

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

**2:00 P.M., 25 MAY 2006
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
THOMAS SUGRUE, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Chair
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Warren Huff
Hyman Myers, AIA
Bruce Lavery

Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Erin McGinn Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

ALSO PRESENT

Charles Fuller, Greenbelt Knoll
Art Friedman, Greenbelt Knoll
Lillian Friedman, Greenbelt Knoll
Virginia Barlow, Greenbelt Knoll
Nancy Erskine, Greenbelt Knoll
Gary Brookstein, Greenbelt Knoll
Jeanne Kane, Greenbelt Knoll
Cornelia Camp, Greenbelt Knoll
James Camp, Greenbelt Knoll
James S. Young, Greenbelt Knoll
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Howard B. Haas, Esq.
Vesna Hess, 316 S. 21 Street
Andrew A. Chirls, Esq.
Alvin Holm, AIA

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sugrue, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Huff, and Mr. Myers joined Mr. Sugrue on the Committee. Mr. Lavery arrived shortly thereafter.

GREENBELT KNOLL HISTORIC DISTRICT, 1-19 LONGFORD STREET

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee. He explained that Greenbelt Knoll, a modest suburban subdivision located off Holme Avenue south of Roosevelt Boulevard in Northeast Philadelphia, has extraordinary historical significance for the city, commonwealth, and nation. Along Longford Street, a cul-de-sac, the development is situated on a finger of land bounded by parkland. It originally included nineteen single-family Modern residences set in a natural, wooded environment. One has been lost, but eighteen survive in nearly original

condition. Morris Milgram, a leader of the open housing movement in the United States, created Greenbelt Knoll in the mid 1950s as the first self-consciously integrated suburban development in the city and one of the first in the nation. The development marks a major milestone in the American open housing and civil rights movements. In addition to its important place in American socio-political history, Greenbelt Knoll is important architecturally. Designed by the prominent firm of Montgomery & Bishop with architect Harry Duncan, landscape architect Margaret Lancaster Duncan, and consultant Louis I. Kahn, one of the most important architects of the twentieth century, the houses and landscape at Greenbelt Knoll are excellent examples of the organic vein of mid-century Modern architecture. Set in a wood and isolated from its neighbors, Greenbelt Knoll is one of the most important collections of Modernist buildings in Philadelphia.

Mr. Farnham continued that Greenbelt Knoll is highly significant and therefore eligible for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The district fulfills Designation Criteria a, b, c, d, e, g, and j as delineated in paragraph 5 of the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Satisfying Criterion a, Greenbelt Knoll, one of the nation's first integrated suburban housing developments, has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation and is associated with Morris Milgram, Louis I. Kahn, Robert N.C. Nix, and the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, persons significant in the past. Satisfying Criterion b, Greenbelt Knoll is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, the open housing movement. Satisfying Criteria c and d, Greenbelt Knoll reflects the environment characterized by a distinctive architectural style, the mid-century Modernist style; and it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the architectural style. Designed by Montgomery & Bishop with Louis I. Kahn, Greenbelt Knoll is the work of architects whose designs significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, and cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation; it thereby satisfies Criterion e. Criterion g is satisfied by Greenbelt Knoll, which is located on a finger of land projecting into Pennypack Park, is related to a part of a park worthy of preservation. And finally, satisfying Criterion j, Greenbelt Knoll truly exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community. Greenbelt Knoll is a unique and important place that overwhelmingly deserves to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham stated that the boundaries of the proposed district are the outer property lines of the 19 parcels on Longford Street. Of the 19 parcels, 15 are classified as contributing. Three are classified as significant. They are #5, Milgram's house; #14, the Reverend Sullivan's house; and #16, Congressman Nix's house. The vacant lot at #17 is classified as non-contributing.

Mr. Fuller identified himself as the author of the nomination.

Mr. Myers noted that he observed "Green Belt" on a map and asked for a confirmation of the proper spelling. Mr. Farnham provided a copy of the original plans on which title is spelled "Greenbelt."

Mr. Laverty joined the meeting.

Mr. Myers asked why the park, which was part of the original development, was not included within the bounds of the proposed district. Mr. Friedman, a Greenbelt Knoll resident, remarked that the park had included a swimming pool. He added that the park was donated to the City in the 1980s with the understanding that it would be brought back to a natural state, which it was. Mr. Steinberg asked if the parkland could be added to the designation. Mr. Farnham replied that

it could, however a 60-day notice must be issued to the park owner, the City of Philadelphia. Upon Mr. Sugrue's request, Mr. Friedman and Ms. Barlow described the original use of the park. Mr. Friedman explained that Greenbelt Knoll residents and their guests used the park recreationally. Ms. Barlow added that there was a bridge, a swimming pool with a fence, and a changing facility. Mr. Steinberg asked if the passage to the park between lots #4 and #5 remains. Mr. Friedman replied that it does. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Fuller why he had not included the park in the nomination. Mr. Fuller replied that the residents had not used the park for the twenty years. He stated that he no longer considered it part of the neighborhood. Only the original residents had availed themselves of it. He continued that the City had removed the structures and returned it to its natural state. Mr. Myers recommended that the park be included in the designation and Mr. Steinberg agreed. Mr. Farnham added that he would consult with the Commission's lawyers and the property owner, the City, to determine whether the 60-day notice could be waived.

Members of the audience identified one among them, Ms. Barlow, as an original resident of Greenbelt Knoll. Mr. Sugrue asked Ms. Barlow if she had known Morris Milgram and how she chose to live at the development. She replied that she envisioned the development as an ideal place to live, a suburban environment within the city, and that she knew Mr. Milgram prior to his entrance into the development business.

Mr. Myers asked for a clarification of one of the awards bestowed upon Milgram, which was cited in the nomination. Mr. Farnham offered that it was an award jointly given by the American Institute of Architects, *Better Homes and Gardens* and *House and Home* magazines, and the National Broadcasting Corporation. Mr. Myers stated that it must have been a national award and should be further researched.

Mr. Myers asked about Milgram's connection to Louis Kahn. Mr. Farnham stated that the photograph included in the nomination is the most concrete evidence of Kahn's role. He asserted that the fact that Kahn is holding a drawing of a Greenbelt Knoll house in his hand in the photograph indicates that the famous architect must have been significantly involved in the design.

Mr. Myers inquired into the current status of lot #17. Mr. Fuller replied that a tree fell on the house, which was then demolished. He stated that he currently owns it and hopes to turn it into a neighborhood park. Mr. Myers commented that the lot should be classified as "contributing." Mr. Huff agreed and asserted that the lot at #17 should be classified as "contributing" because it retains the landscaping that is so important to the development.

MOTION: Mr. Huff moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District be designated as historic and placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the boundaries expanded to include the park (3064 Holme Avenue) as "contributing" and list lot #17 as "contributing." Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the nomination and stated that he was not convinced that the vacant lot, lot #17, should be classified as "contributing." He asked if there were consistent criteria for classifying it as "contributing." Mr. Sugrue asked if the lot had been consolidated with others. Mr. Fuller had reported that it had not. Mr. Huff stated that lot #17 is part of the original development. He said it is not a generic rowhouse parcel on a street but is an integral part of the subdivision. Mr. Huff stated that in the language of Planning Commission subdivision the lot is on a new street, not a parcel on an established city grid. Mr.

Myers offered that the lot was critical to the site as a whole. He continued to maintain that the natural lot without a house should be “contributing.” Mr. Steinberg added that the designation is really of a site, not of the individual entities.

Mr. Myers asked if the houses were intact. Mr. Fuller replied that the houses have new storm windows, but are largely original. Mrs. Friedman said that all the original openings remain and most have casement windows. Mr. Myers suggested that photographs be taken of the properties. Mr. Farnham explained that plans survive that document the original materials and details. He added that a city photographer will record every building if the Commission votes to designate the district.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District be designated as historic and placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the boundaries expanded to include the park (3064 Holme Avenue) as “contributing” and with lot #17 classified as “contributing.”

Mr. Fuller thanked the Committee and added that his neighbor Mr. Friedman worked with him on the nomination.

801 MARKET STREET, STRAWBRIDGE & CLOTHIER DEPARTMENT STORE

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination, which was prepared by the Preservation Alliance, to the Committee. He explained that the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store is historically and architecturally significant and therefore qualifies to be listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It satisfies Designation Criteria a, d, e, h, and j as defined in Philadelphia’s Historical Preservation Ordinance. Satisfying Criterion a, the establishment as embodied by the buildings has significant interest or value as part of the city’s development and is associated with important individuals; Justus Strawbridge and Isaac Clothier. Satisfying Criterion d, the buildings embody distinguishing characteristics of the Renaissance Revival style. Satisfying Criterion e, Addison Hutton and Simon and Simon were significant architects in Philadelphia and the region. Satisfying criterion h, the building is significant visual feature within the retail zone around the intersection of 8th and Market Streets, a transportation hub. Satisfying Criterion j, the establishment significantly influenced department store and retail development in the city and commonwealth.

Mr. Farnham noted that the proposed designation does not include any of the underground portions of the buildings, even those that are open to the public as parts of the Gallery and the transit concourse. Likewise, the proposed designation does not include the mid twentieth-century bridges between the Main Building and the parking garage.

Mr. Myers asked for clarification on the architectural style of the buildings. He questioned the label of Renaissance Revival for the Main Building. Mr. Steinberg stated that the Hutton building is Renaissance Revival, but the Main Building is not. He added that the Main Building has Deco elements. Mr. Sugrue stated that nomination should be amended with the appropriate style. Mr. Myers suggested Stripped Classicism or Deco Classicism. Mr. Huff offered that the Simon & Simon section of the department store is Deco. Mr. Laverty stated that the building is very similar to Fidelity Mutual, Simon & Simon’s other major building. Howard Haas stated that Deco Classicism is appropriate. Mr. Sugrue offers Deco Influenced Classicism. Mr. Myers concluded the discussion with the assertion that Deco Stripped Classicism should be the name of the style for the Main Building.

Mr. Myers suggests that a photograph of the rear of the department store should be included. He asked for clarification on the medical room, which is mentioned in the nomination. Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance, who prepared the nomination, stated that the medical room was a first-aid room for employees. Mr. Myers asked what “counter-to-counter telephone” noted in the nomination meant. Ms. Blazeovich responded that she was not sure and that it was a direct quote from a source. Mr. Myers asked who designed the rooftop addition to the Hutton building. Ms. Blazeovich was uncertain. Mr. Myers pointed out that the store was close to all forms of major public transportation, not just Reading Terminal, but the subway and trolley lines as well. Mr. Sugrue stated that the nomination should be modified to incorporate Mr. Myers suggestions and corrections.

Mr. Gallery mentioned that the history of the store entails business innovations. It tells of the social history of commerce and business. He stated that the architecture of the building takes second place to that fact. Mr. Lavery added that it created a tradition of public service like Gimbels. He continued that the transformation of downtown would not have taken place without the major retailers such as Strawbridge’s. Mr. Myers asked if there would be changes in the signage with the demise of Strawbridge’s. Mr. Sugrue stated that the Commission would review all proposed alterations to the signage if the store is designated. He then asked if the food court was original. He stated that the food court is typical of European, not American, stores. He asserted that this fact should be mentioned in the nomination.

Howard Haas passed out a letter to the Committee members in support of the nomination.

RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Myers moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the property at 801 Market Street, formerly the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, be designated as historic and placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

316 S. 21ST STREET, A.K.A. 2100 CYPRESS STREET

Mr. Farnham presented to the Committee the proposed amendment to the 316 S. 21st Street entry in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. Attorney Andrew Chirls, owner Vesna Hesse, and architect Alvin Holm were present.

Mr. Farnham explained that in March 2006, the owner of 316 S. 21st Street presented a permit application to the Commission proposing additions and alterations to the large rowhouse on the site. While reviewing the application, the Commission’s staff discovered an error in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. The inventory labels the property as an “Intrusion” in the district. However, the Commission’s ordinance and *Rules & Regulations* do not recognize “Intrusion” as a valid classification. Therefore, the property has no classification. The Commission reviewed the application at its April 2006 meeting and directed the staff to prepare an application to amend the district inventory to comply with the ordinance and *Rules*. Accordingly, the staff requests that the Commission delete the undefined term “Intrusion” from the inventory entry for 316 S. 21st Street and classify the property as “Contributing.”

Mr. Farnham stated that the building at 316 S. 21st Street was erected about 1860 as a three-story Italianate rowhouse. In the 1880s, it was significantly altered; a Queen Anne mansard with dormers and a bay window were added. In 1949, the City condemned the building and the front and side facades of the main block were replaced with new brick facades; the mansard and rear ell were retained. Owing to the retention of the mansard, it is likely that only the outer wythe of

brick was replaced during the 1949 façade reconstruction. The zoning permit for the 1949 facade project notes that the height and area of the building would not change during the work. When the façades were rebuilt, the main entrance was shifted to the Cypress Street façade. In 1994, the building was converted from a four-family to a single-family dwelling. As part of the conversion, he added the columns and pergola at the entrance on Cypress Street.

Mr. Farnham continued that although the main block of the building has a twentieth-century brick façade and the entrance has been relocated to the side façade, the building retains its historical use, footprint, massing, mansard with dormers, rear ell, and bay.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission designated the property as part of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District on 8 February 1995. It had not been individually designated prior to the creation of the district. The entry in the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory lists the property as an "Intrusion." However, the term "Intrusion" is not a valid classification for properties within locally designated historic districts; therefore, the property has no classification. Section 14-2007(2)(e) of the local historic preservation ordinance defines the term "Contributing." The ordinance does not define "Non-contributing," "Significant," or "Intrusion." However, the Commission's Rules & Regulations elaborates on the ordinance and defines "Non-contributing" and "Significant."

Mr. Farnham added that "Intrusion" is a term used in National Register district nominations. The Commission adapted the Rittenhouse National Register Historic District inventory to generate the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. The National Register inventory entry for the property classifies it as an "Intrusion."

Mr. Farnham stated that when the Commission generated the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory, it used the National Register inventory as a basis. However, it amended the inventory in numerous ways including updating the classifications of all properties to conform not only to the local nomenclature, but also to the local guidelines set by the Commission and its Committee on Historic Designation. Most importantly, the Commission did not simply replace the term "Intrusion" with "Non-contributing" while creating the local inventory. It reevaluated every building based on its own rules. The staff has identified 71 instances in which a building labeled "Intrusion" in the national inventory was classified by the Commission as "Contributing" in the local inventory.

Mr. Farnham explained that several of these buildings labeled as "Intrusion" in the national inventory but classified as "Contributing" in the local inventory are refaced buildings like the one in question. The Committee on Historic Designation's discussion of the Rittenhouse-Fitler nomination on 3 April 1987 is especially pertinent and explains the discrepancy between the national and local inventories. The minute states:

The Committee took up the discussion of classifying buildings in the district inventory and recommended that only three classifications be used: Significant, Contributing and Non-Contributing. Significant refers to those buildings or resources of outstanding architectural or historical merit that would be worthy of individual listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The term Contributing applies to buildings that add to the historical and architectural fabric of the district. This includes buildings that have been refaced at a later period but still retain the scale of the streetscape, and modern buildings that contribute positively to a streetscape through their scale, materials or detail. Buildings that are both relatively contemporary and badly out of scale to their streetscape are labeled non-contributing. ... The Committee recommends not placing a

date as a cut off between Contributing and Non-contributing buildings, arguing that history is continuous and does not end at a certain date.

Mr. Farnham continued that according to the guidelines set by the Committee, the building at 316 S. 21st Street should be classified as "Contributing." It is a building that has "been refaced at a later period but still retain[s] the scale of the streetscape." It is neither "relatively contemporary" nor "badly out of scale." Note that the building at 320 S. 21st Street, which is almost identical to this building and which was refaced, is classified in the local inventory as "Contributing."

Moreover, Mr. Farnham stated that the staff has identified several refaced buildings that are labeled as an "Intrusion" in the Rittenhouse National Register District, but classified as "Contributing" in the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Three examples will suffice.

Mr. Farnham added that the building at 318 S. 15th Street was erected in the mid nineteenth century, but refaced in brick in the mid twentieth century. It retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

Mr. Farnham stated that the building at 2217 Locust Street was erected in 1872, but refaced in PermaStone in the mid twentieth century. It retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

Mr. Farnham added that the building at 317 S. 20th Street was erected about 1890 and altered about 1920. The entranceway was moved and the building was refaced in stucco. Yet, it retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff concludes that the labeling of 316 S. 21st Street as an "Intrusion" in the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory is not consistent with the Commission's guidelines for classifying properties in the district. Based on the ordinance, Rules & Regulations, the guidelines established during the review of the Rittenhouse-Fitler nomination, and the classification of other refaced buildings in the inventory, the staff recommends that the inventory entry for 316 S. 21st Street be amended to classify the property as "Contributing."

Mr. Myers stated that, as a member of the Committee that surveyed the local district for the Historical Commission, he could see how such a mistake could have been made because the National Register inventory was used as the basis for the local inventory. Mr. Myers expressed concern for the legal implication of a mistaken classification, but Mr. Sugrue reminded him that the legal question is out of the purview of the Designation Committee. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the Committee make a recommendation based on the architectural and historical facts and let the Commission confront the legal issues. Mr. Steinberg stated that the staff's report presented clear reasons for classifying the property as a "Contributing" resource.

MOTION: Mr. Steinberg moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District be amended to classify the property at 316 S. 21st Street as "Contributing." Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

Mr. Lavery asked the staff how many properties that were listed as "intrusion" in the National Register inventory for the district are listed as "non-contributing" in the Philadelphia Register inventory for the district. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff did not establish that number during its research, but that it would attempt to determine it. Mr. Sugrue asked about the classifications for the rest of the properties on the block. Mr. Farnham replied that the property in question is labeled as an "Intrusion," but the others in the row are labeled as "Contributing."

Mr. Chirls identified himself as the legal counsel for Ms. Hesse, the fiancé of the property owner.

Mr. Holm stated that he confirmed with George Thomas, who wrote the National Register nomination of the District, that the classification of the subject property as an "Intrusion" was not mistaken. Mr. Sugrue explained to Mr. Holm that the National Register classification was not at question. He clarified for Mr. Holm that the National Register is different from the Philadelphia Register. The Philadelphia Historical Commission derives its jurisdiction and bases its reviews on local, not federal, designations. Mr. Steinberg noted that the Commission has questioned district classifications proposed by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Myers pointed out that a completely reconstructed building could be listed as "Contributing" on the Philadelphia Register. He added that a building that is entirely new could be considered "Significant" in a local district.

Mr. Steinberg asked why the property owner is proposing that the property be classified as "Non-contributing." Mr. Holm responded that he was proposing the classification because he wanted to alter and add to the building. He remarked that the Architectural Committee had denied his proposal and asked this Committee to consider his design. Mr. Steinberg stated that the Designation Committee does not review permit applications. He stated that proposals to alter this building are not germane to the current proceedings. Mr. Farnham noted that he wanted to correct a few misstatements. He explained that the Architectural Committee does not have the authority to deny proposals. He reported that the Architectural Committee had recommended denial of Mr. Holm's proposal in March 2006, but that the Commission had tabled the application to allow the Architectural Committee an opportunity to review Mr. Holm's revised design and the Designation Committee an opportunity to address the classification issue. He stated for the record that neither the Architectural Committee nor the Commission had denied Mr. Holm's permit application. He continued that Mr. Holm had not submitted the inventory amendment application to the Commission; the staff had submitted it at the Commission's request. Continuing, Mr. Farnham stated that, in the spirit of full disclosure, the staff had informed Mr. Holm of the error in the inventory at the Architectural Committee meeting in March 2006. Mr. Chirls clarified that his client and Mr. Holm would like the property to be listed as "Non-contributing." To bolster the request, Mr. Holm noted that the building had been altered. He stated that a pergola had been added to the side of the building. He also noted a third-floor bay. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that these additions predate the designation of the district. Mr. Holm stated that only 9% of the fabric of the building is original and that the Cypress Street wall bows and must be replaced. Committee members questioned Mr. Holm's 9% figure. Mr. Sugrue pointed out that Mr. Holm's claims do not justify listing the property as "Non-contributing." Referring to the Designation Committee minute from the Rittenhouse-Fitler review, he asked if Mr. Holm believed that the building was out of scale with the streetscape. Mr. Holm responded questioned the definition of the term "scale." He reported that the building is three stories and faced with brick. Mr. Holm explained that Otto Sperr and Hugh McCauley, who altered the building in the 1990s, were active in preserving the Rittenhouse Square area. He asserted that they would not have altered the building if it was historically significant.

Mr. Chirls stated that the Committee has heard why the architects who worked on the National Register nomination for Rittenhouse Square considered this property "Intrusive." He asserted that, for the sake of the credibility of the process and out of fairness to the owner, the Committee should be consistent. Ms. Hesse stated that she and her fiancé purchased the property with the understanding that they would be able to significantly alter it because it is considered an "Intrusion." Mr. Gallery stated that the staff discovered the error in classification and that the applicant was informed of the mistaken "Intrusion" label at the Architectural Committee meeting on 28 March 2006. He questioned the veracity of the statements by the owner and her architect regarding their earlier knowledge of the mistake in the local inventory. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Farnham to comment on the allegation. Mr. Farnham stated that Jorge Danta of the Commission's staff had disclosed that the property was mistakenly classified as an "Intrusion" at the Architectural Committee meeting in March 2006. Mr. Farnham stated that his memory of the meeting two months earlier was not entirely clear. He asked the Committee not to rely on his memory, but to consult the tape recordings of the meeting. However, he stated that he believed that Mr. Holm and owner William Hozack attended the March Architectural Committee meeting and that Mr. Holm had been surprised when Mr. Danta revealed that the building was mistakenly listed as an "Intrusion." At this time, Mr. Gallery, Mr. Holm, and Ms. Hesse exchanged comments. Mr. Sugrue called for order and stated that the Designation Committee would deliberate on the designation matter at hand and not consider allegations and counter-allegations. He stated that the Committee's task is to determine if the property should be classified as "Contributing" or "Non-contributing" and then make a recommendation to the Commission.

Mr. Gallery offered that this is not the only district in which there are differences between the National Register District inventory and the Philadelphia Register District inventory. He stated that alterations do not necessarily disqualify a property from being classified as "Contributing." He continued that the alterations to this property have not degraded it to the level of "Non-contributing." Mr. Chirls asked if the minutes from the meeting when the district was designated are available. Mr. Farnham replied that the minutes of all Commission and committee meetings are public documents and are available. Mr. Sugrue stated that the criteria for "Contributing" versus "Non-contributing" for the Rittenhouse-Fitler District are very clear in the minutes.

RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 4 to 1, the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District be amended to classify the property at 316 S. 21st Street as "Contributing." Mr. Laverty dissented.

Mr. Sugrue thanked Mr. Huff for his generous service to the Committee and Commission for many years and wished him a happy retirement.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Huff moved to adjourn. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin McGinn Cote