
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: ANTHONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: KELLEY ANDRADE, DARLENE HELLER, JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: LANI GOINS (BETHLEHEM PRESS), CHRISTINA TATU (MORNING CALL)

VISITORS PRESENT: KIM CARRELL-SMITH, JORDAN CLARK, GRACE CRAMPSIE SMITH, BRYAN HAY, DAVID HORN, RAFAEL PALOMINO, JAMES PRESTON, SAMI RABIH, RICHARD SAUCE, LEE SNYDER, BETH STARBUCK, KIERA WILHELM, LARISSA WOODS

MEETING DATE: JUNE 21, 2021

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on June 21, 2021, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA as well as via GoToMeeting virtual meeting platform. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Point of Order: Mr. Cornish expressed appreciation for Mr. Long's detailed meeting minutes but noted a personal understanding of Robert's Rules of Order that HCC motions should be introduced with a series of "whereas" clauses that detail important discussion points and conclude with a final "therefore" clause prior to the motion. Mr. Long responded that the City Clerk provides a template for all HCC resolutions intended for City Council consideration, with "whereas" and "therefore" sections already completed; continued that HCC is only commissioned with providing relevant motions. Mr. Lader noted that City Council recently submitted a reminder to HCC about the requirement to identify within all denial motions how Applicants can revise elements within their COA Applications so that submissions could be determined as appropriate.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 321 Wyandotte Street

Property Owner: Cathedral Church of the Nativity

Applicant: Lee Snyder

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. The adjacent Parish Hall burned to the ground in 1939 but was rebuilt as the new Sayre Hall in a similar Gothic Revival style in 1940. This structure is a large, 3-story stone multi-purpose building with a steeply pitched slate roof and a cross gable, casement windows with carved masonry window and door surrounds as well as cast masonry sills and lintels. A more recent addition is a new cloister that facilitates handicap accessibility for both buildings.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to install a new louver in the upper east wall of Sayre Hall to provide ventilation air to the central air handling unit and to install a new louver in the transom of the double doors in the basement of Cathedral Church to provide ventilation air to the Sanctuary.

Guideline Citations:

- **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.

- **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** -- 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 install 32-inch-high x 18-inch-wide louver at upper floor level in east wall of Sayre Hall and to install 14-inch-high x 56-inch-wide louver within lower portion of existing transom above double doors in Cathedral Church basement. Both proposals are inappropriate, as currently presented ... mainly because they violate conditions of SIS 10, which require new additions to be easily reversible without resulting in damage to historical building fabric of contributing structures. Appropriate alternative for proposed louver for Sayre Hall takes advantage of existing window opening around corner, as indicated on provided floor plan. Should HCC approve motion in support of louver at proposed location, opening must be centered above windows below (not justified left, as currently depicted) while top of opening must align with tops of adjacent openings; careful attention by skilled stone mason must be used to integrate opening into existing stone façade while cast masonry sill and lintel elements matching existing openings elsewhere should also be part of new project scope. Appropriate alternative for proposed louver in lower portion of existing transom above Cathedral Church basement doors would involve careful removal of entire transom and salvage for potential future reinstallation; new louver should be fabricated to fit within resulting opening.

Discussion: Lee Snyder and Richard Sause represented proposal to install louver in upper east wall of Sayre Hall to provide ventilation air to central air handling unit and to install louver in transom of double doors in basement of Cathedral Church to provide ventilation air to Sanctuary. Applicant confirmed that existing transom above double basement doors to Cathedral Church can be carefully removed, salvaged and properly stored in preparation for potential future reinstallation in order to accommodate new louver in full transom location. Applicant continued by describing conditions at Sayre Hall mechanical room that prevent installation of new louver within existing window(s) at upper north façade; requested clarification from Historic Officer about conditions for approval if new opening is created within upper east façade. Mr. Long clarified top of new opening should align with tops of openings of adjacent windows while centerline of new opening should align with centerlines of windows below; new opening should also have cast sill and lintel to match existing elsewhere. Mr. Lader inquired about material of proposed louvers; Applicant confirmed louvers are aluminum in dark bronze finish but can be painted, as needed. Mr. Lader suggested light gray color to match adjacent stonework and offered to meet Applicant on-site together with Historic Officer to finalize color selection. Applicant inquired if HCC would allow bidding of both options (new louver in new opening at upper east wall and new louver in existing window opening at upper north wall) to determine least expensive approach. Mr. Simonson inquired if depicted grille (louver) in submitted photograph labeled "Ex. Exhaust Air Louver in East Wall" already exists; Applicant confirmed louver exists and also depicted in additional photograph labeled "East Elevation: Existing Air Louver". Mr. Simonson continued that both approaches for new louver are appropriate; assumes bid for new opening with custom stonework will be more expensive but uncertain if proposed louver size will fit within existing window opening. Applicant noted approach to use existing window opening for new louver would require revising grille size to accommodate HVAC needs while also fitting existing opening.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader 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 install new louver in upper east wall of Sayre Hall to provide ventilation air to central air handling unit and to install new louver in transom of double doors in basement of Cathedral Church to provide ventilation air to Sanctuary was presented by Lee Snyder and Richard Sause.

2. Appropriate locations for new louver at Sayre Hall include following options:
 - a. 32-inch-high x 18-inch-wide louver at upper floor level in east wall; top of new opening aligns with tops of openings of adjacent windows and centerline of new opening aligns with centerlines of windows below; cast sill and lintel to match existing elsewhere
 - b. existing window opening in mechanical room at upper floor level in north wall; louver size based upon HVAC needs and ability to fit within existing opening

note: Applicant allowed to select preferred installation location after bidding both options
3. New louver to be installed within location of existing transom above double basement doors to Cathedral Church; existing transom to be carefully removed, salvaged and properly stored for potential future reinstallation.
4. Applicant to cooperate via City of Bethlehem for on-site determination of paint color selection for both louvers by HCC Chair and Historic Officer prior to fabrication and installation.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 712 East Fourth Street

Property Owner: 712-714 East 4th Street, LLC

Applicant: Sami Rabih

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is the far-right unit of a detached 3-story, 6-unit mixed use building. Each unit includes a storefront entrance door and shop window at street level with either a bow window or two bays of windows at the upper residential floor levels. Upper-level windows are one-over-one, double-hung sash and select windows serve as emergency egress leading to exterior fire escapes. The overall brick masonry structure with simplified upper cornice, unadorned parapet and flat roof dates from ca. 1900. The street-level exterior façade has been significantly manipulated over time and has lost its original architectural character. This façade received T1-11 rough-sawn vertical plywood sheathing sometime during the late 20th century and is currently painted light gray in color. A projecting pent roof sheathed with asphalt shingles, a new shop window and a new storefront entrance door were installed in 2019.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to add a vinyl decal on the front window.

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 and Awnings'** -- Care should be taken in mounting signs and awnings 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: COA Application indicates intent to install vinyl decal lettering on existing shop window for new commercial tenant. Based on proportions of provided drawing, existing shop window measures 60-inches high x 84-inches wide. Signage proposal includes one vinyl decal measuring approximately 25-inches high x 15-inches wide as stylized dollar sign in dark green color with outline in orange followed by logo "Dollar & UP" measuring approximately 12-inches high x 60-inches wide in combination of upper- and lower-case, serif, italic lettering in dark green color with outline in orange. Subsequent three text lines identify products for purchase, with each line measuring approximately 3-inches high and including words: "LOTTERY-CIGARETTE-TOBACCO" followed by "HOME & CLEANING SUPPLY" followed by "COLD DRINK"; all three lines include all upper-case, sans-serif lettering in dark green color.

Vinyl decal lettering is inappropriate as currently presented. Proposed dollar sign is much too large for existing shop window and should be omitted. If “Dollar & UP” graphic is company logo, HCC is required to accept; however, relevant design guidelines discourage lettering with outline in differing color. Lettering in dark color is difficult to discern by passersby and will not be successful. More appropriate signage involves omitting dollar sign and raising company logo to upper third portion of shop window while also surrounding with pinstripe detail to create uniform border around logo. Design guidelines for signage do not address texts beyond company logo so proposed list of products available for sale is not considered signage. Should HCC support secondary lettering, Applicant is encouraged to revise various words from singular to plural: “cigarettes, supplies, drinks”; lettering should also be reduced in size and revised as serif lettering to comply with guidelines. All vinyl details should be warm white or ivory in color and installed on inside surface of shop window.

Discussion: Sami Rabih represented proposal to add vinyl decals on front shop window. Mr. Lader inquired if 84” x 60” dimensions on supplemental drawing indicate size of intended signage or existing shop window; Applicant confirmed that provided dimensions indicate shop window size. Applicant continued by agreeing that proposed dollar sign is too large and prefers to omit so potential customers walking by can view inside store; also confirmed that proposed list of products for sale might change over time and requested ability to revise, as needed. Mr. Lader noted relevant design guidelines discourage letters outlined in differing color and dark lettering is difficult to read; Applicant confirmed that proposed green color derives from color of dollar bill but would consider lighter green color or perhaps gold. Mr. Lader continued with preference for lettering in warm white or ivory color but might be amenable to other light colors if already part of company logo. Mr. Simonson inquired if dollar sign is part of company logo; Applicant responded that dollar sign is not part of company logo and initially included to emphasize company name (Dollar & UP). Applicant continued by inquiring if company logo lettering could increase in size if dollar sign is omitted; Mr. Simonson reminded Applicant that window signage is limited to maximum 40% of overall glass surface. Applicant agreed to raise company name to upper portion of shop window to improve visibility inside store. Mr. Lader noted design guidelines also encourage pinstripe detail around sign perimeter; Applicant agreed to integrate pinstripe detail in complementary color. Applicant concluded with concern about visibility of window decals if installed on inside glass surface due to glass thickness; Mr. Lader noted that inside installation is required for window decals and enables easier cleaning.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. Proposal to install vinyl decal on front window was presented by Sami Rabih.
2. New appropriate signage includes following details:
 - a. company logo “Dollar & UP” (but no dollar sign) in upper- and lower-case, serif, italic lettering in upper portion of existing shop window and surrounded by pinstripe detail
 - b. limited list of products available for purchase (can amend over time) in much smaller, all upper-case, sans-serif lettering in lower portion of shop window
 - c. all lettering and graphics are vinyl decals in warm white or ivory in color, to be installed on inside surface of shop window
3. Applicant agreed to submit revised design proposal prior to fabrication and installation via City of Bethlehem for final consideration by HCC Chair and Historic Officer.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 125-127 West Fourth Street

Property Owner: Larissa Woods and Luis Rivera

Applicant: Larissa Woods and Luis Rivera

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a 1-story, brick masonry, detached building with a flat roof behind a stepped parapet. The building dates from circa 1925 and was most likely associated with the emerging automobile industry at that time (car dealership or mechanical shop), as evidenced by similar structures throughout Bethlehem. The building originally had large glass storefronts; however, the façade has been significantly manipulated over time and has lost its original architectural character. Leaded glass or glass block transoms above lost storefronts are currently covered over with plywood. Shop windows in simple metal frames dating from the mid- to late 20th century are located on either side of the front entrances. HCC recently approved the Applicant's request to demolish inappropriate plywood sheathing, pent roof and metal siding to reveal the earlier façade beneath.

Proposed Alterations: It is a continuation discussion of the HCC meeting on April 19, 2021, allowing the Applicant to remove the façade and reveal original materials. The Applicant proposes to install window panels, repair brick and windows and install exterior lighting.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 1.** -- A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
- **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.** -- Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **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) 7.** -- Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 10.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage and Awnings'** -- see Agenda Item #2

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to build upon original proposal to reconfigure what is currently two-unit commercial structure into two rear dwelling units and two front commercial units. Approved demolition of inappropriate façade elements seems complete; however, Applicant should clarify intentions with revealed brick masonry façade (many nails and fasteners remain in façade after removal of various siding). Although discouraged within relevant design guidelines, Applicant might consider painting entire front façade for more uniform appearance as alternative to current mix of various brick types and colors.

Original proposal to repair revealed transoms as well as to install new transoms to replace missing by matching existing is appropriate. Current COA Application includes image of ¼-inch thick reeded replacement glass, but recent on-site inspection confirmed transoms remain covered over with plywood. Uncertain if proposed glass matches existing glass within historic transoms or if suggestion is possible alternative rather than in-kind replacement; clarification is requested before appropriateness can be determined. COA Application makes no mention of entrance doors (previously interior doors located within recessed entrance but now revealed upon removal of wood sheathing); similarly, Applicant's intent with two existing shop windows is no longer mentioned so clarifications are warranted. Recent removal of exterior sheathing also revealed secondary windows as well as exposed ceiling of former recessed entrance, so clarification of those details is also warranted.

Current COA Application includes depictions of gooseneck light fixtures, craftsman-inspired metal outdoor wall sconce and retractable awning in black color; however, proposed locations for various items are not

indicated. Gooseneck fixtures have previously been determined by HCC as appropriate within HCD; however, appropriateness requires no visible cables, conduits or junction boxes on exterior façade and LED bulbs are limited to max. 3000K color temperature. Design guidelines do not mention specific outdoor light fixtures, so discussion of proposal (craftsman-inspired wall sconce in black metal with copper details and seeded glass: San Marco by Lamps Plus measuring 18 ¼-inches high) is warranted. Appropriate awnings should be Sunbrella canvas (or comparable) over metal frames with open ends while front valances should flap loosely.

Finally, previous COA Application included photograph of rear façade (visible from Rink Street) with notation “Awning” at two locations while current Application no longer references rear façade; clarification is warranted before appropriateness of proposed rear façade rehabilitation can be determined.

Discussion: Larissa Woods represented proposal to continue discussion of HCC meeting on April 19, 2021, that determined removal of façade to reveal original materials was appropriate; Applicant proposes to install window panels, repair brick and windows and install exterior lighting.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s intentions following recent removal of inappropriate exterior siding at front façade. Applicant noted that existing glass within transoms is very damaged, with some transoms even missing; coordinated with local supplier to determine appropriate replacement glass (see submitted “reeded” glass sample) and need to reconfigure certain transom divisions to reflect original configuration. Mr. Simonson inquired if all or only select transoms will be replaced; Applicant clarified intent to replace all transoms, using wood frames for new glass. Mr. Lader suggested aluminum frames for replacement transoms as appropriate alternative to wood that will also last much longer.

Mr. Simonson inquired about Applicant’s intent with two large shop windows and two smaller windows within recessed entrance; Applicant responded that existing windows will be retained, with potential for future replacement. Applicant continued by confirming Mr. Long’s comment about original façade having large glass storefronts but confirmed inability to afford replacement storefronts and also noted existing tenant does not need large expanse of windows. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to cooperate with qualified contractor to understand cost ramifications of replacement aluminum and glass storefront assembly so front façade returns to typical aesthetic of this building type, noting new storefront façade would also resolve other current issues. Applicant continued that existing wooden entrance doors are in good condition so both will be retained and painted black. Mr. Lader inquired if transoms are visible from inside commercial units or if current interior ceiling is lower than transoms; Applicant noted one structural beam just below transoms visible across entire length visible from inside both units, with transoms also visible and ceilings above.

Applicant explained that proposed location for new wall sconce is central brick pillar within recessed entry, adjacent to commercial entrance. Mr. Lader inquired about dimensions of proposed wall sconce, noting concern about door clearance; Mr. Simonson explained City Planning & Zoning would cooperate with Applicant to ensure proper door clearance prior to wall sconce installation. Mr. Simonson continued by inquiring if proposed gooseneck light fixtures will also receive canopy, as depicted in inspiration photo; Applicant clarified that provided image was taken from neighboring structure (also owned by Applicant) but current location would not have canopy above lights, which will be installed into existing upper parapet. Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s intention with existing ceiling above recessed entrance, noting recent removal of metal siding resulted in open joint between trim and existing brick façade; Applicant admitted on-going thoughts about retaining metal panel ceiling or replacing with PVC. Mr. Lader noted need to install flashing at junction between horizontal siding and vertical masonry wall to avoid water penetration. Applicant continued by proposing replacement of current metal caps at stepped parapet; Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to carefully remove existing caps and report back to HCC on condition beneath (could be original cast or masonry caps) before finalizing proposal. Applicant also clarified that proposed awnings are intended above entrances at two rear residential units.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s preferred approach for rehabilitating front façade. Applicant noted preference to retain existing brick façade rather than replace with aluminum and glass storefront; continued by proposing to clean facade and retain as patchwork of brick types rather than painting overall façade, noting upper façade (at parapet) has uniform brick units while lower façade includes several brick types. Applicant also confirmed desire to paint remaining paintable surfaces (windows, doors, etc.) black in color. Mr. Lader explained that HCC does not assess color selections for paintable surfaces while permanent

colors on fabricated surfaces require HCC input so proposal to paint existing window frames, doors, etc. does not require mention within HCC motion. Mr. Lader requested input from HCC concerning existing brick façade, noting fasteners, nails, glue, etc. remain visible after recent removal of inappropriate wood and metal siding. Mr. Loush suggested uniform brick area above transoms could be cleaned and repointed, as needed; brick façade below transoms could be painted for uniform appearance but acknowledged preference to avoid painting brick surfaces. Mr. Cornish agreed with Mr. Loush. Mr. Hudak encouraged Applicant to clean revealed brick surfaces to determine if repointing is needed before returning to HCC with assessment of façade conditions and resulting proposal to paint all/select brick portions or to leave exposed; continued with assumption that reestablishing glass storefront will be too expensive for Applicant's consideration and requested such language not be included with HCC motion.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader 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 continue discussion of HCC meeting on April 19, 2021, that determined removal of façade to reveal original materials as appropriate was presented by Larissa Woods; Applicant proposes to install window panels, repair brick and windows and install exterior lighting.
2. Appropriate rehabilitation of existing façade includes following details:
 - a. existing brickwork to be carefully cleaned, including removal of all dirt, glue, nails, fasteners, etc.; joints to be repointed as needed using appropriate mortar mix and damaged or missing brick units to be replaced in-kind
 - b. existing metal coping at stepped parapets to be carefully removed; revealed cast or masonry caps should be retained and repaired in-kind
 - c. transoms to receive new reeded glass, as submitted ... though not exact match to existing, proposed glass references period details of Historic Conservation District; **note:** HCC recommends aluminum frames as appropriate alternative to proposed wooden frames at replacement transoms for ease of maintenance and longevity, with Applicant returning to HCC for final review of details prior to fabrication and installation
 - d. exposed front edge of ceiling above recessed entrance to be repaired with pre-finished drip edge at vertical brick façade to prevent water penetration
 - e. new gooseneck light fixtures have no visible cables, conduits or junction boxes on exterior façade; LED bulbs are limited to max. 3000K color temperature
 - f. new craftsman-inspired wall sconce in black metal with copper details and seeded glass (San Marco by Lamps Plus measuring 18 ¼-inches high, or comparable), to be centered on vertical column within recessed entryway, next to entrance door; LED bulb limited to max. 3000K color temperature
 - g. two awnings (one at each rear apartment entrance) to be Sunbrella canvas (or comparable) in black color with no printed graphics or logos and to be installed over rigid metal frames, with front valance flaps and open ends

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #4 -- **note:** Mr. Loush confirmed a conflict of interest with this agenda item, abstaining from discussion and the resulting resolution.

Property Location: 317-327 South New Street

Property Owner: 325 South New Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: A building was never constructed at 317 South New Street, which currently serves as vehicular and pedestrian access to a collection of rear additions and parking spaces within the interior of this city block.

The structure at 319 South New Street is a single-story, semi-detached commercial wood-framed building with a flat roof. The building dates from ca. 1900; however, many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. An ornamental cornice at the main (west) façade has been covered over by a steep shed roof with asphalt shingles. The remaining front façade as well as side and rear façades are painted beige. The storefront includes a large double shop window with upper divides set in wood frames, a paneled and glazed entrance door and a retractable awning.

The structure at 321-323 South New Street is a 3-story, 4-bay attached, commercial and residential brick masonry building with a flat roof, ornamental upper cornice, decorative window heads and altered storefronts. The building dates from ca. 1885 and is Italianate in style. The original brick façade is painted beige while the two storefronts include large, divided glass display windows set in aluminum frames, recessed entrances and retractable awnings. The property also includes a series of two-story and single-story rear additions, several dating from the early 20th century, as evidenced by segmental brick arched window and door openings.

The structure at 325 South New Street is a 3-story, 3-bay attached, commercial and residential brick masonry building with a flat roof and altered storefront. Like the adjacent structure, this building dates from ca. 1885 and was probably Italianate in style; however, the exposed front façade was treated with a stucco veneer and given an etched pattern (often referred to as "Brickote") in imitation red brick sometime during the mid-20th century. The storefront was probably altered at the same time, resulting in one set of steps leading up double doors into a commercial space and flanked on either side by small shop windows while another set of steps lead up to a single door that services residential units at upper floor levels. A shed roof with asphalt shingles delineates the entry level from upper floor levels and includes a retractable awning. The remaining visible side façade and the rear façade have been covered in yellow stucco with a textured surface. Original architectural features were lost during façade renovations so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. The entire structure seems to be vacant.

The structure at 327 South New Street is a single-story, attached commercial wood-framed building with a flat roof and includes a large, single-story masonry rear addition with a flat roof. The main building dates from ca. 1900, as does the rear addition; however, many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. An ornamental upper cornice at the main (west) façade remains visible and is painted deep red while the upper façade has been covered over and painted bright white. The remaining front façade is painted deep red while the rear façade has been covered in yellow stucco with a textured surface. The storefront includes an off-center paneled and glazed entrance door, a large shop window set in wood frames, two smaller shop windows set in aluminum frames and a retractable awning.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish four buildings while integrating the salvaged and rehabilitated façade of one existing building to construct a new, multi-story, mixed-use building.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- see Agenda Item #3
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #3
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #3
- **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 and Awnings'** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless proposed demolition involves a non-significant building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant.
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- including but not limited to following:
 - (1) Size, Scale, Proportion - New construction should relate to the dominant proportions, size and scale of period buildings (1895 to 1950) in the district.

- (2) Rhythm and Patterns - Design elements of principal facades should reflect and maintain neighborhood patterns of period buildings (1895 to 1950), including but not limited to the following: prevalent number of bays; door and window placement; floor-to-floor and cornice heights; spacing between windows and doors and between windows and cornices or rooflines; and dimensions of the facade's base and cornice.
- (3) Window and Door Openings - The size and design of window and door openings should be similar to those of period buildings (1895 to 1950) in the immediate neighborhood.
- (4) Materials and Textures - Building materials, textures and treatments should be compatible with those of period buildings (1895 to 1950) in the immediate neighborhood. Traditional materials common in the Historic Conservation District, such as brick, wood and stone, are preferred.
- (5) Architectural Details - New construction should include details and appurtenances reflecting the character defining features of neighborhood buildings of period significance (1895 to 1950), such as porches, porticos, cornices, lintels, arches, quoins, and chimneys.
- (6) Shape and Massing - New construction should incorporate massing, building shapes, and roof shapes that are present in period buildings (1895 to 1950).
- (7) Streetscapes - New construction shall reflect prevailing setbacks, and physical elements which define streetscapes, such as brick walls, wrought iron fences, building facades or combinations of these which form visual continuity and cohesiveness with the period buildings (1895 to 1950).

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on January 25, 2021, Applicant contended that all four existing structures at proposed project location have exceeded anticipated lifespans and exhibit code-compliance, life-safety as well as environmental issues that preclude viability. Applicant justified 12-story height of proposed replacement structure with desire to maximize development allowed by zoning ordinance and explained that architectural details of demolished structures inspire portions of proposed replacement. In response to Applicant's presentation, HCC commended overall design as attractive; however, proposal to replace existing one- and three-story structures with one 12-story building was deemed by HCC as inappropriate and incompatible with relevant design guidelines. Applicant was encouraged to explore integration of one or more existing buildings into overall design proposal ... especially contributing Italianate structure located at 321-323 South New Street. Several HCC members noted that development projects taller than five stories are inappropriate for current location as well as for overall Historic Conservation District (HCD).

Applicant returned to HCC on February 22, 2021, with COA Application to demolish existing structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street while integrating rehabilitated front façade of contributing structure at 321-323 South New Street into overall development project. Design also incorporated dominant cornice height of existing streetscape at third-floor level façades; however, revised proposal rose another ten stories, resulting in 13-story building that significantly digressed from roof heights of adjacent buildings and represented increase of one floor level to previous 12-story building. HCC expressed appreciation for Applicant's integration of front façade of contributing structure within design and noted design approach was successful at street level; however, impact of proposed high-rise building on immediate streetscape as well as overall HCD was of great concern to HCC. Similar sentiments were expressed by ten individuals during Public Commentary portion of meeting, with no public support for proposed building height. HCC adopted proposal 6-0-1 that City Council DENY Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed mixed-use high-rise development.

Applicant successfully petitioned for removal of HCC Motion to DENY recommendation to issue COA from subsequent Bethlehem City Council meeting agenda to amend design proposal and re-submit for further HCC assessment. Applicant returned to HCC on April 26, 2021, with intent to demolish four existing structures located at 319-327 South New Street, rehabilitate existing Italianate front façade at 321-323 South New Street as well as develop adjacent alley located at 317 South New Street and replace with new 10-story commercial and residential building. Like previous assessment, HCC expressed appreciation for Applicant's integration of front façade of contributing structure within design and noted design approach was successful at street level; however, impact of proposed high-rise building on immediate streetscape as well as overall HCD was of great concern to HCC. Similar sentiments were expressed by five individuals during Public Commentary portion of meeting, with no public support voiced for proposed building height. HCC adopted unanimous proposal that City Council DENY Certificate of Appropriateness for proposal to

demolish three buildings, to rehabilitate existing façade of one contributing building and to construct multi-story mixed-use building. HCC expressed support for developing current project location; however, proposal to replace existing 1-story and 3-story buildings with new 10-story structure was determined as inappropriate for existing streetscape and for overall HCD based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with the ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of the Historic Conservation District, Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition as well as concerning New Construction.

During meeting on June 1, 2021, select members of Bethlehem City Council confirmed receipt of updated drawings for Applicant's development proposal that reduced overall building height and tabled decision to consider HCC recommendation to DENY recommendation to issue COA until HCC could assess revised design. Current COA Applicant and supplemental items represent Applicant's response to City Council. Cover letter dated June 4, 2021, indicates intent to demolish four existing structures located at 319-327 South New Street, rehabilitate existing Italianate front façade at 321-323 South New Street as well as develop adjacent alley located at 317 South New Street and replace with new 9-story commercial and residential building. Accompanying engineering report completed by Bällina Group bases recommendation for demolition of all existing structures on "Life Safety & Code Compliance" issues as well as "Environmental Concerns" observed during visual property inspection conducted on August 11, 2020. Cover letter as well as accompanying architectural renderings and drawing sheets describe proposed replacement structure as 9-story, mixed-use building that measures approx. 110-feet wide, approx. 75-feet deep, approx. 88-feet high at shortest (southwest) corner and approx. 92-feet at tallest (northwest) corner ... excluding mechanical penthouse. Proposed entry level includes 6,500 SF of commercial and community spaces while proposed upper floor levels include 8,000 SF each, with mix of one-bedroom/one-bath and two-bedroom/two-bath apartments totaling 61 units. Applicant's project overview references recent marketing/demographics study of downtown Bethlehem and notes "strong need for market rate apartment housing for workforce individuals, healthcare providers, young professionals, life science and university communities, and graduate students"; references to affordable housing could not be found within cover letter, project overview or on architectural drawings.

HCC assessment and recommendations should focus on three main concepts: proposed demolition of four existing structures; size and scale of proposed development project; proposed new construction, with storefronts at street level and traditional façade treatments for upper floors.

Demolition: Design guidelines concerning requests for demolition note HCC encourages Applicant to "evaluate significance of buildings within historic district" and "all attempts to reuse historical buildings are exhausted prior to considering demolition". Guidelines continue that HCC will not adopt motion in support of demolition 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 undue economic hardship". Strictly interpreted, all four existing buildings qualify as "contributing structures" to HCD because they were built during district's period of interpretation (1885-1950). Structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street have been significantly compromised over time so all three can no longer be assigned architectural styles. As single-story structures, 319 and 327 South New Street also do not conform to typical 2-, 3- and 4-stories of contributing structures within district; rather, both are perceived as appendages or infill to adjacent structures. However, structure at 321-323 South New Street does exhibit typical size, scale and proportion as well as window openings of district's mixed-use buildings and retains original architectural detailing; thus, it continues to serve as contributing structure within HCD. Based upon relevant design guidelines, proposal to demolish structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street is conceivable and remains part of development proposal. As previously encouraged by HCC, rehabilitated front façade of existing structure at 321-323 South New Street is now integrated into overall development project and is appropriate; however, Applicant is also encouraged to integrate additional portions of historical structure into overall project development, if feasible.

Size and Scale: Should HCC approve proposed demolition, requests are predicated on Applicant's ability to replace lost buildings with proposal that satisfies Design Guidelines for New Construction within HCD. Relevant guidelines note "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-, three- (and four-) 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 addresses existing dominant cornice heights by incorporating such details at third-floor level of various façades; however, revised design rises another six stories, resulting in 9-story building ... which significantly digresses from roof heights of adjacent buildings and represents decrease of only one floor level from previous 10-story building. Earlier COA Applications included several computer-generated views looking south that referenced Fred B. Rooney Building as part of existing streetscape. HCC cautioned Applicant from only referencing nearby non-contributing structures. Greenway is located due south and downhill from proposed 9-story development project so resulting shadow lines would extend well beyond width of Greenway during much of the day. While current design approach might succeed at street level, broader issue is impact of proposed high-rise building on HCD. Based upon relevant design guidelines, current proposal for 9-story structure is inappropriate for immediate streetscape and more generally for overall district.

New Construction: Design guidelines continue by referencing such important issues as: Rhythm and Patterns, Window and Door Openings, Materials and Textures, Architectural Details, Shape and Massing as well as Streetscapes. Proposed floor heights of lowest levels match those of neighboring buildings while intermediate cornice emphasizes transition from commercial street level to residential upper floor levels. Integration of existing façade at 321-323 South New Street is reflected within provided drawings; however, relationship of that structure to proposed upper floor levels is lacking and warrants further development. Street-level development implies four or even five unique structures while upper-level development implies two unique structures but with no obvious relationship to street-level development. As currently depicted upper-most floor level seems to terminate just above window line, which does not allow for adequate roof structure above and implies no parapet around roof perimeter, so clarification is warranted.

Architectural features include double-hung windows, casement (or fixed-sash) windows, cast sills and lintels as well as expressed cornices. Proposed façade materials identified on architectural drawings consist of “natural stone veneer”, “synthetic brick veneer” and “synthetic stone veneer”; term “synthetic veneer” is not identified within relevant Design Guidelines as appropriate for HCD so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. Outer wall condition of upper floor levels seems to cantilever out over support columns at northwest corner (best illustrated on Drawing Sheet A-202, Drawing 1: West Elevation) and warrants clarification before appropriateness can be determined; columns might need to be exaggerated beyond minimal size requirement to compensate for size differential.

Subsequent reviews with HCC should address such details as proposed window and door types, cast sills and lintels, cornice profiles and façade materials along with lighting fixtures ... preferably with product samples. For on-going project development, Applicant should note that tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate within HCD. Appropriate window lite divisions should be taller than wide so select windows are inappropriate (appear to be square, meaning uniform in height and width) while remaining casement windows (or fixed sash) include lower operational hoppers, which are not characteristic of HCD. Applicant should reference ‘Guidelines for Storefronts’ before finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant should reference ‘Guidelines for Signage and Awnings’ before preparing overall building signage concept to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals; those same guidelines also note awnings with closed ends are inappropriate.

Discussion: Jordan Clark, James Preston and Rafael Palomino represented proposal to demolish four buildings while integrating salvaged and rehabilitated façade of one existing building to construct new, multi-story, mixed-use building. Applicant confirmed original reasons remain for demolishing existing buildings (structural and environmental issues) while HCC recommendation to integrate front façade of existing Italianate structure is integral to current development proposal; continued that commentary during previous HCC review resulted in reduction of one floor level and removal of rooftop terrace with various amenities. Mr. Lader requested clarification about Applicant’s approach to retain and integrate rehabilitated façade into development project; Applicant noted approach to stabilize, rehabilitate and anchor existing façade of contributing building onto supporting structure of new project has yet to be finalized but will return to HCC to address various concerns following approval of current design approach. Mr. Lader appreciated that proposed structural system no longer conflicts with window placements of existing façade (previous

designs included conflicts) but expressed concern about lack of finalized approach to temporarily support salvaged façade during demolition to ensure subsequent integration into overall development project; Applicant confirmed previous layout conflicts were resolved and stressed intent to integrate rehabilitated façade into overall design. Applicant continued by noting reduced building height now aligns with nearby structure previously approved by Bethlehem City Council upon recommendation by HCC, explaining preference to focus discussion on overall building height rather than number of stories. Mr. Lader requested clarification about proposed construction method that allows such limited space for roof structure above upper-most windows; Applicant responded that proposed construction method is concrete superstructure, with upper-most slab at 8-inches thick and insulation above. Applicant continued that suggestion to “beef up” size of structural column at southwest corner is easily resolved so it aligns with walls above.

Mr. Cornish expressed appreciation for proposed design up to intermediate cornice above third-floor level as appropriate based upon design guidelines; also recounted personal observations during stroll through South Bethlehem when Applicant first appeared before HCC and discerned appropriate buildings within Historic Conservation District (HCD) are 2-, 3- and 4-stories in height. Mr. Cornish continued by admitting select structures within District exceed typical building height and conceded past error by HCC for recommending City Council approval of nearby commercial structure at 90-feet tall as appropriate, stressing non-contributing buildings should not be referenced for subsequent designs within HCD, including nearby Rooney Building which was constructed prior to establishment of HCD. Mr. Cornish concluded that Applicant’s on-going development project varies significantly from typical building height of appropriate designs within HCD.

Mr. Hudak repeated previous concern about proposed development above existing alleyway owned by City of Bethlehem but noted recent communication with City officials who confirmed that Applicant is required to pay taxes on proposed development above alleyway; continued that revised height of proposed project remains major concern and expressed disappointment with City Council for returning Applicant to HCC for yet another assessment rather than satisfying their civic duty to either approve or deny proposed development project based upon HCC recommendations. Mr. Lader inquired what height Mr. Hudak would consider appropriate for proposed development; Mr. Hudak countered that HCC unanimously rejected previous design proposal at approximately 104-feet tall so City Council should have suggested to HCC what height they would consider appropriate. Mr. Hudak concluded by expressing on-going appreciation for overall design but cannot accept current proposed building height as appropriate.

Mr. Simonson expressed appreciation to Applicant for incorporating historical façade into overall design proposal; also confirmed that City of Bethlehem will secure taxes for development above Graham Street (alleyway). Mr. Simonson continued by noting that project design has improved while overall building height was reduced from 12/13 stories to nine stories, which is more appropriate; also encouraged Applicant to continue design development of upper portions to align better with street-level development and noted upper parapet will be required, resulting in slight increase in overall building height.

Mr. Lader noted current COA Application continues to reference nearby Rooney Building, although HCC previously requested Applicant to avoid references to non-contributing structures that were completed prior to establishment of HCD; also noted that District does have select contributing structures that are five stories tall (noting nearby Flat Iron Building). Mr. Lader continued by questioning two different window types for upper-level apartments and encouraged Applicant to integrate appropriate double-hung windows (even double-ganged) as appropriate alternative to current fixed windows with lower hoppers; expressed appreciation for street-level design and noted improvements from previous iterations but continued that upper floor levels look quite different from lower portions so Applicant should focus efforts to unify building portions. Mr. Lader concluded by noting proposed brick colors seem to reference nearby non-contributing Rooney Building so more appropriate brick colors are appreciated with future design proposals. Applicant agreed that future discussions should involve more substantive discussions about window types, brick colors, etc. Mr. Lader agreed that future HCC assessments should include various details but confirmed current discussion and resulting motion should focus on appropriate size and scale of development project.

Public Commentary:

Beth Starbuck confirmed recent receipt of notification from Mayor’s office that her tenure on HCC had expired and was not being renewed so comments are intended as member of general public; continued by

urging HCC to review relevant design guidelines (written descriptions and accompanying graphics) that explain issues of building height ... specifically that appropriate new construction should not be any taller than adjacent existing structures; suggested new shorter buildings (limited to five stories) are more affordable to construct and already exist within HCD so developer's claim that only taller buildings are economically viable is questionable; continued that, even if HCC accepts overall tall building within HCD, current design proposal is not cohesive, noting street-level design seems appropriately scaled and detailed while upper floor levels appear as much larger structures rather than aligning with and inspired by street level; concluded that current visual of two large buildings atop five smaller-scale buildings at street level is inappropriate. Mr. Lader expressed sincere appreciation to Ms. Starbuck for her decades of dedicated service and expertise as member of HCC.

Kim Carrell-Smith reiterated appreciation to Ms. Starbuck for dedicated service as long-term HCC member; also agreed that current proposal of two large buildings atop smaller-scale streetscape is inappropriate; continued that Applicant's justification of "matching" building height of nearby structure should be disregarded because that building is non-contributing and select HCC members admit regretting previous recommendation to approve it as appropriate; also encouraged HCC to adhere to relevant design guidelines and not assume City Council will ... countering Mr. Hudak's claim that Council rather than HCC should determine appropriateness of building heights within HCD.

Applicant expressed appreciation to HCC and to general public for various commentary but also noted that HCC is recommending body while City Council gives final approval to development projects; admitted size and scale are main issues to resolve before architect can continue with detailed planning and requested HCC to vote on current design proposal so it can be presented yet again to City Council ... with potential to discuss various architectural features in more detail, pending Council approval; Applicant concluded by confirming intent of offering ten percent of all living units as Affordable Housing.

Mr. Lader noted HCC appreciation of affordable housing component but also reminded Applicant that HCC is tasked with assessing projects according to relevant design guidelines. Mr. Lader continued that HCC can strictly interpret guidelines to limit appropriate development to 2-, 3- and 4 stories but also acknowledged nearby taller structures, some previously determined by HCC as appropriate. Mr. Lader also noted that Applicant has reduced overall building height and has responded to HCC comments over time by making various design improvements while also noting need for overall design to be more cohesive; concluded by suggesting that Applicant seems willing to cooperate with HCC about on-going design efforts.

Motion: Mr. Cornish made the motion and Mr. Evans seconded the motion that HCC recommend City Council DENY a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work to demolish four buildings while integrating the salvaged and rehabilitated façade of one building to construct a new, multi-story, mixed-use building due to the negative impact of the replacement nine-story building on the existing streetscape as well as on the overall Historic Conservation District based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect integrity of property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District, Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction. Supporters of the motion noted that an appropriate development project would be limited to five stories in height. The motion failed: 2-4-1, with abstention by Mr. Loush.

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Patrick 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 four buildings while integrating salvaged and rehabilitated façade of one existing building to construct new, multi-story, mixed-use building was presented by Jordan Clark, James Preston and Rafael Palomino.
2. New building includes following details:
 - a. demolition of existing structures at 319, 321-323 (except 3-story Italianate front façade), 325 and 327 South New Street
 - b. rehabilitation of salvaged front façade at 321-323 South New Street, for integration into overall development project

- c. replacement structure is 9-story, mixed-use building that measures approx. 110-feet wide, approx. 75-feet deep, approx. 88-feet high at shortest (southwest) corner and approx. 92-feet at tallest (northwest) corner ... excluding mechanical penthouse
 - d. entry level includes 6,500 SF of commercial and community spaces while upper floor levels include 8,000 SF each, with mix of one-bedroom/one-bath and two-bedroom/two-bath apartments
 - e. floor heights of lowest levels match those of neighboring buildings while intermediate cornice above third floor level emphasizes transition from commercial street level to residential upper floor levels
3. Subsequent COA Applications for HCC consideration should focus on unifying upper-level façades with façades at street level for more cohesive design approach as well as addressing such details as window and door types, cast sills and lintels, cornice profiles and façade materials along with exterior lighting, overall building signage concepts and street-level storefronts with awnings.

The motion for the proposed work was approved: 4-2-1, with abstention by Mr. Loush. Mr. Cornish and Mr. Evans did not support the motion, noting the proposed building height is inappropriate due to the negative impact of the replacement 9-story building on the existing streetscape of 2-, 3- and 4-story buildings and adjacent Greenway as well as on the overall Historic Conservation District based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect integrity of property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

New Business: Mr. Lader welcomed Mr. Patrick as HCC's newest member.

General Business: Minutes from HCC meeting on May 17, 2021, were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

Mr. Evans noted personal observation that long-standing issue with inappropriate garbage corrals at 213 West Fourth Street (Dunkin Donuts, with corrals located along Broadway facade) has yet to be resolved; continued by noting façade renovations at 314 Brodhead Avenue (adjacent to Mike's Auto Glass) have ceased and scaffolding was removed, resulting in unprotected openings and incomplete façade. Mr. Simonson agreed to investigate both issues; will report on status during subsequent HCC meeting.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY: _____

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