

**REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 27 MAY 2025
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler		X	
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Chrissy Devers
Chwen-ping Wang, Ping Architects LLC
Daniel Trubman
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Jay Farrell
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Michael Bucci, G-Space LLC
Sharyn Katz
Susan
Vivek Tomer

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1632 POPLAR ST

Proposal: Remove gable roof and stone veneer; construct rooftop addition; replace windows

Review: In Concept

Owner: The Church of the Living God, The Pillar, and Ground Truth

Applicant: Chwen-ping Wang, Ping Architects LLC

History: 1860; Green Hill Market

Individual Designation: 5/11/2018

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes in concept approval for constructing a fourth-floor addition, roof deck, and pilot house to 1632 Poplar Street. The building was constructed in 1859 and was historically known as the Green Hill Market House. The developer intends to convert the former market and church building to residential use. The proposed rehabilitation scope includes adding a fourth floor and roof deck with pilot house, restoring the brick façade and cornice, and installing new windows and exterior doors.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Add fourth floor and roof deck with pilot house.
- Rehabilitate exterior.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The design of the proposed fourth-floor addition successfully differentiates itself from the historic building through its massing, size, scale, and architectural features. To increase compatibility and better meet Standard 9, the addition and roof deck should be set back more from the roofline, a cornice detail should be added, and a more neutral color for the addition's cladding should be selected.
 - o More research must be done to determine the best approach for exterior masonry rehabilitation. To meet Standard 9, the applicant should remove sections of the stone veneer to determine the feasibility of removal and the condition of the masonry material underneath. Once this is complete, the applicant can work with the staff to determine an approvable preservation approach to rehabilitate the masonry façade.
 - o The applicant and staff have not located historic photographs of the building that show all historic window and front door entrance configuration. To meet Standard 9, the applicant must work with the staff to determine historically appropriate replacements.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The low slope gable roof proposed for removal is hidden by the building's cornice and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The historic form and integrity of the designated building will not be visibly altered by the removal of the roof. If a future

owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the roof could be reconstructed; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The fourth-floor addition with roof deck should be revised to satisfy Standard 9. Additional research is needed to offer guidance on the replacements of the windows and front door. Selective demolition should be undertaken to develop a plan for removing the added stone and restoring the brick facade.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chwen-ping Wang and developer Vivek Tomer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver inquired about removal of the stone veneer.
 - o Mr. Wang responded that they are still in the process of determining the approach with the veneer material, but that they believe there is red brick beneath the veneer which they would like to expose and restore.
- Mr. Cluver stated that exploratory work will be important. He commented that the stone veneer is detracting from the building's overall appearance, and he would approve of the removal of the veneer and restoration of the red brick. Mr. Cluver added that the proposal for a lime wash finish may be challenging because the brick has already been painted. Ms. Gutterman agreed, stating that lime wash cannot be applied over paint.
 - o Mr. Tomer reiterated that their intent is to see if they can remove the paint without damaging the brick.
 - o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the brick restoration approach is different than the scope shown in their application.
 - o Mr. Tomer explained that he is looking to the Committee members for guidance in restoring the building's exterior, including the brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that exploratory work removing the paint and stone veneer must be done to determine final building colors. He observed that the current submission shows a beige building with a black addition. He noted that with the paint and veneer removal, it could end up as a red brick building and that this color change would impact the overall color scheme for the project. He stated that the Committee could conceptually approve of removing the paint and veneer and restoring the historic red brick façade.
 - o Mr. Tomer confirmed that restoring the red brick façade is their goal but that they would need to complete the exploratory work to confirm if this is possible.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concerns about the fourth-floor addition and its color shown in the rendering. She pointed out that if the overbuild was closer in tone to the historic building, it would reduce the visual mass.
- Mr. Cluver expressed concern about the proposed size of the fourth-floor addition. He observed that it is proposed as a full floor with a minimal setback. He recommended a more significant setback. He expressed concern about potential water infiltration between the new and old portions of the building. He inquired about the dimensions of the setback.
 - o Mr. Wang responded that the addition would sit right behind the brick gable and cornices.

- o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that this means there is no setback.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the addition as shown appears too large for the building. He pointed out that there are long views of the building owing to nearby empty lots and open space and the addition, if constructed as shown, would be visibly prominent.
 - o Mr. Tomer responded that all of the nearby vacant parcels are owned by developers, and that upcoming new development would eventually obscure views of the fourth-floor addition.
- Ms. Stein commented that she is less concerned about future development on nearby parcels and more focused on the historic building. She pointed out that the lack of setback on the addition makes it difficult to understand the break between the old and new. Ms. Stein continued that if the addition was set back three to five feet on all sides from the façade it would appear very different, with the difference between the historic building and new addition clearer.
 - o Mr. Tomer expressed willingness to set the addition back two to three feet.
 - o Mr. Cluver commented that the Committee would need to review a drawing showing a setback, and it is unlikely that two to three feet on each side would be sufficient.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that eliminating the parapet on the addition could help to minimize the height.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed roof deck was enormous. He suggested that the deck railing could be pulled back which would eliminate the need for the parapet. He asked about the location of rooftop mechanical equipment.
- Mr. Cluver stated that while the axonometric drawings were helpful in the submission application, he would like to also see perspective views from Ridge Avenue and surrounding streets looking up at the addition.
- Mr. Tomer stated that they would do their best to propose a successful rehabilitation of the historic building but that changes to the addition would need to be within reason for the project to remain financially feasible.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicants for their efforts to bring the building back into use.
- Ms. Stein expressed concerns about the proposal to remove historic decorative brick from below third floor windows and enlarge the window openings. She suggested that the original window openings be retained.
 - o Mr. Tomer responded that they would work with the staff to determine if the brick below the windows on the third floor was original or a later alteration.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application was submitted for in-concept review.
- The height and massing of the proposed fourth-floor addition is too great for the building. This can be resolved by setting the addition back on all sides and reducing the height of the parapet.
- Exploratory work on the building's exterior should be completed to determine if the existing stone veneer and paint can be successfully removed and the underlying red brick restored. If the red brick can be restored, this will help guide the final exterior color selections for the addition, door, and window materials.
- The roof deck railing should be pulled in further from the sides of the addition.

- The rooftop mechanical equipment should be shown on the plans and renderings.
- Additional investigation of the third-floor window openings is required to determine if the decorative brick panel below the existing window opening is historic or a later alteration. This should be completed prior to determining the final window size.
- The applicant should continue to work with the staff to identify compatible replacement windows and doors for the historic building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application can satisfy Standard 9 if the fourth-floor addition is set back from the historic building on all sides and the height is reduced, the deck railing is pulled in from all sides of the addition, the exploratory work determines that the red brick can be restored, and the mechanical equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The application satisfies Standard 10 as the low slope gable roof proposed for removal is hidden by the building's cornice and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The historic form and integrity will not be visibly altered by the removal of the roof. If a future owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the roof could be reconstructed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1632 Poplar St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 123-129 Chestnut St Associates

Applicant: Stephanie Rumer, Permex Permit Expediting

History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing a sign at the corner of the former Corn Exchange National Bank and raising a flag sign on an existing flagpole on the Chestnut Street elevation. The proposed signage is an addition to signage above the pedestrian doors. The corner sign would be attached to a bracket mounted to the brick quoins at the corner using sleeve anchors or an alternate method approved by the Historical Commission. The application notes that internal illumination of the aluminum and acrylic sign may be included if permitted by city code. The proposed flag sign measures 5 feet by 8 feet and would hang from an existing pole and pole extension.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install corner-mounted sign and flag sign.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed mounting locations of the corner signs would compromise the distinctive brick quoins and the sign materials are incompatible with the historic materials and features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the corner sign but approval of the flag sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:32:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein noted that the corner is a particularly vulnerable portion of the building and that the proposed wiring may be difficult to execute and would be detrimental to the structure's longevity if it was possible.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the mounting scheme for the flag sign.
 - o Mr. Maust clarified that the application proposed using an existing flagpole.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed flag is quite large and wanted to know if the pole could handle the requisite stress loads.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a condition assessment of the existing pole.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro said that if the existing pole is an extension, that could make it more vulnerable to stress from a large flag.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, suggesting the pole was likely not designed for a flag of this size.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the reveal in the brickwork at the corner is a powerful visual element which would be obscured by the proposed corner-mounted sign.

- o Mr. Cluver agreed and suggested that even signs located on either side of the corner would likely be inappropriate.
- o Ms. Gutterman agreed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if flags of this size have been previously approved by the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey worried about the wind load of such a large flag.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification whether the bottom of the flag would be tethered in some fashion.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked that the applicant provide a structural assessment of the existing flagpole and the proposed flag.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hanna Stark, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in support of the staff recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The corner quoins are a character-defining feature which the proposed corner-mounted sign would negatively impact.
- The flag sign could meet the applicant's desire for more prominent signage.
- More information should be provided by the applicant about the existing conditions of the flagpole and the stress loads of the proposed sign.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed corner-mounted sign would compromise the decorative elements of the building's corner and fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed flag may satisfy Standard 9, but more information is needed to assess the potential negative impacts on the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9, and suggested that the property owner consult with the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia as the holder of the facade easement.

ITEM: 123-29 Chestnut St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2114 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sharyn Katz

Applicant: Michael Bucci, G-Space LLC

History: 1854; Hazelhurst & Huckel; Roman brick façade with terra cotta details by architectural firm of Hazelhurst & Huckel for James Beatty, salesman, 1887

Individual Designation: 11/2/1972

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Significant, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify and enlarge the rear of the rowhouse at 2114 Green Street as well as to add a green roof terrace-plus-pilot house to the property. Modifications to the property would include: the rear garage door and existing deck above it would be altered, the bay window on the side of the property would be removed and the first floor would be enlarged, the rear bay window would be restored and altered to include doors in place of windows, and the third floor would be extended over the rear bay window to make room for a green roof terrace. A new stair penthouse would be constructed on the roof for access to the terrace. No work to the front façade is proposed. The stair penthouse is currently presented to be 11 feet and six inches tall, set back from the front cornice by about 30 feet. The rear block of Wilcox Street is a service alley with garages and no front-facing properties.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Modify and enlarge the rear of the property.
- Add a green roof deck plus stair penthouse.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property would be avoided.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application as proposed, but approval provided the pilot house is lowered to the extent possible, the roof terrace is not built over the third-floor bay window, and the parapet at the roof level in the rear is replaced by a railing, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:44:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Michael Bucci and property owner Sharyn Katz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to respond to the staff's comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- o Mr. Bucci replied that the penthouse could be lowered. He stated that he did not quite understand the guidance about the green roof addition which was shown to extend over the rear bay.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the staff was responding to the addition extending out and covering the bay, and the suggestion was that it be pulled back to align with the rear of the building.
 - o Mr. Bucci noted that neighboring properties all extend to around the same line as what is proposed.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that it could be acceptable to extend the roof as a bay, but that the third-floor bay appears compressed as proposed.
 - o Mr. Bucci pointed to neighboring properties that have extensions over the rear bays.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that work to neighboring properties may have been done prior to historic designation.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the rears of the properties in this row are not identical. He remarked that another concern was that they are removing all of the masonry on the third floor. He agreed with Ms. Gutterman that doing the extension as a bay would be a way to make the room bigger and he urged the applicant to explore that option.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there does not appear to be plans and elevations of existing conditions which is required as part of the submission.
 - o Mr. Bucci responded that it may not be deciphered easily, but that there are dashed outlines on the architectural plans which show existing conditions.
- Ms. Stein commented that the plans in the application should be lined up so that the front facade is always in the same spot which would allow them to easily see the stacked arrangement of each floor.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the penthouse is too tall.
 - o Mr. Bucci responded that it will not be visible from the street or sidewalk. He stated that they may be able to reduce it in height slightly.
- Mr. Cluver postulated that a lower penthouse could help with the proposed solar panels.
 - o Mr. Bucci noted that the solar panels would start a little further back and that the space directly behind the penthouse would be used for mechanical equipment.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked how these were being mounted to the roof.
 - o Mr. Bucci responded that it would be a new roof but that the front half of the building would be the original roof line and the solar panels would be mounted on standard solar panel brackets.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if the height that is drawn in the section accurately represents what was being proposed.
 - o Mr. Bucci responded in the affirmative.
- Mr. McCoubrey drew attention to the rear parapet and suggested that it would be preferred to minimize the height of the parapet while allowing a larger railing.
- Ms. Gutterman asked that details be provided of the cement board siding proposed for the side parapet walls.
 - o Mr. Bucci noted that there is a cross section that showed that detail, and it was pulled up on the Zoom screen.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey called attention to the height of the parapet shown in this cross section. He again suggested a railing rather than a parapet.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the drawings show a significant part of the first-floor rear ell masonry being removed to extend the first floor.

- o Mr. Bucci responded that they are extending into the side yard and that the existing bay window is in a deteriorated state and the side yard is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- o Ms. Gutterman asked that the applicant provide a demolition drawing in a revised application.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the staff if their recommendation concerning the parapet was in reference to the lower small deck at the bottom of the bay as well as the upper roof parapet.
- o Ms. Hendrickson responded that the staff was referring to the upper parapet in its recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Additional demolition drawings and plans which are lined up should be provided in a revised application.
- Extending the rear roof over the third-floor bay should be avoided; however, extending the bay up to create a double bay could be acceptable.
- The penthouse height should be lowered to the extent possible.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application is incomplete because it lacks demolition drawings, and it is therefore difficult to understand the extent of the proposed scope.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness as well as the comments provided by the staff.

ITEM: 2114 Green St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:07:38

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:08 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.