

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**RICHARD DILWORTH, PH.D., CHAIR
THURSDAY, 16 APRIL 2009, 9:00 A.M.
ROOM 578, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Janet Klein
David Schaaf, RA
Penelope Giles

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
Elise Vider, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Bevan Lawson
Lori Curtis, Siloam
Alexis Lukach, Siloam
James Johnson, Siloam
Joseph Lukach, Siloam
Mike Erwin, Siloam
Cathy Maguire, RSM, Siloam
Bernadette Kinniry, RSM, Siloam
Shawn M. Langdon, Siloam
Kevin R. Boyle, Esq., Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young
Angela Ayukachale, Siloam
Eileen DeBenedictis, Siloam
Sheila Breen, Siloam
Mark Whitehead, Siloam
Dan Mawoini, Siloam
Michelle Cooper, Siloam
Marie Malloy, Siloam
Dorothy Krotzer
Andrew Palewski
Victoria Siu
Angela McFadden
Amy Dougherty, Friends of the Free Library
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Dilworth called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Giles and Klein and Mr. Schaaf joined him on the Committee.

1123-33 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Siloam

Nominator: Andrew R. Palewski

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the individual designation of the church building at 1123-33 Spring Garden Street. The Church of the Assumption, designed by Patrick Charles Keely, was constructed in 1849 and is the sanctuary where Katharine Drexel was baptized. The nomination contends that the property at 1123-33 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, b, and e, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1123-33 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, b, and e.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. Andrew Palewski represented the nomination. Attorney Kevin Boyle, Joseph Lukach, the executive director of Siloam, Eileen DeBenedictis, the chair of Siloam's property committee, structural engineer Bevan Lawson, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the property owner.

Mr. Schaaf opined that Criterion h also applies to this building as it is a landmark at the intersection of Spring Garden Street and Ridge Avenue. He also noted that Criterion d may apply as well as this is a fine example of Gothic Revival architecture.

Mr. Palewski, the nominator, stated that he is a resident of the West Poplar neighborhood. He claimed that this neighborhood had lost most of its architectural heritage, especially its early nineteenth-century buildings. A few remain, but this church is the most spectacular and the most important. He stated that the church was designed by important architect Patrick C. Keely and is oldest surviving examples of his work in the United States and Canada. He stated that Archbishop John Neumann was involved in the consecration of the building and Saint Katherine Drexel was baptized in it. He concluded that the preservation and protection of this building is important for the neighborhood and the city. Ms. Giles asked Mr. Palewski if the Church of the Assumption should be designated under Criteria d and h as well as those cited in the nomination. Mr. Palewski agreed that the building does satisfy Criteria for Designation d and h.

Ms. Klein was interested in the patented imitation brownstone cement. She suggested that the staff look into this material and provide any additional information on it if possible. She asked if the property is listed on the National Register. Ms. Coté stated that it was not. She stated that the church has a pleasing simplicity of Gothic design that is very beautiful.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the paragraph on page eight of the nomination be stricken as the relationship between Keely and English architect Augustus W. N. Pugin is mostly speculative. Mr. Dilworth opined that the claims are conjectural and should not be included unless proven. Mr. Schaaf felt that there were too many qualifiers in the paragraph and that it should be removed unless additional research revealed a connection between the two architects.

Dorothy Krotzer, who assisted with the nomination, reiterated that this is the earliest surviving example of Keely's work in the United States and stated that Keely was a prolific architect who worked primarily for the Catholic Church.

Victoria Siu of the Callowhill Neighborhood Association read a letter of support in favor of the designation of the site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the nomination and the two additional Criteria suggested today. He noted that the Keely Society sent a letter of support and that Keely was an architect of great distinction.

Ms. Giles asked if the owner was present and would like to comment. Mr. Gallery interjected that the Commission does not need the owner's consent to designate a property.

Mr. Boyle, the attorney for the property owner, stated that Siloam is a non-profit organization. He introduced Joseph Lukach, Siloam's executive director. Mr. Lukach stated that Siloam was founded in 1995 to provide mind/body/spirit services to people impacted by HIV/AIDS. The organization was founded in Philadelphia because there were 17,000 people diagnosed with HIV in the area at the time, five times higher than the United States average. He stated that Siloam chose the property because of its proximity to the served population and because it is amidst numerous other social service groups. He stated that the organization works out of the rectory building and has paid \$80,000 for a new roof for the rectory building.

Eileen DeBenedictis, the chair of Siloam's Property Committee, informed the Committee on Historic Designation that Siloam rented the rectory from the Archdiocese from 1995 to 2006. The Church had been vacant and deconsecrated for about four or five years by 1995. She stated that Siloam purchased the rectory, convent, and church building because the Archdiocese would only sell the entire property; the organization was only interested in the rectory, but bought the other buildings as a package. After purchasing the property, Siloam began to investigate its options for the church building. She stated that they looked into the rehabilitation of the building. She stated that the organization only reached the decision to demolish the church after several years of consideration. The organization can not afford the \$5 million required for the rehabilitation of the church. The demolition of the church would, in turn, grant access to the convent building, which Siloam can use.

Mr. Lukach stated that Siloam investigated the preservation of the church building. It engaged the Community Design Collaborative (CDC) to do feasibility study and worked with Partners for Sacred Places to find funding for the building. The CDC determined that it would cost \$5.4 million to rehabilitate the church building. Siloam is committed to focusing its services on the HIV/AIDS community. The rehabilitation of the church is beyond its financial capacity. He stated that Siloam consulted with the Nonprofit Finance Fund on financing for capital improvements. The organization needs \$800,000 to continue to work in the rectory building and \$1.5 million to use the convent. In November 2008, Siloam decided to demolish the church building because it determined that it was infeasible to adaptively reuse it. Siloam received a grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to fund the demolition. The grant money must be used by June 2009. Mr. Lukach stated that no one sought to protect the building during the 20 years it sat vacant. He stated that no one made any efforts to preserve the building until Siloam indicated that it would seek a demolition permit. He concluded that the designation of the church would place his organization in serious financial jeopardy.

Mr. Thomas, Siloam's preservation consultant, noted that the CDC figure of \$5.4 million covers the stabilization of the church only. The total rehabilitation costs would be much higher.

Mr. Lawson, Siloam's structural engineer, stated that the church has been unheated for several years and that the freeze-thaw cycles have damaged the building. He displayed images of the deterioration, pointing out cracks and other damage to the building. He noted that the arches were built without keystones. Cracks at the arches indicate significant structural failure.

Mr. Dilworth stated that he thought that this nomination raised issues that should be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship, not the Committee on Historic Designation. He asked if Mr. Thomas was going to address the historic significance of the church. Mr. Boyle stated that suggesting a deferral of the presentation of this information until a review before the Committee on Financial Hardship assumes that the building will be designated. He is trying to save his client time and money by presenting all this information now. Mr. Boyle cited the notice letter that it states that the Philadelphia Historical Commission conducts business in a "reasonable and practical way." He asserted that it is reasonable and practical to review this information now not after designation. Ms. Giles informed Mr. Boyle that the Committee's task is to review the nomination and recommend to the Commission whether the property meets one or more of the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Boyle paraphrased from the preamble of the preservation ordinance, stating that the Commission must act in the interest of the people of Philadelphia. Mr. Farnham clarified that the Committee is solely responsible for determining whether the property meets one or more of the Criteria for Designation listed in the historic preservation ordinance and then make recommendation to the Commission based on that determination. The recommendation is advisory; it is non-binding. The Commission alone has the authority to take other factors into account. Designation is a discretionary; the Commission is not required to designate, even if the property is worthy of designation. Arguments about the Siloam's mission et cetera should be made to the Commission. Review by the Committee on Financial Hardship would only occur after designation and only if the property owner submitted a permit application predicated on hardship. The question of finances has no place in this discussion. However, the integrity of the building is significant to this discussion. If the integrity building is degraded to such a point that the church cannot signify its historic significance, then it may no longer meet the Criteria.

Mr. Boyle stated that the building described in the nomination no longer exists; the interior has been gutted. Mr. Farnham clarified that, even if designated, the Commission would not have jurisdiction over the interior. Mr. Thomas disagreed with the "fair" condition assessment in the nomination. He stated the church is in poor condition. It is at best a ruin and no longer represents the Keely building of the 1840s.

Mr. Lawson discussed the significant water infiltration into the building. He showed photographs of efflorescence and stated that the mortar is loosing lime, which is bleaching out. He claimed that the salmon brick is turning into powder. The freeze/thaw cycles are increasing the damage exponentially. He stated that the roof framing needs replacement. Also, the street traffic is causing damaging vibrations in the building. He added that the city has deemed the building "Unsafe." Mr. Lawson pointed to a photograph indicating that the timber columns, painted-to-look-like-marble, are rotting at their bases. Mr. Schaaf disagreed with Mr. Lawson's assessment. Mr. Schaaf asked if the walls are plumb. Mr. Lawson stated that they appear to be, but the tower walls are bowing. Mr. Thomas stated that water is running down the tower walls and that the copper cladding on the steeples is holding moisture in. Mr. Lawson stated that there is an immediate threat of tower collapse. The joists are rotating owing to moisture. In the basement, the masonry on earth is absorbing moisture. There is termite damage. Mr. Schaaf

observed that would not be surprised if he saw similar problems in his own basement. He stated that the evidence of significant deterioration was not convincing.

Mr. Thomas stated that the building has lost its integrity. He said that the nomination is rife with errors. The description is in error. It describes stained-glass windows that have not existed for years. Their removal significantly changed the exterior. The building has stucco from the 1950s and an inappropriate copper roof. He stated that Keely-designed church would have had a gray color with a gray slate roof. The building is a gutted shell that has not been maintained for 20 years. Mr. Thomas showed a slide indicating the layers of stucco that have been added to the exterior. He stated that there is a 1950s stucco over a brownstone and then a gray stone underneath. He opined that all the elements that made this building a Keely church are lost. He stated that this is not the building with the strongest association to Katherine Drexel, which is the criterion for the National Register. There are other buildings with stronger associations to the saint. He added that no surface survives that represents the era of her baptism. He stated that the real monument to John Neumann is the shrine at the church at 5th Street and Girard Avenue. He stated that there is an issue with the physical context as well. He said that Spring Garden was thriving at the time the church was constructed. That thriving community no longer exists.

Ms. Giles stated that the rehabilitation of this church could revitalize the community. She noted that the historic preservation ordinance exists to protect these buildings such as this one.

Mr. Thomas stated that this is a vacant church in a neighborhood of vacant warehouses and parking lots. He added that there are other examples of Gothic Revival churches in Philadelphia. The Archdiocese decided which churches were important when it retained ownership of the landmarks: St. Joe's, St. Mary's and St. Peter's. The Church felt that this church was expendable. He added that it was cheaply built. He opined that the core issue is the loss of fabric with the alterations from the 1890s and 1950s. He stated that the building now has an orange stucco façade and a green copper roof; it is not the building that Keely designed. He asserted that it could no longer be attributed to Keely.

Mr. Schaaf stated that color is something that can be easily changed. Ms. Krotzer stated that the overall form of the church is very much that which Keely designed. Ms. Giles asked Ms. Krotzer what steps the neighborhood had taken to promote the restoration of the church and what help it is willing to offer. Ms. Krotzer offered the support of the neighborhood group and said that they would be willing to work with the owner. Mr. Boyle asked the Committee to be practical; he reminded the Committee that the notice letter says that the Commission will be reasonable.

Amy Dougherty of the Friends of the Free Library asked the owners about their intention for the building at the time of purchase. Ms. DeBenedictis stated that there was no program for the church building and that they intended to study it after the purchase, which was rushed.

Mr. Gallery reminded the Committee about the court's decision in the Boyd Theatre case, which concluded that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interiors of buildings. He opined that the exterior of the church meets the Criteria. He stated that much of the owner's case has to do with the interior of the church.

Ms. Sui stated that she is a benefactor of the visual beauty of the church every time she walks by it. She stated that the chain link fence around the building is an eyesore. Mr. Lukach stated that the fence was put up owing to a concern about the structural stability of the steeples.

Sister Bernadette Kinniry, a co-founder of Siloam, stated that Siloam performed its due diligence at the time of purchase and determined that the property was not designated as historic. She stated that the organization has done what it could, but the building has disintegrated. She added that community support is nice, but Siloam needs financial support.

Mr. Lawson explained the difference between stabilization and rehabilitation. The church does not even meet the building code for stabilization.

Angela McFadden, a neighborhood resident, asked how many windows were left in the building. Mr. Thomas replied that only three stained-glass windows remain. She then asked if there had been a termite inspection. She how much the demolition would cost. She asked about the plans for site after demolition. Mr. Lukach responded that no termite inspection had been undertaken and that it would cost \$250,000 to demolish the building. He stated that \$75,000 was spent on asbestos, guano, and debris removal. He added that there is no program for the site. They will clear the site and possibly create a garden. Ms. McFadden asked what the cost would be to meet the minimum requirements of designation. Mr. Lawson stated that, if the property were designated, it would have to be maintained.

Ms. Klein asked what State entity had given the grant for demolition. Mr. Lukach stated that the Department of Community & Economic Development had provided a grant of \$300,000 to demolish the church.

Ms. Giles stated that she believes that the property meets Criterion for Designation h. Mr. Dilworth stated that he believes the property meets other Criteria. Mr. Schaaf concurred. Mr. Dilworth stated that Criterion for Designation b may not apply because the association with Katherine Drexel is weak. He added that anything associated with Drexel has been removed from the church. Mr. Schaaf stated that it is the church that is associated with the event of her baptism, not merely the baptismal font. He explained that the situation is analogous to that at Independence Hall. The room where the signing of the Declaration of Independence may have changed, yet we honor the building for the event that took place in it.

Ms. Giles stated that she will offer a motion indicating that the property meets Criteria for Designation a, d, e, and h. Mr. Farnham asked her if she is solely recommending that the site meets those Criteria for Designation or if she is also recommending that the site should be designated. Ms. Giles responded that her motion is limited to the assertion that the site meets those Criteria for Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Giles moved to recommend that the property at 1123-33 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, d, e, and h and that the paragraph on page 18 regarding architect Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin should be deleted from the nomination. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4901 KINGSESSING AVENUE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Kingessing Recreation Center building and the Kingessing Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia building at 4901

Kingssessing Avenue. The buildings, designed by Philip H. Johnson, were constructed between the years of 1916 and 1919. The nomination contends that the property at 4901 Kingssessing Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 4901 Kingssessing Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Alliance submitted the nomination for the library and the other three libraries on the agenda. He stated that they were Andrew Carnegie's gift to the City. He stated that these buildings are architecturally significant, retain their integrity, and serve their neighborhoods to this day.

Ms. Giles asked if these four library branches were slated to be closed and if this was a way to circumvent that process. Mr. Gallery replied that these four branches were slated for closing but they were not nominated to circumvent the process. He stated that the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) came and documented the buildings two years ago; the nominations were started at that time. He stated that, even if the branches are closed, the buildings themselves are important enough to preserve. He conceded that the budget crisis and slated closings accelerated the designation process. Amy Dougherty of the Friends of the Free Library stated that Judge Fox ruled that the mayor cannot unilaterally close libraries. Mr. Farnham stated that the designation would have no impact on the use or ownership of the libraries.

Ms. Klein stated that there are more Carnegie libraries in the City. Mr. Gallery responded that the Alliance would not be nominating all the branches, but only the branches that are important works of architecture as well as associated with Carnegie. He noted that there are about 16 library buildings that meet these criteria.

Ms. Klein stated that the library buildings would also qualify for designation under Criterion j; they represent the cultural heritage of the community. The Committee concurred.

Mr. Schaaf observed that the block of Regent Street that terminates at the complex is lined with stately, uniform buildings built at the same time. With the library at the termination of Regent Street, the complex and surrounding buildings forms an interesting composition from a Beaux Arts city planning perspective.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Alliance submitted the nomination for the Kingssessing Library, but not the Kingssessing Recreation Center. A neighbor submitted a nomination for the recreation center about two years ago, but it was deemed incomplete because it did not include the library, which sits on the same parcel. When the staff received the Alliance's library nomination, it combined it with the incomplete recreation center nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the property at 4901 Kingssessing Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, h, and j, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

7720-24 FRANKFORD AVENUE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Thomas Holme Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia building at 7720-24 Frankford Avenue. The library was constructed in 1906-07. The nomination contends that the property at 7720-24 Frankford Avenue satisfies designation criteria a, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 7720-24 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Ms. Klein commented on the interesting connection to Thomas Holme. Thomas Chapman, a neighborhood resident, supported the nomination. Amy Dougherty of the Friends of the Free Library stated that all of the four nominated libraries are important to their communities. Mr. Schaaf concurred and stated that all of these buildings are icons within the communities. Ms. Dougherty stated that Carnegie wanted to elevate these communities with education and books, and that is physically manifested in the steps leading up to the front doors of these branch libraries. Ms. Klein observed that this week is "Library Week" and that a poster of all the Carnegie libraries would be a good promotional tool for the Friends of the Free Library.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the property at 7720-24 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, h, and j, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Giles seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Giles excused herself from the meeting.

446-64 N. 65TH STREET

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Haddington Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia building at 446-64 N. 65th Street. The library, designed by Albert Kelsey and Paul Philippe Cret, was constructed in 1913-15. The nomination contends that the property at 446-64 N. 65th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 446-64 N. 65th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Amy Dougherty of the Friends of the Free Library and Mr. Gallery renewed their earlier comments about the branch libraries. The Committee members agreed that this too was an excellent example of the Carnegie libraries.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the property at 446-64 N. 65th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, h, and j, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1333 WAGNER AVENUE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Logan Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia building at 1333 Wagner Avenue. The library, designed by John Torrey Windrim, was constructed in 1917-18. The nomination contends that the property at 1333 Wagner Avenue satisfies designation criteria a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1333 Wagner Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, and h, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Amy Dougherty of the Friends of the Free Library and Mr. Gallery renewed their earlier comments about the branch libraries. The Committee members agreed that this too was an excellent example of the Carnegie libraries.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the property at 1333 Wagner Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation a, e, h, and j, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

7913-29 OXFORD AVENUE

Owner: Wawa Inc.

Applicant: Wawa Inc.

Proposal: Rescind designation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rescission of the designation of 7913-29 Oxford Avenue from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Philadelphia Historical Commission designated the 1830s Greek Revival style house on 23 November 1966. In February of 2007 fire damaged the building and subsequently the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L & I) issued "unsafe" violations. In September of 2008 another fire damaged the

building and L & I deemed the building “imminently dangerous.” As a result the Commission signed off on a demolition permit and the building has since been demolished.

Please note that Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations states that:

The bases for the rescinding of an entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places are 1) the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, 2) additional information shows that the resource does not meet the criteria for the Register, or 3) error in professional judgment as to whether the resource meets the criteria for listing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission rescind the designation of 7913-29 Oxford Avenue, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations, as the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the rescission request to the Committee. Attorney Thomas Chapman represented the request.

Mr. Chapman stated that the property was designated in 1966. When Wawa purchased it a few years ago, there was no indication that the property was historic. He stated that Wawa has acted in good faith. Wawa has made attempts to sell the property or donate it to the Temple Healthcare System, but those efforts have failed. He stated that two fires have destroyed the building.

Ms. Klein recommended that the staff look into and confirm that this is no potential for archeological significance at the site.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff that, given the lack of description in the Commission minutes, why this building was designated in the first place. Mr. Farnham explained that the building was a good example of an early nineteenth-century building. He postulated that, because it was one of three or four buildings of the same style and age designated at the same time, the Commission was attempting to preserve the nineteenth-century village that once stood in this area. He stated that building had been much altered illegally before the fires and no longer conveyed its significance to the public.

Mr. Dilworth stated that it would be unfair of the Commission to designate for one reason, the building, and, once the building was lost, to hold onto the designation for another reason, archaeological potential. Mr. Schaaf posited that the building was originally designated for its architectural character and because it was part of the early nineteenth-century village. Mr. Farnham stated that it is highly unlikely that it was designated for its archeological potential; the Commission’s records for this property contain not mention of archaeology.

Ms. Klein asked the staff to research the site and present the results of that research to the Commission at May 8 meeting. Mr. Chapman asked Ms. Klein to speculate on the results of that research. Ms. Klein replied that the map research might indicate an earlier, important site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the Commission rescind the designation of 7913-29 Oxford Avenue, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations, because the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dilworth moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:36 a.m.