
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: TODD CHAMBERS, CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), GARY LADER (CHAIR), MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER

MEMBERS ABSENT: (NONE)

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG (HISTORIC OFFICER)

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)

VISITORS PRESENT: MOHAMMAD AYAZ, CHRIS ECKENRATH, JOE FITZPATRICK, ANTHONY SEITZ, JOHN SNAVELY

MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 20, 2025

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on October 20, 2025, at the City of Bethlehem Town Hall Rotunda, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 23 East Third Street

Property Owner: OM Three, LLC

Applicant: Mohammad Ayaz

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a single-story, attached, commercial storefront with a flat roof. The stepped terra-cotta parapet includes scrollwork details while the terra-cotta cornice and side panels feature egg-and-dart mouldings. The sign band is exposed brick masonry. The aluminum and glass storefront was modified in the late 20th century while large-format tiles at the apron and recessed entry were used to replace similar tiles following damage caused by a car accident in 2012. The building dates from ca. 1920 and is Classical Revival in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to paint the brick sign band and install backlit letters attached to a raceway within the sign band for a new commercial tenant.

Guideline Citations:

- **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.** -- 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.
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'**-- Care should be taken in mounting signs to minimize damage to materials. This includes reusing hardware or brackets from previous signs

and also taking advantage of existing mortar joints for installing hardware rather than drilling directly into masonry units to facilitate future sign replacement or removal. Design Guidelines continue that HCC “will not recommend for approval ... sign boxes with internal ... lights and translucent sign faces”.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application and supplemental document indicate intent to install new illuminated lettering within sign band above storefront to reflect new commercial tenant and also to paint existing exposed brick masonry sign band. Scale drawing of proposed signage with elevation (façade) view (indicated as required on COA Application) is not included, so Application is incomplete.

Height of existing sign band is indicated as 36-inches while height and width dimensions of proposed signage as well as overall width of existing sign band are not indicated and computer-generated images are not to scale; thus, confirmation that signage fits within existing sign band cannot be determined. Provided image seems to indicate that proposed lettering is centered horizontally and vertically within sign band except for tail of lower-case letter “y”.

Proposed sign is composed of individual channel letters in bright white color that read “CrispyHalal” in large, bold, stylized cursive lettering. Channel letters are fabricated from .080 aluminum with overall depth of 4-inches. It is unclear if channel letters receive front faces, so clarification is warranted. Letters are installed using 3/8-inch bolts to metal raceway that measures 4-inches deep x 6-inches tall, which is anchored into existing façade using brackets and 4-inch lag bolts. Proposed lettering includes 6500K LED illumination in red color; however, it is unclear if letters glow internally resulting in translucent faces and/or if letters are individually backlit resulting in halo effect. Applicant also proposes to paint existing exposed brick masonry sign band in black color.

Proposal to install new illuminated signage within existing sign band and also to paint existing sign band is inappropriate for several reasons. HCC traditionally considers bright white color as inappropriate within Historic Conservation District (HCD); Applicant should consider ivory or warm white as appropriate alternative for lettering. HCC traditionally limits appropriate depth of dimensional letters within HCD to maximum 2-inches, while current proposal envisions lettering that is 4-inches deep, so discussion is warranted. HCC traditionally limits appropriate LED lighting to maximum 3000K color temperature in satisfaction of design guidelines to use low-wattage warm lightbulbs while Applicant proposes 6500K color temperature. Relevant design guidelines for appropriate signage within HCD indicate that no conduits, raceways or junction boxes should be visible while Applicant proposes to mount lettering onto visible raceway. Individual letters pin-mounted to existing sign band would be appropriate alternative to current inappropriate proposal. Should HCC be amendable to this alternative, Applicant should take advantage of existing mortar joints for all installation hardware rather than drilling directly into brick masonry units to avoid need for subsequent repairs when replacing or removing signage. Letters that include translucent front faces and glow internally are traditionally considered by HCC inappropriate while backlit individual letters resulting in halo effect are traditionally considered by HCC appropriate, so clarification is warranted. Applicant's proposal to paint existing exposed brick masonry sign band is inappropriate based upon relevant Design Guidelines which state “HCC will not recommend for approval ... applying waterproof or water repellent coatings on masonry and stucco”. HCC has traditionally interpreted this guideline to include paint applied to unpainted masonry surfaces as inappropriate.

Supplement to COA Application depicts signs from previous tenant are still installed within transoms above each storefront window, so clarification about Applicant's intentions with transoms is warranted. Any proposed new signage within transoms must be assessed by HCC prior to installation. Similarly, COA Application offers no indication of additional signage within existing storefront windows, recessed entrance door or shop window; such signage also requires HCC assessment prior to installation.

Discussion: Mohammad Ayaz represented proposal to install new signage of backlit letters within existing sign band for new commercial tenant. Applicant confirmed proposed red LED lighting is only available in 6500K color temperature. Applicant clarified that proposed paint color for brick masonry sign band is dark gray “peppercorn” rather than true black; continued that proposed color will match existing tiles at this and nearby storefronts to contrast with new signage and make lettering more visible. Applicant suggested alternative solutions for sign band: stucco over exposed brick masonry or install Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) rigid panel over exposed brick masonry ... both in dark gray color. Mr. Lader requested clarification about internal illumination; Applicant responded that proposed illumination is not internal but

rather backlit, resulting in halo effect. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant is willing to reduce thickness of proposed lettering from 4-inches to 2-inches; Applicant responded with uncertainty about this request without presence of sign fabricator. Mr. Lader continued that Applicant's sign fabricator previously appeared before HCC and is familiar with relevant design guidelines; Applicant was amenable to proposed revision, pending clarification from fabricator. Mr. Chambers requested clarification about proposed raceway, considering design guidelines state that visible raceways are inappropriate. In response to Historic Officer's comments, Applicant expressed willingness to install raceway behind rigid backer, so it is no longer visible. Mr. Chambers noted preference for this approach rather than individual pin-mounted letters resulting in multiple install locations within sign band ... especially if existing brick masonry façade is left exposed. Applicant suggested raceway should be painted dark gray to match proposed paint for sign band; Mr. Chambers clarified HCC considers painting exposed brick masonry façades inappropriate. Applicant suggested that proposed ACM rigid backer would serve to protect brick masonry façade beneath; Mr. Lader noted those panels should be installed into existing mortar joints rather than directly into brick masonry units, if approved. Mr. Chambers expressed preference for leaving brick masonry façade exposed rather than covering over with rigid panels as "least disruptive approach" while allowing Applicant to use proposed raceway for installing channel letters. Mr. Evans supported this approach as appropriate and cost effective, while also suggesting Applicant should paint raceway brick red rather than dark gray to blend with exposed brick façade. Mr. Simonson continued that raceway brackets should be installed within existing mortar joints to avoid damage to brick masonry units, while also noting no conduits or junction boxes should be visible. Ms. Strasser suggested Applicant could reduce overall size of lettering ... noting current proposal extends sign to full 36-inch height of sign band ... and install on rigid backer or on front of light box; continued that rigid backer or light box should be small enough to allow visibility of exposed brick behind and also include off-set pinstripe detail around sign perimeter traditionally requested by HCC. Mr. Chambers supported that suggestion but noted it would represent significant revision to current proposal and require subsequent HCC review after Applicant provides updated scale drawings and product specifications. Mr. Lader inquired about dimensions of existing sign band; Applicant responded that sign band measures 36-inches high x 480-inches wide. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring if overall size of lettering can be reduced so tail of letter "y" does not extend below bottom border of sign band; Applicant responded that current proposal "is as small as possible". Mr. Chambers noted thickness of raceway allows lettering to stand proud of existing façade, so tail of letter "y" is in front of lower sign band border and will not cause damage. Mr. Chambers continued by inquiring about proposed face of channel letters; Applicant responded that letters with acrylic fronts will have backers to prevent through illumination. Mr. Chambers called attention to supplemental detail that states letter faces are aluminum, which is solid and not translucent. Applicant suggested potential to include gooseneck lighting fixtures for supplemental illumination by calling attention to similar fixtures at nearby commercial location. Mr. Simonson clarified that gooseneck fixtures at other location existed long before current signage was installed, so such fixtures might not be helpful at this location; continued that Applicant is required to submit subsequent COA Application for gooseneck fixtures by providing scale drawings of proposed fixture placement along with all relevant product information, envisioned installation method, type of illumination, etc. Mr. Lader clarified that current assessment of proposed signage without additional gooseneck fixtures could be captured within HCC motion ... pending subsequent review and approval of finalized details by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair before resulting permit is issued.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's intentions with existing signage within storefront transoms. Applicant responded that existing vinyl signs will be replaced with graphics and photos that relate to new commercial tenant. Mr. Simonson explained all updated vinyl graphics must be submitted for review by Zoning Officer but could be assessed by ... prior to fabrication and installation. Mr. Simonson suggested that Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair could review those items while assessing revised sign details rather than returning later to HCC.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to install backlit letters within the sign band as signage for a new commercial tenant was presented by Mohammad Ayaz.
2. Appropriate details for new signage at existing sign band include:
 - a. sign is composed of individual channel letters in warm white or ivory color that read “CrispyHalal” in large, bold, stylized cursive lettering; installation of signage is centered vertically and horizontally within existing sign band
 - b. channel letters are fabricated from .080 aluminum with overall depth of 2-inches; front faces are solid painted aluminum
 - c. letters are installed using 3/8-inch bolts onto metal raceway that measures 4-inches deep x 6-inches tall, which is anchored into mortar joints of existing façade using brackets and 4-inch lag bolts; raceway is painted brick red in color to match exposed brick masonry façade of sign band, which remains unpainted
 - d. lettering includes 6500K LED backlit illumination in red color for resulting halo effect

Note: Applicant agreed to submit revised details of proposed signage (including scale drawings with critical dimensions of existing sign band and of new sign) along with proposed vinyl graphics for transoms above storefront windows via City of Bethlehem Planning Office for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair before resulting permit is issued.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 14-36 West Third Street

Property Owner: Douglas Kelly, Patriot Ventures, LLC

Applicant: High Hotels, LTD

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This proposed 8-story hotel structure will include a series of entry-level glass storefronts with awnings at the front (north) façade facing West Third Street and also at the rear (south) façade facing the Greenway. Six upper floor levels will include brick as well as Exterior Insulating Finish System (EIFS) façades punctuated by sets of windows organized according to hotel room layouts. A roof-top terrace with bar will complete the uppermost floor level while a single-story porte cochère (carport) at the western end of the site will serve as the main drop-off location for passenger vehicles. As a reminder, HCC is mandated with preserving structures dating from the designated era of the Historic Conservation District (ca. 1895 - 1950); thus, when completed this Contemporary building will not be considered significant to the District.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant is returning to HCC for review and recommendation of approval on the following items: rooftop outdoor seating area, pergola, glass railing. The Applicant is also requesting consideration of alternate proposals for façade materials previously determined by HCC as appropriate, including façade brick, pre-cast details and porte-cochère (carport) finishes.

Guideline Citations:

- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item 1
- **Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines** -- relevant sections concerning ‘New Construction’ (pp. 8-12): HCC encourages new construction that “(preserves) the cohesive ambiance of the Historic Conservation District with compatible, sympathetic, and contemporary construction, ... (matches) setbacks of adjacent buildings on a streetscape and (has) compatible siting, proportion, (size and) scale, form, materials, roof configuration, details and finishes”; also should address such concerns as shape and massing, rhythm and patterns, window and door openings, materials and textures, architectural details as well as streetscapes.
- **Historic Conservation Commission ‘Design Guidelines for Storefronts’**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application was submitted to City Hall’s Planning Department on October 3, which was five business days late for proposals

intended for review during October 20 HCC meeting. Upon cursory review of provided materials, Applicant seems to be approaching HCC with requested revisions for select details captured within previous COAs ... including but not limited to real brick and cast stone replaced with brick and stone veneers along with different façade treatments for porte cochère. Applicant also proposes modular structural system with integrated louvers and lighting to serve as permanent rooftop pergola that extends from recessed bar to front façade facing West Third Street. It should be noted that HCC previously considered similar rooftop proposals at nearby project sites as inappropriate, with those Applicants amendable to retractable/removable awnings that do not fully extend out to front façade and are limited to seasonal use. Supplemental details also offer more specific details about proposed glass windscreen system at rooftop parapet facing West Third Street, with possible height ranging from 6-feet to 8-feet. Discussion with Applicant is warranted before appropriateness of requested revisions along with various new proposals can be determined.

Discussion: John Fitzpatrick and Anthony Seitz represented proposal to return to HCC for review and recommendation of approval on following items: rooftop outdoor seating area, pergola, glass railing. Applicant is also requesting consideration of alternate proposals for façade materials previously determined by HCC as appropriate, including façade brick, porte-cochère (carport) finishes, and precast items.

Applicant apologized for late submittal of current COA Application and presented samples of various products as supplemental to Application. In summary, Applicant requests assessment of proposed revisions to select exterior façade and porte cochère details along with desire to consider proposed rooftop pergola, as initially proposed during previous appearance before HCC. Applicant clarified that glass panels of proposed railing system at front façade facing West Third Street are 4-feet tall in response to previous HCC comments that 6-feet was too high. Applicant also noted that proposed pergola was scaled down, so it no longer covers entire recessed rooftop area in response to previous HCC comments that initial proposal was too large; continued that pergola does not extend fully to front façade and includes mechanically operated louvers that open and close in response to weather conditions. For reference, Applicant cited similar rooftop pergola at Tempo Hotel in Savannah, Georgia, that is located within boundaries of that city's historic district. Mr. Evans inquired why Applicant is also returning for assessment of alternative façade materials previously determined by HCC as appropriate. Applicant summarized ongoing process of pricing various building components; most recent round of pricing resulted in excessive costs, so current request is to consider affordable alternatives to select materials. Applicant also noted that proposed revisions will not result in any changes to massing, rhythm, scale, proportion, etc. of overall building.

Proposed material revisions include:

- Aberdeen thin brick veneer by Glen Gery with standard Portland cement mortar joints as alternative to traditional brick units; red color remains as originally proposed
- RockCast lightweight series precast stone as alternative to traditional cast elements; sizes, profiles and Buffstone color remain as originally proposed
- building base masonry cladding remains large format 12-inch x 24-inch units by Rockcast in Smokehouse and Crystal White colors; proposed change is to thin veneers from full depth panels
- accent banding at each floor level revised from traditional precast elements to Cloudscape thin brick veneer by Glen Gery with standard Portland cement mortar joints that match brick color for uniform appearance
- Foam Shapes by Master Wall in color and finish to match Buffstone product as alternative to precast elements at upper floor levels for windowsills and lintels

Mr. Lader inquired if proposed thin-brick veneer is limited to original brick at lower floor levels or if veneer also replaces EIFS at upper floor levels; Applicant responded that EIFS remains at upper floor levels, as previously determined by HCC as appropriate. In response, Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to reconsider intended finish color for EIFS, noting current cool dark gray "appears menacing" and does not relate to warmer colors commonly found throughout Historic Conservation District. Ms. Strasser commented that upper façade elements in lighter color might appear "stripey" while Mr. Evans did not believe current color scheme appears "oppressive". Ms. Strasser noted that provided brick veneer sample also includes darker colors; Applicant explained that preferred brick selection includes occasional dark bricks resulting in subtle variations to avoid completely uniform façade.

Mr. Evans inquired what savings Applicant could be achieved with proposed revisions. Applicant responded that significant savings can be achieved; continued that switching from traditional brick units to brick veneers (but still with traditional mortar joints) will result in \$1MM savings. Mr. Chambers noted concern with thin brick veneers at window openings, resulting in flat uniform surfaces rather than typical recessed window openings found throughout Historic Conservation District. In response, Applicant provided supplemental wall section detail depicting 3-inch reveal of original design will be retained by using corner veneer elements at window openings to achieve traditional depth; continued that windowsills and lintels will also project forward to achieve similar traditional depth. Applicant called attention to two courses of lighter brick veneers as banding at each floor level, as proposed revision to original cast stone bands. Mr. Simonson inquired about mortar colors for all masonry surfaces; Applicant responded that all mortar colors previously determined by HCC as appropriate remain, with no requested revisions.

Proposed porte cochère revisions include:

- column surrounds with large-format masonry veneer bases and thin brick veneer above as alternatives to previously approved full-depth panels below and brushed aluminum ACM panels above to match proposed revisions at main building façade
- Master Wall woodgrain look in cedar finish for soffits of porte cochère and main entrance canopy as alternative to previously proposed aluminum tongue-and-groove system with woodgrain look
- Master Wall Metaltex Aggrelime as alternative to previously approved ACM panel system for fascia details of porte cochère and main entrance canopies; colors include Peppercorn to match previously approved ACM panels of same color and Umber Rust to resemble previously approved dark bronze color

Mr. Simonson inquired if only materials are being proposed for revisions to porte cochère or if anything structural also changed from previous HCC assessment. Applicant responded that size, scale, style and overall footprint of porte cochère remains consistent with previous submittal while canopy at drop-off entrance now has one structural column (rather than two) and canopy no longer attaches to main building façade. Mr. Chambers recalled metal panel system at column shafts, soffits and fascias of previous submittal and requested Applicant to clarify what is proposed to change. Applicant noted that upper portions of column shafts previously included metal panel cladding while current submittal proposes thin brick veneer to match façade of main structure; continued that metal panel details previously proposed for canopy soffit and fascia would be replaced with new materials that mimic colors and finishes of previous submittal. Mr. Chambers noted that provided drawings no longer include reveal joints at vertical surfaces of canopies; Applicant explained that previous metal panels required reveal joints while proposed alternative involves stucco over foam insulation with metallic finish applied to finish coat, so reveal joints are no longer needed. Mr. Chambers continued that provided Reflected Ceiling Plan drawing sheet indicates borders of 6-8-inches at canopy edge while accompanying Elevation (façade) drawing sheet depicts stucco finish that wraps up at canopy edge. Applicant confirmed that proposed alternative material will wrap up at canopy edge. In response, Mr. Chambers requested Applicant to integrate reveal joints into fascia to mimic original metal panel look and also help to reduce cracking. Mr. Chambers continued by inquiring about lengths of proposed panels within soffits; Applicant responded that individual boards of proposed alternative are approximately 10-feet long. Mr. Lader inquired about potential differences in longevity of proposed alternative materials in comparison to original products; Applicant responded that Master Wall products have 25-year warranty. Mr. Lader continued that previous submittal resulted in HCC determination that EIFS is appropriate when limited to façade at upper-most floor levels because those areas are not perceived by passersby and also because proposed structure is considered non-contributing to Historic Conservation District; however, current proposal includes EIFS details at lower floor levels as well. Mr. Evans stated that “today’s EIFS is quite different from product specifically called out in HCC’s Design Guidelines (as inappropriate).” Mr. Lader agreed that proposed product “seems to be different animal” from previous generation of EIFS. Mr. Simonson inquired where EIFS actually begins. Applicant responded that front façade facing West Third Street has EIFS at 6th floor level and above (no change to previous design); continued that proposed revisions include EIFS at windowsills and lintels along with fascia at porte cochère and drop-off entrance. Mr. Simonson requested clarification about height of canopies at porte cochère and drop-off entrance; Applicant noted those heights are approximately 16-feet.

Applicant transitioned to discuss proposed rooftop pergola, noting previous discussion resulted in HCC concern that proposal “made it feel like another enclosed story”. Applicant recalled previous design that included glass railing system facing West Third Street between 6-feet and 7-feet in height and rooftop pergola covered entire outdoor seating area; current proposal reduces height of Ascent glass windscreen system by Sightline (refer also to supplemental product specifications) to 4-feet above finish floor of rooftop terrace and proposed Scenic Structure pergola by Landscape Forms (refer also to supplemental product specifications) now measures 43-feet x 70-feet, which covers approximately 2/3rds of seating area ... with all sides open except for screen at adjacent rooftop tower. Proposed modular pergola includes integrated louvers within canopy that mechanically open, as weather conditions allow. Mr. Evans inquired about material of pergola; Applicant responded that proposed structure is aluminum in dark gray metallic finish, similar to dark gray color previously considered by HCC as appropriate for EIFS at upper floor levels. Mr. Evans noted that HCC traditionally encourages rooftop metal structures to be painted “sky gray” that blends into sky when perceived from afar; Applicant seemed amenable to that suggestion. Mr. Chambers noted height of proposed glass railing system is 3-feet above parapet and sets back approximately 30-inches from front face of façade, so it will not be perceived from public right-of-way below. Mr. Chambers continued by inquiring about proposed material for panel/screen at adjacent rooftop tower; Applicant responded that envisioned panel is composite material with dark woodgrain look. Mr. Chambers expressed preference for color of panel/screen to match color of pergola for consistency but does not have preference for lighter or darker color because shadows cast by pergola when louvers are open will attract view up toward sky. Mr. Chambers concluded by inquiring about color of louvers within pergola canopy; Applicant confirmed that color of louvers will match color of pergola.

Public Commentary: Chris Eckenrath, property owner who lives just outside Historic Conservation District but has experience with architectural design and construction, expressed appreciation for overall project and offered some thoughts about proposed color scheme of EIFS at upper floor level façades ... noting trajectory of sun might make lighter colors more reflective (and more annoying) while darker colors might not reflect as much sunlight; also encouraged Applicant to investigate potential to camouflage rooftop pergola by using ambient lighting that prevents structure from being overtly visible from street level below.

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

1. The proposal to return to HCC for review and recommendation to approve various items was presented by John Fitzpatrick and Anthony Seitz.
2. Appropriate revisions to façade materials previously determined by HCC as appropriate include:
 - a. Aberdeen thin brick veneer by Glen Gery with standard Portland cement mortar joints as alternative to traditional brick units; red color remains as originally proposed, with occasional dark bricks resulting in subtle variations; corner veneer elements at window openings retain 3-inch reveal of original design to achieve traditional depth
 - b. RockCast lightweight series precast stone as alternative to traditional cast elements; sizes, profiles and Buffstone color remain as originally proposed
 - c. building base masonry cladding remains large format 12-inch x 24-inch units by Rockcast in Smokehouse and Crystal White colors; proposed change is to thin veneers from full depth panels
 - d. accent banding at each floor level revised from traditional precast elements to Cloudscape thin brick veneer by Glen Gery with standard Portland cement mortar joints that match brick color for uniform appearance
 - e. Foam Shapes by Master Wall in color and finish to match Buffstone product as alternative to precast elements at upper floor levels for windowsills and lintels

3. Appropriate revisions to porte cochère previously determined by HCC as appropriate include:
 - a. column surrounds with large-format masonry veneer bases and thin brick veneer above as alternatives to full-depth panels below and brushed aluminum ACM panels above to match proposed revisions at main building façade
 - b. Master Wall woodgrain look in cedar finish for soffits of porte cochère and main entrance canopy as alternative aluminum tongue-and-groove system with woodgrain look; maximum length of boards is 10-feet
 - c. Master Wall Metaltex Aggreline as alternative to ACM panel system for fascia details of porte cochère and main entrance canopies; colors include Peppercorn to match previously approved ACM panels of same color and Umber Rust to resemble previously approved dark bronze color; reveal joints integrated into fascia to mimic original metal panel look and also help to reduce cracking
4. Appropriate rooftop details include:
 - a. Ascent glass windscreen system by Sightline at main façade facing West Third Street
 - i. 4-inch x 4-inch extruded aluminum posts with powder coat finish in dark gray or sky gray color; post spacing is 4-feet to 5-feet on center
 - ii. infall panels are 9/16-inch laminated glass
 - iii. maximum height is 4-feet above finish floor of rooftop terrace
 - b. Scenic Structure pergola by Landscape Forms
 - i. measures 43-feet x 70-feet, with all sides open except for screen panel at adjacent tower element
 - ii. sets back from main façade facing West Third Street; top of pergola aligns with top of adjacent tower element
 - iii. includes integrated louvers within canopy that mechanically open, as weather conditions allow
 - iv. all components are fabricated from powder-coated extruded aluminum in dark gray or sky gray color
 - c. Scenic screen panel by Landscape Forms includes fixed louvers; all components are fabricated from powder-coated extruded aluminum in color of pergola

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

General Business:

Minutes from HCC meeting on September 15, 2025, were approved by those attending that meeting, and with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

There was no further business; meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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