
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS, ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER, KENNETH LOUSH, MICHAEL SIMONSON

MEMBERS ABSENT: CHAZ PATRICK, ANTHONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS), JEFF WARD (WFMZ)

VISITORS PRESENT: PLAMEN AYVAZOV, SCOTT BARTKUS, JANET PÉREZ-CARDONA, ANTONIO FIOL-SILVA, MICAH MUTSCHLER, WILLIAM NOLL, GINA PERINI, TAYLOR REED, RICHARD SAUSE, MARYLOU SEIXAS, WILLIAM SEIXAS, CHRISTINE USSLER

MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 18, 2021

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on October 18, 2021, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 822 East Fourth Street
Property Owner: First Hispanic Baptist Church
Applicant: Janet Pérez-Cardona

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: The main structure is a semi-detached, two-story brick church building with cast stone details. Constructed in the 1940s it is Classical Revival in style. The structure involved with proposed window replacements is at the rear of the church and is a semi-detached, 3-story red brick classroom building with a flat roof, large metal classroom windows on the east and west façades as well as smaller secondary windows on the east, south and west façades with flat metal detailing. This addition dates from the 1960s and is Mid-Century Modern in style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to replace 13 aluminum hopper windows located on the three-story rear building on each façade at grade with Pella single-hung fiberglass windows, custom-fabricated to fit existing openings.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- Distinctive ... features ... that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to replace existing windows at first floor level of rear structure due to poor condition with new

fiberglass windows. Accompanying hand sketches incorrectly label proposed windows as “single-hung”, which would involve one fixed sash above one operable sash. No product specifications are provided so unable to discern if proposed windows are fixed sash, awning style or casements. Although proposed replacements appropriately fit existing openings, it is not historically appropriate to lose character-defining horizontal muntins of original windows. Applicant previously appeared before HCC on August 21, 2017, with similar proposal to replace windows at third-floor level. Resulting COA required cooperation with Historic Officer at that time to decide between fiberglass and aluminum window replacements that also included intermediate horizontal muntins; frames were to be covered with break metal capping (not coil stock), with all materials in bronze color to match newer windows at second floor. Appropriate window replacements for first floor level should match material and color of recent third-floor replacements and also include horizontal muntins that replicate existing divisions.

Discussion: Janet Pérez-Cardona and William Noll represented proposal to replace 13 aluminum hopper windows located on the three-story rear building on each façade at grade with Pella single-hung fiberglass windows, custom-fabricated to fit existing openings. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant is amendable to installing same window system previously installed at third-floor level; Applicant agreed with Mr. Lader's suggestion and confirmed Pella fiberglass window replacements were previously installed. Mr. Simonson requested resulting motion should include language that requires Applicant to submit specifications/cut sheet (and preferably to-scale building façade drawings) along with clarification of operation type(s) as well as proposed color via City of Bethlehem for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair prior to fabrication. Mr. Evans recalled previous HCC approval of break metal capping instead of coil stock for needed trim so resolution should also include mention; Applicant confirmed no metal capping is needed because windows will be custom sized for each existing opening.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Mr. Simonson adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to replace 13 aluminum hopper windows was presented by Janet Pérez-Cardona and William Noll.
2. Appropriate window replacements include the following details:
 - a. Pella fiberglass windows, custom-fabricated to fit existing openings
 - b. bronze color and other details to match replacements already installed at third-floor level, including break metal capping (not coil stock), as needed
 - c. include horizontal muntins that replicate existing divisions
 - d. no tinted, colored or reflective glazing
3. Applicant agreed to submit relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) via City of Bethlehem for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair prior to fabrication and installation.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 306 Brodhead Avenue

Property Owner: Angelina M., LLC

Applicant: William and MaryLou Seixas

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: 306 Brodhead Avenue is composed of two very similar adjoining structures. Both are three-story, three-bay, mixed-use brick masonry buildings with flat roofs; one has subsequently lost its neighbor and is now an end structure while the other is attached. Both are late Italianate in style and comprise the end portion of an entire block of similar structures along Brodhead Avenue completed between 1890 and 1900. Original entry-level storefronts have been manipulated over time and now include recessed entrances and large storefront

windows with painted aluminum frames flanked on either side by brick piers. Both storefronts share a simplified cornice over the entry level while the sign band is capped by similar windowsills at the second level. Brick pilasters at each upper level lead to upper brick corbeled cornices. Exterior façades of both structures have been painted, with the entry level storefront in light beige color, upper floor levels in yellow color and the upper parapet in medium beige color.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to add vinyl signage to be applied to the bottom divisions of front-facing windows.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'** -- Care should be taken in mounting signs to minimize damage to historic materials. This includes reusing hardware or brackets from previous signs. If reusing existing hardware or attachment locations is not an option, select mounting locations that can be easily patched if the sign is removed. This includes locating holes in mortar joints rather than directly into bricks or masonry, which will facilitate repair if the sign is removed or relocated in the future.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During meeting on May 20, 2019, HCC determined Applicant's various proposals for façade renovations, logo signage and awning as appropriate. During subsequent meeting on November 18, 2019, HCC determined Applicant's revised signage and awning proposals as well as new exterior lighting also appropriate. Current COA Application represents response to HCC request for secondary signage proposals and consists of vinyl lettering within lowest window divisions and extending full width of both storefront windows. 4-inch-tall letters are all-uppercase, sans serif, stylized lettering with solid borders above and below while individual words/phrases are separated with bold dots. Proposed lettering within left storefront lower window reads:

" • SEARED SHRIMP CEVICHE • SANCOCHO • CHILI-CHORIZO JALAPEÑO • " while proposed lettering within right storefront lower window reads: " • OVER STUFFED EMPANADAS • FRESH-CUT FRIES • ".

Proposed signage is appropriate, with following clarifications:

- confirm overall height and width of each lower storefront window intended for signage to ensure proposed lettering will fit
- identify thickness dimension of top and bottom borders, for inclusion within resolution
- lettering should be installed on inside surfaces of windows
- identify color of lettering, with suggestion to avoid bright white and neon colors
- ensure spacing between words/phrases and bold dots are consistent ... spacing currently appears irregular

Discussion: William and MaryLou Seixas represented proposal to add vinyl signage to bottom divisions of front-facing windows. Applicant presented sample of proposed signage ribbon for inspection as well as revised graphic depiction of intended signage. Mr. Lader requested clarification about revisions depicted on new submittal; Applicant explained overall signage height is 4 ¼-inches (lettering and borders) and intended location is upper portion of each lower window (revised from original proposal to center signage vertically within lower windows). Mr. Lader noted lower windows appear black within provided graphic. Applicant clarified graphic designer darkened windows to facilitate better depiction of proposed signage; confirmed windows will not be darkened, with all voids between letters and borders to remain clear. Applicant continued that all letters and graphics are warm white in color.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Cornish and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to add vinyl signage was presented by William and MaryLou Seixas.
2. Appropriate signage includes following details:

- a. 4-and-1/4-inch-tall vinyl lettering (including top and bottom borders) installed on inside glass surfaces, at upper portion of lowest window divisions and extending full width of both storefront windows
 - b. letters are all-uppercase, sans serif, stylized lettering with solid borders above and below while individual words/phrases are separated with bold dots; spacing between lettering and dots to be uniform
 - c. lettering within left storefront lower window reads:
“ • SEARED SHRIMP CEVICHE • SANCOCHO • CHILI-CHORIZO JALAPEÑO • ”
 - d. lettering within right storefront lower window reads:
“ • OVER STUFFED EMPANADAS • FRESH-CUT FRIES • ”
 - e. all lettering and graphics are warm white in color while voids between lettering and graphics are transparent
3. Applicant is encouraged (but not required) to consider serif lettering as more appropriate font style for signage within Historic Conservation District.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 210-212 East Third Street

Property Owner: 210 East Third Street, LLC

Applicant: Scott Bartkus

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a two-story, three-bay, detached brick masonry building with a flat roof. The building portion facing East Third Street was originally constructed ca. 1900 as an appliance and hardware store but later served as a tavern under various ownership. The upper floor level has 1-over-1 double-hung windows while the original entry-level storefront has been altered to include a central recessed entrance flanked on either side by modified windows openings ... each with side-by-side sliding windows. During the mid- 20th century, the storefront received a cladding of Formstone (regionally referred to by the brand name ‘Permastone’), a type of pigmented stucco shaped to imitate the appearance of stone masonry. The east façade was clad in vinyl siding sometime during the mid- to late 20th century. Masonry and wood frame rear additions connect this structure to the two-story brick masonry residential building facing Mechanic Street. Many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be identified by a defining style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to paint the front (north) permastone façade and side (east) façade siding in a red brick color. It is also proposed to modify the front façade first floor windows to their previous full height and to install wood framing, lintels and single-pane glass, to infill the existing recessed entry flush with the façade and to install a full-lite aluminum front door.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to paint front (north) façade Formstone cladding and side (east) façade vinyl siding in red brick color, to modify existing windows at front façade, to infill current recessed entry flush with remaining exterior façade and to install new full-lite aluminum front door. HCC is not commissioned with assessing paint colors and existing Formstone is already painted; however, Formstone is inappropriate within Historic Conservation District, so Applicant is encouraged to remove rather than paint in order to investigate condition of façade beneath ... noting potential for revealing details of original storefront. Similarly, vinyl siding is inappropriate within Historic Conservation District, so Applicant is encouraged to remove and investigate condition of wall behind rather than paint. Existing entry-level windows at front façade are also inappropriate so Applicant’s intent to modify openings is encouraged; however, appropriateness of proposed plate glass windows with no divisions at each opening as well as modifications to associated

framing and lintels cannot be determined without more information concerning size, material, glazing, etc. Similarly, existing recessed entrance is inappropriate so Applicant's intent to modify is encouraged; however, appropriateness of new aluminum door flush with front façade and infill remaining opening cannot be determined without product details of envisioned door type and understanding of proposed infill. COA Application describes new entrance door as "full-lite aluminum door"; however, accompanying graphic depicts two-lite storm door, which is not only inappropriate but potentially violates relevant building codes for commercial storefront. Infill above door replacement is not identified; transom is appropriate alternative. Notations on COA Application indicate proposed signage, exterior lighting and brick retaining wall connected to west façade with front gate will be considered during subsequent HCC meeting. Applicant is strongly encouraged to cooperate with licensed design professional experienced with historic structures to consider appropriate options for rehabilitating not only front and side façades of main structure but also for remaining building components, which are all visible from public right-of-way. Applicant should also note COA Application requires scale drawings if walls or openings are altered so future proposals should include measured drawings depicting façades with proposed window and door replacements.

Discussion: Scott Bartkus represented proposal to paint front (north) permastone façade and side (east) façade siding in red brick color as well as to modify front façade first-floor windows to previous full height and to install wood framing, lintels and single-pane glass and also to infill existing recessed entry flush with façade and to install full-lite aluminum front door. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant explored conditions of façades beneath current cladding systems, also noting need for more details (measured drawings, product information for proposed items, etc.) along with better understanding of Applicant's intentions with overall property. Applicant described 2-year plan to rehabilitate various components of project site in cooperation with new commercial tenant, with desire to "make façades more historic"; assumes uniform red brick color for entire building, in combination with full-height windows and aluminum storefront door, will result in more historical appearance. Mr. Lader inquired about potential to selectively remove existing cladding to examine physical condition of walls beneath; Applicant explained vinyl siding was installed over Homasote (or comparable) fiberboard cladding with applied brick motif design. Mr. Evans recalled previous on-site review of project location that determined existing fiberboard cladding was not sound, resulting in HCC approval of current vinyl siding; continued that remaining façade components are indeed brick. **note:** according to relevant design guidelines, fiberboard cladding as well as vinyl siding are inappropriate façade materials within Historic Conservation District. Mr. Evans continued by expressing concern with proposal to paint over existing vinyl siding, stressing need for Applicant to investigate proper preparations before painting differing wall surfaces as well as proper product selection that adheres to vinyl as it expands and contracts ... which is most likely different from product that properly adheres to permastone (stucco) cladding at front façade.

Mr. Lader inquired about appropriateness of proposed flush entrance in comparison to existing recessed entrance condition; Mr. Long explained appropriateness of flush or recessed entrance depends upon interpretation of front façade ... noting original storefront entrance might have been flush or recessed but was most likely flanked on either side with full-height and full-width storefront glazing and (potentially) with transoms above. Mr. Lader recommended covered awning above entrance if Applicant intends entrance door flush with front façade to offer shelter for patrons entering and exiting new commercial location; continued by explaining need for product literature (specifications, cut sheets, etc.) and ideally material samples of window and door replacements before determining appropriateness. Mr. Simonson requested clarification about window replacements; Applicant confirmed desire for new windows to be flush with front façade but integrated into existing openings. Mr. Simonson continued by inquiring about ownership status of adjacent (empty) lot; Applicant confirmed ownership of both properties, noting potential for new commercial tenant taking advantage of adjacent side yard for outdoor seating ... to be reviewed in more detail during future HCC meeting. Mr. Lader inquired about intended material of infill above proposed door replacement. Applicant responded with intention for wood paneling above door but welcomed suggestions; Mr. Lader explained glass transom is more appropriate. Mr. Simonson inquired about intentions with remaining exterior walls ... noting building extends back to Mechanic Street; Applicant clarified current proposal to paint exterior walls is limited to front permastone façade and vinyl siding at side façade.

Mr. Cornish expressed appreciation for Applicant's initial rehabilitation proposals but noted current lack of required details and information on specific products prevent HCC from making informed resolution. Applicant requested better understanding of specific needs and requirements. Mr. Lader explained need

for scale drawings of building façades as well as relevant product information and samples of proposed window and door replacements as well as details concerning front awning, all signage, exterior lighting, etc.; Mr. Simonson clarified scale drawing is only required for front façade because intended window and door replacements are limited to that façade. Applicant agreed to return with requested details but inquired about current approval of submitted paint colors. Mr. Lader noted HCC does not approve paint colors but reminded Applicant of concerns about properly preparing surfaces intended for painting as well as selecting products that properly adhere to differing wall surfaces.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Cornish and seconded by Mr. Evans adopted proposal to table decision to determine appropriateness of proposed work. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to approve current proposal and encouraged Applicant to cooperate with licensed design professional experienced with historic structures before returning for subsequent review of proposals that respond to expressed concerns.

The motion to table a decision about the appropriateness of the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #4

Property Location: 925 Prospect Avenue

Property Owner: Taylor and Lauren Reed

Applicant: Caitlin Laskey, Artefact, Inc.

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a two and one-half story, detached residential building with foundations, first-floor walls and front porch details of flagstone construction. Upper-floor levels are exposed half-timber construction with stucco fields between ... some with decorative detailing. The cross-gabled roof has deep overhangs with exposed construction beams and large support brackets. Constructed ca. 1920, this structure is Swiss Chalet Arts and Crafts in style while the rear extension, with first-floor sunroom and upper-level open porch, has Classical Revival details.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to replace wood casement windows with aluminum-clad wooden casement windows with SDL (simulated divided lites) and 7/8-inch exterior muntins and also to replace two French doors with two single-leaf, aluminum-clad wooden doors.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 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 will be avoided.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to replace first floor and attic windows as well as one second-floor window with aluminum-clad wooden windows to match style and color of existing window replacements already installed at second floor and to replace two sets of second-floor porch French doors with single-leaf full-lite aluminum-clad wooden door replacements. City's database includes no record of HCC review of window replacements at second floor level so they should not necessarily serve as appropriate example for proposed replacements. Existing historical windows pair exterior casements with accompanying interior storms, which insulate effectively and result in very different aesthetic from proposed window replacements without interior storms. SIS note deteriorated historical features should be repaired rather than replaced but if deterioration requires replacement, new features should match original; however, COA Application and supplemental photographs provide no evidence that existing historical windows require repair or replacement so

discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. If proposal for casement window replacements is determined inappropriate, Applicant could replace interior storms to replicate existing simple configurations while improving insulation value; otherwise, current proposal for casement window replacements with divided lites and custom sized to match existing openings is appropriate.

Though elevated and set back under deep roof overhang, proposal to install single-leaf patio doors at second-floor rear porch is inappropriate because new doors with single lites contradict SIS that historic character and distinctive features will be preserved; appropriate door replacements should include divided lites. For same reason, proposal to enlarge windows flanking either side of chimney by cutting down openings is inappropriate. If determined by HCC as appropriate, existing windowsills should be salvaged and reused while new wall openings should replicate flagstone detailing at existing window openings.

Before determining appropriateness of proposed window and door replacements, Applicant encouraged to clarify following:

- according to company website, Kolbe casement windows are also available with 'True Divided Lites' as well as 'Performance Divided Lites' (for better energy efficiency) ... both models are more appropriate than proposed 'Simulated Divided Lites'
- project narrative mentions second-floor window proposed for replacement; however, supplemental architectural drawings make no reference to second-floor windows
- identify intention with wall-unit air-conditioner above attic windows at front (north) façade
- describe intentions with transoms above proposed window replacements at sunroom visible from side (west) and rear (south) façades

Applicant should also be aware that tinted, colored and reflective glazing is inappropriate within Mount Airy Historic Conservation District.

Discussion: Taylor Reed and Christine Ussler represented proposal to replace wood casement windows with aluminum-clad wooden casement windows with 'Simulated Divided Lites' and 7/8-inch exterior muntins and also to replace two French doors with two single-leaf, full-lite, aluminum-clad wooden doors. Applicant confirmed willingness to include lite divisions on patio door replacements at second-floor rear porch; also indicated intent to remove in-wall air-conditioner at front façade, with resulting void to be patched with stucco to match existing. Applicant explained second-floor window intended for replacement is not indicated on provided drawings because of location at east (side) façade, which is not currently depicted; continued by explaining small window replacement (approx. 2-feet high x 2-feet wide) at east façade will receive one vertical and one horizontal muntin resulting in 4-lite condition.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's reason for proposing to replace existing historical windows, considering poor condition is not obvious from provided materials. Applicant explained unusual existing window situation (exterior casements with heavy muntins paired with interior storm windows with beefy rails and stiles) that compromises amount of natural light reaching interior spaces while initial investigations revealed second-floor windows were previously replaced, resulting in better natural light conditions; current request is for new window replacements at first floor and attic to "match" existing replacements. Applicant also clarified that original proposal to lengthen windows flanking either side of chimney is removed from COA Applicant due to associated expenses. Applicant concluded by confirming window replacements at rear sunroom include coordinating transoms.

Mr. Lader requested further clarification about reason to replace existing historical windows. Applicant explained property was recently purchased and initial interior renovations did not result in better daylight conditions unless interior storms were removed; however, inefficient insulating value of remaining historical casement windows resulted in poor conditions for heating/cooling interior spaces. Applicant continued by describing recent efforts to cut back adjacent landscape, which somewhat improved daylight conditions but did not provide sufficient results. Mr. Evans inquired about percentage of windows previously changed out; Applicant noted slightly more than one-third of all windows are already replacements. Mr. Lader requested clarification about differences between existing (historical) exterior and interior windows. Applicant noted current exterior windows are casements with divided lites while interior windows are full-lite storms with heavy stiles and rails; current proposal would remove both sets from each existing opening and replace with exterior casements with insulated glass and applied muntins but without interior storms. Mr. Evans noted resulting resolution should require Applicant to submit relevant product information for final review and for Applicant to consider performance series of proposed window type.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader and seconded by Mr. Loush adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to replace wood casement windows with aluminum-clad wooden casement windows and to replace two French doors with two single-leaf, aluminum-clad wooden doors was presented by Taylor Reed and Christine Ussler.
2. Appropriate window replacements include following details:
 - a. existing first floor and attic windows as well as one existing second-floor window (all exterior casements with divided lites in combination with interior storm casements without divided lites) to be replaced with Kolbe Ultra series (or equivalent) aluminum-clad insulated wooden casement windows and no interior storm windows
 - b. new windows to be custom sized to fit existing openings
 - c. divided lites to match existing window configurations and color to match window replacements previously installed at second floor
 - d. existing transoms above windows at rear sunporch also to be replaced in tandem with new casement windows
 - e. no tinted, colored or reflective glazing
3. Appropriate door replacements include following details:
 - a. two sets of existing second-floor rear porch French doors to be replaced with Kolbe Ultra series swinging patio doors (or equivalent) single-leaf aluminum-clad wooden door replacements
 - b. new doors to be custom sized to fit existing openings
 - c. divided lites to coordinate with nearby window configurations and color to match window replacements previously installed at second floor
 - d. no tinted, colored or reflective glazing
4. Applicant confirmed plans to remove existing through-wall air-conditioning unit centered above gang of attic windows at front (north) façade and repair resulting void to match adjacent stucco in color and finish texture.
5. Applicant agreed to consider casement windows with 'True Divided Lites' as well as with 'Performance Divided Lites' (for better energy efficiency) as more appropriate models than proposed 'Simulated Divided Lites' before submitting relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) of finalized window and door selections via City of Bethlehem for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair prior to fabrication and installation.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #5

Property Location: 117 East Third Street

Property Owner: Second Lease, LLC

Applicant: Gina Perini

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: The existing structure is a three-story, three-bay, semi-detached, mixed-use, masonry building with a flat roof. Constructed in ca. 1890, the original storefront façade was reconfigured during the mid- to late-20th century using standard bricks in light brown color, resulting in a slightly recessed entrance at left leading up to residential units while a deeply recessed door centered within the façade leads directly into the commercial space, which also has a small shop window at right. Remaining portions of the front façade have an applied stucco in light brown color with textured finish. 1-over-1 double-hung windows at the upper floor levels appear to be in poor condition. Architectural details of the front façade have been removed over time so the building can no longer be assigned a defining style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to replace awning fabric and add new business name and logo;
note: review is after the fact.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'** -- see Agenda Item #2

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to install replacement fabric with applied graphics onto existing awning frame at 117 East Third Street. Inspection of project site confirmed replacement awning is already installed, so Applicant seeks review after project completion. Applicant also appeared before HCC on December 14, 2020, with similar request for review after installing previous awnings as well as new (but different) company logo on awnings, storefront windows and doors.

Supplemental hand sketch indicates awning measures 34-inches high in addition to 10-inch-high front valence flap while width is 238-inches and depth from building façade is 30-inches. Provided invoice confirms replacement awning is Sunbrella fabric #4608 (black in color), which is appropriate, as are open awning ends. Supplemental graphic indicates new company logo measures 30-inches high x 30-inches wide, centered horizontally and vertically along pitched awning surface. Centered within logo are letters "F&A" in bold, upper-case stylized serif lettering crowned by slogan "CRAFT BEERS" in much smaller, upper-case serif lettering along with Bethlehem star detail. Beneath letters and within thin stylized panel is slogan "GROG HOUSE" in small, bold, upper-case stylized serif lettering followed by "ESTD 2021" in much smaller, upper-case stylized serif lettering. Provided graphics indicate logo details are warm white in color, which is appropriate. COA Application makes no mention of new window signage; however, recent inspection of project site confirmed same logo also installed within several storefront windows and doors, which is appropriate but also requires assessment by City's Zoning Officer.

Discussion: Gina Perini represented proposal to (review after the fact) replace awning fabric and add new business name and logo. Applicant confirmed previous review with HCC resulted in new awning with open ends and new business logo; continued that current proposal includes same black canvas awning with open ends and (another) new business logo of same dimensions as previous appropriate logo. Mr. Lader requested confirmation that current COA Application includes only one awning while previous review involved two awnings; Applicant confirmed one new awning is currently installed while remaining awning was removed. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about status of previous logo; Applicant explained former logo represented business partnership that no longer exists while new logo reflects current business owners. Mr. Simonson noted new logos appear in various storefront windows and doors but are not referenced within COA Application; Applicant confirmed that new logos appear in same storefront locations previously determined by HCC as appropriate. Mr. Simonson also noted previous COA required review of all window and door signage by Zoning Officer and requested resulting resolution include similar language.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to review after the fact, replace awning fabric and add new business name and logo was presented by Gina Perini.
2. Appropriate replacement awning includes following details:
 - a. existing frame to be retained for installation of new awning fabric; replacement canvas awning with no side panels is Sunbrella #4608 (black)
 - b. new awning measures 34-inches high in addition to 10-inch-high front valence flap while width is 238-inches and depth from building façade is 30-inches
 - c. new company logo measures 30-inches high x 30-inches wide, centered horizontally and vertically along pitched awning surface with following details:

- i. centered within logo are letters "F&A" in bold, upper-case stylized serif lettering crowned by slogan "CRAFT BEERS" in much smaller, upper-case serif lettering along with Bethlehem star detail
 - ii. beneath letters and within thin stylized panel is slogan "GROG HOUSE" in small, bold, upper-case stylized serif lettering followed by "ESTD 2021" in much smaller, upper-case stylized serif lettering
 - iii. all company logo graphics and lettering are ivory in color
3. Decals for storefront windows and one recessed entrance door include company logo to match new logo on replacement awning. Each decal measures 30-inches high x 30-inches wide, with various lettering and graphics in ivory color; final approval of storefront window decals must be secured from City's Zoning Officer.

The motion for the (already completed) work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #6

Property Location: 321 Wyandotte Street

Property Owner: Cathedral Church of the Nativity

Applicant: Architerra, PC

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a stone church with a south facing gable with rose window, a steeply pitched slate roof and a gable transept. The current transept was the original church and dates from 1864 while the current nave was constructed in 1887. The church is Gothic Revival in style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish existing steps at the main entrance and replace with a deeper landing at the doors, longer tread depths and curved wing walls for a wider base landing. Proposed materials will match existing, with bid alternates for optional cast stone or bluestone caps and bluestone treads.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 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 would be unimpaired.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless the proposed demolition involves a non-significant addition or portion of the building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant. ... [and continues] ... or the Applicant has demonstrated that they have exhausted all other options and ... will suffer undo(sic) economic hardship.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Applicable Design Guidelines as well as SIS encourage repairs to rather than replacement of deteriorated historical features but if deterioration requires replacement, new features will match original in design, color, texture and materials; however, COA Application and supplemental drawing sheets provide no evidence that existing historical stone entrance steps require significant repair or full demolition and replacement with modified design. Inspection of site confirms side walls of historical steps are integrated into stone church structure and cannot be considered as non-significant addition. Applicant also fails to demonstrate all options to repair/restore historical steps were exhausted, resulting in undue economic hardship; thus, current proposal to demolish existing historical stone entrance steps is inappropriate.

Should HCC deny request for demolition of existing historical steps following clarifications by Applicant, needed repairs should be carefully conducted and all deteriorated materials replaced in-kind, with no bid alternates for potentially different materials. Should HCC approve demolition of existing historical steps, current replacement design proposal is inappropriate due to incompatibility with other relevant SIS: new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize property; new work shall be differentiated from old ... to protect integrity of property and its environment; new additions ... will be undertaken in such manner that, if removed in future, essential form and integrity of historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Discussion: Micah Mutschler and Richard Sauce represented proposal to demolish existing steps at main entrance and replace with deeper landing at church entrance doors, longer tread depths and curved wing walls for wider base landing. Proposed materials will match existing, with bid alternates for optional cast stone or bluestone caps and bluestone treads. Applicant explained current proposal includes deeper top landing and wider bottom landing as well as deeper treads to accommodate improved accessibility; continued that narthex and associated steps are not original to historical structure so desire is to make entrance steps safer while respecting oldest building components. Applicant continued that existing limestone treads require on-going maintenance, so desire is for continuous treads rather than pieced stone elements with mortar joints ... with preference for bluestone treads because they are readily available in full-width dimensions while limestone treads (to match existing) are more difficult to source. Applicant also noted design proposal revises handrail assembly to improve safety and confirmed existing upper landing is 40-inches deep (approximate swing dimension of entrance doors) while proposed landing measures 60-inches deep. Mr. Lader inquired about justification for proposing long slab lengths for replacement treads; Applicant explained desire to avoid joints within stone units (especially at heavy traffic areas) ... although joints could be integrated at central handrail location but not between handrail and wing walls. Applicant also clarified preference for bluestone treads and caps but admitted that economics might determine selection of cast stone elements instead. Mr. Lader expressed concern that current proposal involves demolition of existing side walls which seem integral to historical church walls; continued by inquiring if bluestone is used elsewhere on church campus. Applicant explained bluestone landings already exist elsewhere on church campus. Mr. Cornish encouraged HCC to consider entire church structure (rather than simply entrance steps) for its significance to overall Historic Conservation District ... noting current steps are used multiple times each week to serve living structure ... and expressed appreciation for Applicant's desire accommodate accessibility issues with current proposal. Mr. Loush encouraged Applicant to salvage existing stone materials for reuse in new design proposal but also expressed understanding of need for introducing new materials to accommodate new tread dimensions for overall safety improvements; also noted proposal to extend top landing represents improvement so congregants can avoid conflict with opening/closing of entrance doors. Mr. Lader inquired if existing stone is veneer or full-dimension stone elements. Applicant confirmed existing steps include face stones on both sides and interior rubble so stones are not full depth of wing walls; continued that proposed new wing walls will be faced with stone veneer with reinforced concrete fill for more stability.

Public Commentary: Christine Ussler described professional involvement with modifications to narthex during 1990s to improve accessibility between church and adjacent Sayre Hall; confirmed narthex includes new stone veneer cladding while wing walls at stairs leading to church are historical but agreed deeper top landing at entrance doors into church represents accessibility improvement and will serve as nice design feature for congregation.

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Cornish and seconded by Mr. Loush adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to demolish existing steps at main entrance and replace with deeper landing at doors, longer tread depths and curved wing walls for wider base landing at 321 Wyandotte Street was presented by Richard Sauce and Micah Mutschler.
2. Appropriate replacement steps include following details:
 - a. careful demolition of existing entrance steps to limit damage to adjacent church walls, with potential reuse of salvaged materials for replacement steps

- b. top landing matches existing elevation at door sill and measures 148-inches wide x 60-inches deep; flanked on either side with 18-inch-thick wing walls at 34-inches high
- c. steps descend to base landing below, with curved wing walls flaring out so bottom tread measures 216-inches wide; each step has 18-inch tread depth and 7-inch riser height, with 1-inch overhang
- d. stair treads and wall caps are 2-inch-thick bluestone slabs, with potential cap alternative in cast stone
- e. curved wing walls to be faced with 4-inch stone veneer, with reinforced concrete fill between
- f. new 1-inch-thick wrought iron handrails and 1-inch-square posts match moulding profiles and scrollwork of existing; installed at each outer wing wall and also centered along width of treads

The motion for the proposed work was approved 5-1. Mr. Lader opposed the motion, citing the current proposal violates Secretary of Interior's Standards 2 and 5 to retain, preserve and maintain distinctive historical materials and features as well as Secretary of Interior's Standard 9 that new additions shall be differentiated from the old to protect the integrity of the property. Mr. Lader also encouraged the Applicant to explore other options for safer access into the building.

Agenda Item #7

Property Location: 407-409 Vine Street

Property Owner: Amicus Properties

Applicant: Cassie Rogg, Artefact, Inc.

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a three-story stone and brick building with a deep bracketed upper cornice, prominent second- and third-floor bay windows, 6-over-1 double-hung windows as well as arched windows with bevel siding panels on the third floor. The building dates from ca. 1915 and has Classical Revival as well as Italianate influences. The entry-level storefront façade at #409 was originally occupied by a building contractor while the entrance at #407 allowed access to residential units above; however, the storefront was replaced with a recessed porch, open-web iron support post and upper fascia sheathed in shingles in response to a change from commercial to residential use sometime during the mid-20th century.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to restructure the street-level recessed front façade at 407-409 Vine Street with new windows and door in-kind and stucco exterior siding (at 409 Vine Street only). The existing transom will have shingles removed to be replaced with wood paneling/trim to recall a likely original condition.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 3.** -- Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to reconstruct compromised street-level front façade (at #409 Vine Street only). Proposal to replace existing three-gang of windows with aluminum-clad, wooden, six-over one, double-hung windows to fit existing opening with expressed muntins and wide mullions between individual windows is appropriate, noting that appropriate glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective. In-kind door replacement is appropriate, pending clarification by Applicant about condition of existing door and need to replace along with associated details. Based upon recent site inspection, former recessed façade included either brickote or brick veneer so proposed stucco represents appropriate replacement, pending clarification by Applicant about intended

pigmentation and finish treatment. Proposal to remove shingles at transom location above former storefront (flush with exterior wall above) is appropriate while replacing with raised wooden trim to recall former glazed transom represents plausible solution. Historical images of front façade with original storefront are not provided so Applicant is encouraged to physically investigate upon removal of shingles to potentially confirm original transom divisions. Proposal to replace inappropriate open-web iron support post is encouraged; however, proposed fiberglass or composite Doric post (similar to porch posts nearby at #417-#419 Vine Street) violates SIS 3 “changes that create false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken”. In response, Applicant should consider simplified post design or supplemental support of existing beam across front façade that avoids need for structural post. During meeting on May 16, 2016, HCC passed resolution that encouraged Applicant to remove historically inappropriate bevel siding infill panels on upper-level windows; however, such efforts were never conducted so clarification is requested.

Discussion: Christine Ussler represented proposal to restructure street-level recessed front façade (at 409 Vine Street only) with new windows, in-kind door replacement and stucco exterior siding; existing transom will have shingles removed, to be replaced with wood paneling/trim to recall likely original condition. Applicant clarified original intention was limited to repainting front façade; however, façade veneer was determined as structurally unsound and required replacement. Applicant also clarified desire to delineate corner of elevated porch with new post to replace existing (inappropriate) iron post; would consider suggested box post but explained round column fosters circulation past porch to recessed entrance. Applicant clarified existing entrance door is full-lite wooden door, to be replaced in kind. Applicant also agreed to consider previous HCC request to remove infill panels on upper-level windows.

Mr. Lader requested clarification about proposed stucco treatment and encouraged Applicant to include control joints that align with window openings; Applicant noted control joints might be unnecessary due to limited stucco surface but would consider. Mr. Lader continued that such joints would help animate façade to avoid uniform appearance; Applicant clarified stucco will have smooth finish with neutral, medium-tone pigment. Mr. Lader requested that proposed panel divisions of implied transom align with placement of new support column below and noted horizontal scoring detail of existing masonry piers at each side of recessed façade should inform control joint placement of new stucco façade.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to restructure street-level recessed front façade was presented by Christine Ussler.
2. Appropriate façade improvements (at 409 Vine Street only) include following details:
 - a. existing three-gang of windows replaced with aluminum-clad, wooden, six-over-one, double-hung windows to fit existing opening with expressed muntins and wide mullions between individual windows; glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
 - b. in-kind replacement of existing full-lite wooden entrance door, to be painted
 - c. new stucco façade in neutral pigment with smooth finish; scored control joints to align with scoring of outside stone piers
 - d. one new round or boxed structural post in fiberglass or composite material to replace existing (inappropriate) open-web iron post, to be painted
 - e. remove existing (inappropriate) shingles above former storefront and replace with raised wooden trim to recall original glazed transom; **note:** Applicant is encouraged to investigate potential evidence of original transom divisions upon removal of shingles to inform trim installation

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #8

Property Location: 128 East Third Street

Property Owner: 128 South, LLC

Applicant: Plamen Ayvazov

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a one-story, detached, brick masonry commercial building that is partially clad in vertical metal-panel siding. It was originally constructed in the late 1800s as a three-story furniture store, but the front façade has been significantly altered and currently includes a recessed commercial entrance with contemporary storefront windows and an applied shed roof with asphalt shingles. The distinctive gable detail centered within the shed roof references previous use as an A&P grocery store. The structure experienced several additions, extending the entire depth of the block to Mechanic Street, with side and rear brick masonry facades dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as evidenced by segmental brick arched window and door openings. Many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish the existing 6,500 sq.ft. metal and brick structure and construct a new six-story commercial and multi-family (55 dwellings) structure; exterior to feature brick, metal panels, stucco panels along with storefront and punched aluminum windows with black frames.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- see Agenda Item #6
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- including but not limited to the following: Size, Scale, Massing and Proportion; Rhythm and Patterns; Window and Door Openings; Materials and Textures; Architectural Details; Shape and Massing; Streetscapes.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to demolish existing main structure along with all rear additions and fully replace with new commercial and residential building. Accompanying drawing sheets depict proposed replacement structure as six-story, mixed-use building approx. 80-feet wide, approx. 135-feet deep and approx. 68-feet high, with no mechanical penthouse. Proposed entry level includes approx. 2,500 square feet of commercial space located at corner of East Third Street and Webster Street, with remaining square footage dedicated to support spaces for residential tenants. Proposed upper floor levels include mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments totaling 55 units, with private terraces for select upper-level units. Provided drawings do not indicate any below-grade basement/cellar level or on-site parking spaces. Assessments of appropriateness and resulting recommendations will focus on three main concepts: proposed demolition of existing structures; size, scale, massing and proportions of proposed development project; proposed construction details, with storefront at street level and various façade treatments for upper floors.

Demolition: Relevant guidelines concerning requests for demolition note that HCC encourages Applicant to "evaluate significance of buildings within historical district" and "all attempts to reuse historical buildings are exhausted prior to considering demolition". Guidelines continue that HCC will not recommend approval unless "proposed demolition involves non-significant buildings or building additions, provided demolition will not adversely affect parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant" or when "Applicant has demonstrated they have exhausted all other options and will suffer undo(sic) economic hardship". Strictly interpreted, existing building portions dating from early 20th century qualify as "contributing" to Historic Conservation District due to construction during district's period of interpretation (1885-1950). Applicant offers no assessment of existing conditions to determine what portions are contributing and no evidence that historical portions of existing building cannot be integrated into proposed development project, so discussion is warranted before request to demolish is approved.

Size, Scale, Massing and Proportions: Should HCC approve demolition as currently proposed, requests are predicated on Applicant's ability to replace lost building with new structure that satisfies relevant Secretary of Interior's Standards as well as HCC Design Guidelines concerning size, scale, massing and proportions. Current design proposal fills void left by demolished structures, which is appropriate; however,

guidelines continue by noting “new construction should reflect the dominant cornice and roof heights of adjacent buildings and proportions of building elements to one another and the streetscape” ... and continue ... “In South Bethlehem, where two- and three-story buildings are the norm, buildings that digress from these standards by any great degree seriously impact the Historic Conservation District. If large-scale construction is considered, particular attention will be given to ... the effect of the proposed building on the streetscape and the (District) as a whole.” Current design proposal digresses from dominant cornice heights of nearby contributing structures, which are two, two- and one-half and three stories tall, by rising six stories. Design guidelines continue that façades of new construction should have “similar proportions of solids (walls or siding) to voids (storefronts, windows and door openings) of neighboring buildings.” Large-scale punched openings between series of vertical piers of current design proposal do not relate to solids and voids of nearby contributing structures. Based upon relevant design guidelines, current proposal for six-story structure is inappropriate for immediate streetscape and more generally for overall Historic Conservation District, best illustrated by provided photomontages on Drawing Sheet titled “Street Context”. Appropriate design solution would be limited to three or four stories in height based upon relevant Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Design Guidelines ... conceivably with additional floor level if significantly recessed from front façade (min. 12-feet) to avoid perception from street level below ... while nearby contributing structures offer ample examples of appropriate relationships for solids to voids.

New Construction Details: Relevant design guidelines continue by referencing such important issues as: Rhythm and Patterns, Window and Door Openings, Materials and Textures, Architectural Details as well as Streetscapes. Though conceived as one structure, overall building shifts in materiality from brick to dark metal panels as front façade sets back at upper floor levels and as building turns corner along Webster Street. East façade also includes decorative metal screen at entry level while west façade has applied stucco panels. According to relevant design guidelines, brick and stucco are appropriate façade materials; however, proposed metal panels and decorative screens require clarification and subsequent review of product submittals before appropriateness can be determined. Proposed rhythm and pattern of punched windows are contemporary in style while relevant design guidelines note windows should be functionally similar (such as double-hung windows) and have similar muntin or grid patterns (lite divisions) along with expressed sills and lintels as the neighborhood’s historical buildings so current windows are inappropriate. Relevant guidelines also depict design components of appropriate storefronts, including apron at sidewalk level, entrance doors flanked by display windows with transoms above as well as overall sign band and cornice across full width of façade to delineate commercial entry level from residential floors above. Proposed storefront of full-height plate glass segments that recess back from public sidewalk beneath arcade of brick piers is inappropriate due to lack of appropriate storefront components.

If proposed six-story structure is determined appropriate by HCC upon discussion with Applicant, subsequent reviews should address such items as proposed window and door types, windowsills and lintels (all currently lacking), cornice profiles (also lacking) and various façade materials as well as visible exterior illumination. Applicant should be aware that tinted, colored and reflective glazing is inappropriate. Applicant should also reference ‘Guidelines for Storefronts’ before finalizing components and details of proposed storefronts; similarly, ‘Guidelines for Signage’ offer suggestions for building signage concepts to avoid submittals to HCC from future tenants with individual sign proposals.

Discussion: Plamen Ayvazov and Antonio Fiol-Silva, represented proposal to demolish existing 6,500 sq.ft. metal and brick structure and construct new six-story commercial and multi-family (55 dwellings) structure, with exterior to feature brick, metal panels, stucco panels along with storefront and punched aluminum windows with black frames. Mr. Lader noted desire to organize discussion of proposed project into suggested categories of review (Demolition; Size, Scale, Massing and Proportions; New Construction Details) based upon current pre-schematic design so Applicant can move forward with more detailed drawings in response to initial HCC commentary. Applicant acknowledged proposal includes demolition of early 20th century additions to main structure; however, city resources identify project location as “non-contributing” to Historic Conservation District (including remaining city block with contemporary strip mall) and pre-planning meetings with various city entities never indicated need to salvage all or portions of existing structure. Applicant continued that any building elements ultimately determined as historical will be retained, preserved and integrated into overall design. Mr. Lader clarified HCC requires justification for demolition requests before voting to approve/deny but current COA Application does not include typical commentary in support. Mr. Evans continued that HCC must carefully consider each demolition proposal;

otherwise, lack thereof is considered derelict of duty while also noting HCC must ascertain appropriateness of proposed replacement structure before approving demolition. Mr. Lader noted portions of existing building date from Historic Conservation District period of interpretation, so HCC is tasked with discussing. Mr. Cornish recalled HCC approvals of similar previous requests for demolition where contributing buildings were not as compromised as current site so resulting COA to approve demolition is contingent upon Applicant's ability to satisfy relevant design guidelines with proposed development project.

Addressing issues of size, scale, massing and proportions, Applicant noted typical South Bethlehem streetscapes include various scales and architectural styles so current design responds to those characteristics. Proposed building has large storefronts extending down to sidewalk organized between vertical piers that begin at fourth floor level, with setback at fifth floor level and another setback at upper-most sixth floor level ... setbacks are ca. 10-feet deep. Applicant continued that design proposal has no continuous cornice height but rather differing heights in relation to varying streetscapes. Proposed main façade includes brick in dark red color inspired by nearby Bethlehem Steel headquarters and rear façade includes brick in lighter color, with remaining façade components of stucco panels, metal panels and decorative metal screens which imply collection of three different buildings rather than one large structure. Applicant also noted side façade (facing adjacent parking lot) cannot include windows; however, scoring patterns in stucco finish telegraph typical window elements. Applicant justified selection of punched window openings at upper floor levels in response to design guidelines that new construction should result in contemporary building "of its time" to differentiate itself from existing contributing historical structures.

Applicant requested HCC approval for proposed demolition as well as overall size, scale, massing and proportions of proposed development project before returning to HCC for review of new construction details. Mr. Cornish requested Applicant's justification for replacing existing one-story structure with new six-story structure based upon relevant design guidelines. Applicant explained many nearby contributing structures are four stories tall, with commercial first floors significantly taller than contemporary building standards as well as tall roof parapets with upper cornices while design proposal includes shorter floor levels and no roof parapet or upper cornice so new six-story structure approaches height of existing four-story buildings. Mr. Lader noted various taller structures referenced by Applicant are located outside boundaries of Historic Conservation District and therefore not considered as contributing. Mr. Evans inquired about Applicant's justification for proposed punched windows based upon relevant design guidelines, noting that neighboring structures depicted on provided streetscapes have very different senses of rhythm and pattern concerning solids and voids. Applicant clarified combination of narrow and wide window openings at various façades offer sense of depth and texture, with resulting shadows that imply concept of historical windows without copying them; continued by admitting typical windowsill and lintel details are missing from current design.

Mr. Lader noted desire to respond to Applicant's request for HCC approval of proposed demolition and overall design concept, noting appreciation of design and certain materials (specifically brick and stucco façades); continued with personal concern about inappropriateness of proposed size and scale for current location (too tall and massive) but could envision three-story structure with potential for stepping back subsequent fourth floor level above. Applicant noted current zoning ordinance allows structures up to 150-feet at project location. Mr. Lader noted that HCC is commissioned with assessing projects based upon relevant design guidelines and not zoning limitations; continued that provided photomontage of proposed structure within immediate streetscapes is helpful but scale drawings that reflect actual building dimensions are required. Applicant responded with offer to utilize computer technology to generate pedestrian-level street models to view proposed project from various vantages within Historic Conservation District; Mr. Evans welcomed opportunity for computer modeling but also appreciates scale drawings. Mr. Simonson expressed concern about overall height and massing of proposed structure and suggested Applicant's offer for computer modeling might assist HCC with assessing appropriateness ... noting potential for setting outside typical HCC meeting for demonstration. Applicant responded with need to understand if HCC would seriously consider current design proposal before investing time and money into computer modeling. Mr. Lader expressed concern that computer modeling of current design proposal within existing streetscape would not change personal impression that building height should be limited to three or four stories. Applicant justified minimum six-story building height based upon development economics; Mr. Lader explained HCC is not commissioned with assessing economics of project proposals. Applicant repeated statement that existing zoning ordinance allows for much taller structures and expressed unwillingness to

invest in further design development without understanding ability to demolish existing structure. Mr. Cornish clarified by offering examples of previous HCC reviews that resulted in approved demolitions but remain vacant lots because finalized designs for replacement structures were never reviewed for appropriateness. Mr. Hudak noted several similar but larger-scale residential development projects nearby (just beyond Historical Conservation District) scheduled for completion soon.

Applicant requested clarification about expectations of potential presentation outside traditional HCC meeting setting. Mr. Lader described project proposal as exciting and welcomed further exploration; continued by recounting HCC concerns that current building height exceeds appropriateness so subsequent discussions should confirm how design proposal adheres to relevant design guidelines. Applicant concluded by welcoming opportunity to meet with HCC members outside traditional meeting setting to help identify appropriate project components so those details can be further detailed while inappropriate project components can be amended.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted proposal to table decision to approve proposed demolition and resulting development project. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inappropriateness of current design and encouraged Applicant to return for subsequent review of development proposal that responds to expressed concerns, with Applicant's ability to present computer modeling outside traditional HCC meeting setting.

The motion to table a decision about the appropriateness of the proposed work was unanimously approved.

New Business:

Mr. Lader expressed desire to review responses to recent CAMP Training sessions; however, due to length of current meeting, agreed to postpone discussion until future HCC meeting.

General Business: Minutes from HCC meeting on September 20, 2021, were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY: _____

Jeffrey Long
Historic Officer
South Bethlehem Historic Conservation District
Mt. Airy Historic District