted of a rectangular building with an ell (right angle extension) on the front rather than the rear. Most Minimal Traditional houses do not have a front porch; rather than sitting on the porch facing the road, residents had a private deck or patio off the rear of the house.

Many of the residents of these smaller houses did not work in nearby fields but drove to work elsewhere. The wide availability of automobiles changed the nature of shopping, making it possible for consumers to drive to Newark or Wilmington for a greater selection of consumer goods and tax-free shopping. This movement had a negative impact on Kemblesville. As its obsolescent businesses, such as the saddlery and blacksmith shop, closed with the times, other businesses also ceased operating, such as the general store (1955) and the hotel (1969).

As the twentieth century drew to a close, Franklin Township changed dramatically from an agricultural township to a bedroom community. Corporations in Delaware and the nearby University of Delaware became large employers, and the demand for housing spilled into Franklin. Many of the farms throughout the Township became residential developments. Demolition of historic buildings was often the result.

### ***HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY***

An in-depth survey of all structures 50 years of age and older was completed in 2004 by preservation consultant Wise Preservation Planning.<sup>1</sup> Funded by the Township with a matching grant from the PHMC, the intent of the survey was to inform land use decision-making by documenting and registering all structures of historic value. Generally, inclusion in the survey (in addition to each structure's age) was based on National Park Service criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (30 CFR 60.4). These criteria include:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past;
- C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and
- D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey Forms (HRSF) were completed for each property constructed up to 1955. Additionally, the consultants classified historic properties into three categories varying in historical significance. Classification was based on exterior architectural details *only*. According to the consultants' report, "A complete evaluation would include an assessment of the integrity of a building's exterior *and interior*. Thus, it is possible that the recommended classification of a particular building could change" (Wise, 2004: 11). These categories are as follows:

- **Class I** properties include individual properties listed on the National Register or that have received a Determination of Eligibility (DOE) for listing. Contributing properties in any National Register-listed or DOE historic district are also included.

---

<sup>1</sup> Copies of the "Franklin Township Historic Resource Survey" (Wise Preservation Planning, 2004) are available at the Franklin Township office for public review.

- **Class II** properties have the potential to be individually eligible for the National Register. Class II also includes properties of local significance but not necessarily eligible, such as farmsteads and schoolhouses.

- **Class III** properties are all other resources constructed before 1955 which do not retain the architectural significance to be listed on the National Register.

Figure 4-2 on the following page displays the location of Franklin’s Class I, II, and III historic resources. Because several historic structures may be located on a single property, tax parcels rather than the location of individual structures are identified. Classification is based on each parcel’s primary historic resource. HRSFs for each property are available for review at the Franklin Township office.

Altogether, Franklin Township has 28 Class I resources, 63 Class II resources, and 64 Class III resources. The Class I resources include the McKean Farm (DOE 1984) and all contributing properties in the Kemblesville Historic District (DOE 2002). Complete documentation of the District’s resources is necessary for the Act 167 (Historic District Ordinance) design review process, which the Township adopted in 2003.

***Property Types***

The historic resources documented in the 2004 survey are highly varied, including many architectural styles and eras. Most reflect the rural background of the Township, including those in Kemblesville, which historically functioned as Franklin’s commercial and civic hub. These resources fall into a variety of property types, identified in Table 4-3, below.

**Table 4-3. Property Type of Historic Resources, Franklin Township, 2004**

<b>Property Type</b>	<b># of Survey Forms</b>
Intact Farms	29
Farmsteads	20
Individual Resources	63
Residential Village Lots	27
Non-Residential	15
Demolished	11
Ruins	4
Properties not documented	4

Intact farms are properties with a farmhouse, barn, and outlying agricultural fields, while farmsteads represent properties with a farmhouse and barn but lacking fields. Individual resources are properties with either a farmhouse or a barn, but not both. Residential village lots represent the contributing properties in the Kemblesville Historic District. Non-residential properties include mills, churches, cemeteries, schools, stores, and inns. Ruins include properties with substantial ruins as the primary resource while demolished properties are those that were surveyed from 1979 to 1982 (in the Chester County Historic Sites Survey) but could not be found in 2004. Lastly, four properties were not documented because they were not visible from public roads.

***Resource Styles***

The vast majority of structures surveyed in 2004 were houses (133), followed by barns (52), and various domestic and agricultural outbuildings. Table 4-4 presents the architectural styles of the

primary historic resource associated with each Class I, II, and III property. The majority of styles reflect colonial and early American rural building traditions.

**Table 4-4. Style of Historic Resources, Franklin Township, 2004**

<b>Principal Resource Style</b>	<b>Number of Principal Resources</b>
Federal	44
Vernacular	31
Colonial (including Penn Plan)	19
Gothic Revival	11
Modern	7
Mid-Nineteenth Century	7
Ranch	6
Early Republic	6
Early Twentieth Century	5
Folk Victorian	3
American Foursquare	2
Craftsman/Bungalow	2
Tudor Revival	2
Victorian	2
Twentieth Century	1
Greek Revival	1
Cape Cod	1
Italianate	1
Mid-Twentieth Century	1
Queen Anne	1
Other Styles	6

***IMPLICATIONS***

Up until recently, Franklin Township’s approach to historic resource protection was largely voluntary. Preservation of historic structures was for the most part a private activity, though some standards in the ZO and SLDO required developers to identify structures of historic value in site plans and protect them where feasible. For example, the Township’s current standards for open space design require the maximum “conservation of site features identified as having particular conservation value, historical significance, or recreation value” (ZO Section 1510.F.1.a.2). Yet interviews with Township officials and Historical Commission members suggest that resources were often demolished without Township knowledge. Indeed, this was one impetus for the Historic Resource Survey finished in 2004.

Recognizing the need for a more proactive approach to preservation, starting in 2001 the Township’s Historical Preservation Committee (which in 2003 became an ordinance-enabled Historical Commission) worked with the Township to obtain grant funding from Chester County’s Vision Partnership Program to create and adopt tools for historic resource protection. The Township contracted with a preservation consultant to accomplish the following tasks:

- Survey and document the Village of Kemblesville, enabling it to obtain a DOE for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The PHMC issued a DOE for Kemblesville

in 2002, making it eligible for both listing on the National Register and the formation of a Pennsylvania Certified Historic District (pursuant to Act 167).

- Obtain certification from the PHMC naming Kemblesville a Certified Historic District, and develop language for an Historic District Ordinance which creates an HARB for Kemblesville. In 2003, the Historic District Ordinance was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and Kemblesville became a state-certified Historic District. Franklin’s seven-member HARB is responsible for reviewing all proposed alterations and demolitions to the exterior of existing structures and the design of new construction within the Kemblesville Historic District. Following its review, the HARB makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the issuance of “Certificates of Appropriateness.” These COAs are approval statements signed by the Supervisors certifying the historical appropriateness of architectural alterations and new construction that can be seen from a public right-of-way.
- Draft an Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay Article to protect historic resources located outside the Kemblesville Historic District. The draft Historic Preservation Zoning Article, which basically functions as an overlay district, has undergone extensive edits but has not been adopted, largely due to disagreement over the extent of resources subject to additional review criteria. The intent of the Article is to grant the Historical Commission input, similar to what the HARB has in Kemblesville, for major alterations and demolitions to Class I and II historic resources located outside the Historic District. Regulatory incentives for preservation – such as special exceptions from the use and area/bulk regulations of the underlying zoning district – are also included in the draft ordinance.

A fourth element, which is really part of the third task, is the Historic Resource Survey completed in 2004. Franklin Township was the only township in the Commonwealth to receive funding from the PHMC in 2003 for a municipal-wide historic resource survey. Adoption and implementation of the draft historic preservation overlay is contingent on an accurate inventory and resource classification system, which the 2004 Historic Resource Survey provides.

Altogether, Franklin Township has taken several important steps in recent years to protect historic resources. In fact, nearly all the recommendations made in the 1991 Comprehensive Plan have been implemented: ordinance amendments protecting historic resources have been adopted, an Historical Commission and HARB have been established, the resource inventory has been updated, and the Township has utilized County grant funding to further preservation initiatives. Yet several important tasks remain, including deciding whether or not to further pursue the draft Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay Article.

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

1. Consider adopting a revised form of the draft Historic Preservation Zoning Article.
2. Should the proposed Historic Preservation Zoning Article not be adopted, utilize the Historic Resource Survey in plan review and to promote historic preservation throughout the Township (not just in Kemblesville).
3. Prepare a National Register Nomination for the Kemblesville Historic District. A listing will strengthen the ability of the HARB to examine and make recommendations in the Certificate of Appropriateness process. A National Register listing can also help protect the district from federal and state funded projects, such as road widening.
4. Encourage private historic preservation measures, such as conservation easements, deed restrictions, or restrictive covenants.
5. Apply to become a Certified Local Government (through the PHMC and the National Park Service; benefits include technical assistance and small grants for preservation activities).
6. If a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program is adopted by the Township, consider lands with Class I and II historic resources as TDR sending areas. Lands with Class I and II historic resources in designated growth areas (i.e., Kemblesville) could also become TDR receiving areas if design guidelines for new construction are developed.
7. Consider the use of Township monies for the purchase of façade easements.
8. Promote voluntary efforts by recognizing business owners and homeowners who undertake historic character-sensitive construction, rehabilitation, or restoration. Individuals and businesses could be recognized in Township newsletters or other local publications and be awarded certificates of merit demonstrating the Township's appreciation of their work.
9. Finish developing preservation design guidelines for Kemblesville, and should the Historic Preservation Zoning Article be adopted, for the entire Township.
10. Encourage traffic calming in the Kemblesville Historic District to improve walkability, safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and historic structures, and appreciation of the historic atmosphere.
11. Create a comprehensive signage system for Franklin's Class I and II historic resources. Such a system might include plaques for historic structures and entrance signs to Kemblesville Historic District and/or the Township (including founding dates).
12. Continue to provide training to Historical Commission and HARB members on preservation techniques and funding opportunities.

13. Target outreach and education to landowners in the Kemblesville Historic District, as well as throughout the Township, regarding restoration techniques, funding opportunities, and historic architectural design guidelines.

14. Apply to become a stop on the annual Chester County Town Tours & Village Walks summer program (sponsored by the Chester County Parks and Recreation Department).
15. Explore opportunities to make the McKean Farmstead a Township asset. This might include supporting a National Register application, private preservation efforts, building a library or interpretive center to display legal papers, or focusing Historical Commission activities and scholarship on Thomas McKean's life-story.