
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: TONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: DARLENE HELLER, JEFFREY LONG, ALICIA MILLER KARNER, CRAIG PEIFFER

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER

VISITORS PRESENT: KIM CARRELL-SMITH, CHRIS CASSIDY, DAN CHURCH, PEG CHURCH, PHIL CLARK, YARI COLON-LOPEZ, PETER CROWNFIELD, MICHAEL DECROSTA, LAWRENCE EIGHMY, EMILY FLONTENA, ED GALLAGHER, DANA GRUBB, MISSY HARTNEY, BREENA HOLLAND, LISA JORDAN, RACHEL LEON, JULIA MASERJIAN, ADRIENNE MCNIEL, SETH MOGLEN, ELLIOT NOLTER, RAFAEL PALOMINO, JEFFREY QUINN, KEN RANIERE, DOUG ROYSDON, JAMES SCHANTZ, ANNA SMITH, BRITTANY STORZ, CHRISTINA TATU, YVETTE WALL, AL WURTH

MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 22, 2021

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on February 22, 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.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 11 East Third Street (edible)

Property Owner: MB & DJ, LLC

Applicant: Brittany Storz, MRC Signs

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a semi-detached 1-story commercial building with a flat roof and multiple storefronts. Architecturally defining features include a highly decorative glazed terra-cotta parapet, a stucco sign band and classical pilasters separating each storefront. The building dates from ca. 1920 and is Classical Revival in style. The storefronts were renovated in the 1990s in the Classical style by incorporating large-scale pre-cast masonry units at the sidewalk level, bronze framed glass storefronts and an Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) with stucco finish applied to the façade.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to replace the sign face of an existing sign above the storefront windows.

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.
- **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 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 re-face existing internally illuminated box sign to reflect new corporate logo. Proposed replacement sign face measures 36-inches tall x 144-inches wide, with existing internal LED illumination; flat acrylic sign face to be routed, with "push-thru" lettering and graphics. Right two-thirds of sign includes corporate name "edible" in large, lower-case, bold, sans-serif lettering in dark red color while left third of sign includes corporate logo with details in dark red, blue and yellow colors within large circle in dark red color ... all on bright white background.

Relevant design guidelines describe appropriate signage within Historical Conservation District as rigid panels attached directly to buildings or suspended from brackets as well as individual letters pin-mounted to building facades. Guidelines continue that "HCC ... strongly discourages re-facing existing internally illuminated box signs"; thus, proposal to re-face existing box signs are typically considered inappropriate. However, city records indicate HCC adopted proposal that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for existing internally illuminated box sign during meeting on December 21, 2015 upon condition that only corporate logo and lettering are illuminated but not remaining background. Based upon previous case history, proposed replacement sign face is appropriate with following revisions:

- revise background color from bright white to warm white or ivory
- integrate off-set pinstripe detail around outer sign perimeter in complementary color
- confirm only corporate logo and lettering are illuminated but not remaining background

Discussion: Brittany Storz represented proposal to replace sign face of existing sign above storefront windows to reflect new corporate logo. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant could accommodate revisions, as presented by Historic Officer so that proposed sign face satisfies relevant design guidelines. Applicant confirmed existing internal illumination of box sign is to be retained while only sign face is to be replaced; also agreed to accommodate Historic Officer's suggested revisions, as required for signage to be appropriate. Ms. Starbuck requested clarification that background of new sign face will not illuminate; Applicant responded that only corporate logo and lettering will illuminate while background will remain opaque and will not illuminate.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. Proposal to replace sign face of existing sign above storefront windows was presented by Brittany Storz.
2. Replacement sign face includes following details:
 - a. sign face measures 36-inches tall x 144-inches wide; flat acrylic sign face to be routed, with "push-thru" lettering and graphics
 - b. right two-thirds of sign includes corporate name "edible" in large, lower-case, bold, sans-serif lettering in dark red color; left third of sign includes corporate logo with details in dark red, blue and yellow colors within large circle in dark red color
 - c. sign background is ivory or warm white in color and off-set pinstripe detail around outer sign perimeter is in complementary color (dark red, blue or yellow)
 - d. existing internal LED illumination to remain; corporate logo and lettering will illuminate while background remains opaque and will not illuminate

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 327 Broadway (Seven Sirens Brewing Company)

Property Owner: Sycamore Hill Farm Development

Applicant: Lawrence Eighmy

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: With unique facades facing two streets that ultimately converge further east on the same block, the lowest level of this 3-story structure is accessed along Broadway and previously served as a single-level parking garage while the two upper floors accessed from West Fourth Street also previously served as a two-level parking garage.

An early photograph dated ca. 1890 confirms the existence of a three-story, three-bay masonry structure at this location along Broadway with a corbeled parapet and flat roof; each bay included pairs of windows at the upper two levels while four brick masonry pilasters extended above the parapet, terminating in decorative spires. Recent improvements include installation of appropriate replacement windows at the upper floor levels along with a contemporary glass storefront with shop windows and entrance door.

The exposed west façade is a 3-story structure still sheathed in a painted EIFS that faces an open parking lot. Large, punched openings at the first and second floor levels that previously allowed for natural light and ventilation of the former garage have been installed with appropriate window units.

A large opening across the entire width of the entry level façade along West Fourth Street has steel support columns that define five structural bays. A painted Exterior Insulation Finishing System (EIFS) across the entire width of the building was removed to reveal an upper-level brick façade with cast masonry details at five large window openings and at each corner. Similar cast masonry elements originally defined a lower cornice; however, the profiled fronts of those elements were chipped away to facilitate installation of the EIFS so only rough remnants remain. The original stepped upper parapet terminated in decorative cast masonry elements as well but were also lost during installation of the EIFS. The exposed façade exhibits architectural detailing consistent with commercial and industrial structures built nearby during the early 20th century.

HCC issued recommendations for City Council to issue COAs for various improvements to the three façades during meetings on May 21, June 18 and October 15 of 2018 as well as on February 25 and October 21 of 2019. During its meeting on July 20, 2020 HCC issued additional recommendations to issue COAs for exterior improvements, including: various vinyl signage for storefront windows at the Broadway façade; new guardrails at rooftop locations; metal panel cladding for new rooftop elements. During that same HCC meeting HCC tabled assessments of the following proposals due to lack of sufficient details: a seasonal “shade structure” at the rooftop facing Broadway; masonry repairs to the West Fourth Street façade; renovations to the lower portion of the West Fourth Street façade.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to install rooftop Biergarten, revise garage openings at West Fourth Street façade, install rooftop additions along with revisions to roofline and parapet.

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) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards Bulletin ITS-36** -- Rooftop Additions
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- including but not limited to following: Size, Scale and Proportion; Rhythm and Patterns; Window and Door Openings; Materials and Textures; Architectural Details; Shape and Massing; Streetscapes.

Current assessment focuses on three individual topics, resulting in (potentially) three unique HCC motions that City Council issue COAs for proposed work: installation of rooftop Biergarten "shade structure" at Broadway façade; renovations to upper portion and installation of new storefront at lower portion of West Fourth Street façade; construction of new rooftop penthouse above West Fourth Street façade.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application includes proposal for permanent steel and glass "shade structure" for rooftop Biergarten at Broadway façade as alternative to previous proposal for seasonal fabric structure. Drawing Sheet 2 indicates proposed structure sets back from Broadway façade while extending from front of rooftop structure at east side of building and extending to roof parapet facing parking lot below at west façade. Provided drawing is "not to scale" and dimensions of proposed structure are not indicated. Accompanying summary describes new element as "permanent steel and glass shade structure" while rooftop drawing labels element as "solar collecting shade structure". Computer-generated views of rooftop from different vantage points on Drawing Sheets 3 and 4 indicate slight roof pitch from north to south; material types and sizes of frame components and solar panels are not indicated, and no depiction of rainwater collection is visible. Summary describes structural elements to be painted light gray "to blend with sky beyond", which also matches paint scheme previously determined as appropriate by HCC for roof parapet elements. Inspiration photo at top left of Drawing Sheet 4 identifies shade devise as "Lumos LSX solar collector on steel frame"; no additional product information provided. Local design guidelines mirror Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) for Rehabilitation by allowing new additions "if they do not destroy significant fabric, and if their design is compatible with size, scale, color, material, and character of property and historic(al) district". ITS-36 bulletin for interpreting SIS Standards recommends that new rooftop additions "be designed so they are inconspicuous from public right-of-way, are set back from primary building façade and do not damage character-defining features of historical building". While set back from primary façade and not damaging to character-defining features of existing historical building, current proposed shade structure is incompatible with size, scale, color, material and character of property and Historic Conservation District so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. It should be noted that HCC recently determined permanent rooftop awning fabricated with rigid PVC panels at nearby project location as appropriate.

Discussion: Lawrence Eighmy and Elliot Nolter represented proposal to install rooftop Biergarten "shade structure" at Broadway façade. Applicant acknowledged multiple COA reviews as confirmation of willingness to cooperate with HCC to finalize appropriate design solutions. Applicant continued that current proposal responds to previous HCC concern about temporary nature of initial sunshade structure, noting permanent structure sets back from Broadway façade and reflects Applicant's mission to incorporate environmental awareness into overall project ... noting on-going efforts to qualify for eligible tax credits for rooftop structure and potentially for other building components. Applicant also acknowledged need to further develop proposal that also includes rainwater collection and distribution; however, appropriateness of overall concept is requested from HCC before Applicant can fully develop design proposal. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant would consider set back at parking lot (west) façade; Applicant responded that west façade "is not historically relevant in comparison to Broadway façade" so current proposal extends shade structure to parapet of west wall while set back from Broadway façade. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about pitch of proposed structure; Applicant responded that proposed pitch is due south ... away from existing rooftop elements and toward Broadway façade at 5-10 degrees ... taking advantage of prime solar angle while also protecting front façades of existing rooftop elements (entrance, restrooms, bar, storage, etc.). Mr. Lader inquired why shade structure must extend to parapet wall at west façade; Applicant responded with desire to maximize sun shading while also protecting patrons at parapet rail from elements. Mr. Evans inquired about provisions for noise attenuation ... noting rooftop activities and events could be quite noisy, with sound bouncing off underside of proposed structure and reflecting down onto neighborhood below. Mr. Cornish noted City's noise ordinance does not allow amplified sound at outdoor

(including rooftop) locations while Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) rules dictate noise must be contained within venue location ... with violations resulting in suspension of PLCB license. Ms. Starbuck acknowledged that west façade appears secondary to two remaining façades but feels proposed rooftop structure is inappropriate if flush with existing parapet and should be set back at least 12 feet. Mr. Lader agreed and suggested 20 feet as acceptable set back dimension. Applicant suggested compromise with setback along west façade if structure can extend closer to Broadway façade ... currently set back 29 feet. Applicant continued that size of rooftop structure should accommodate envisioned rooftop furniture and frame should also align with structural components of existing structure below. Mr. Evans supported Applicant's suggested compromise by moving rooftop structure closer to Broadway façade and away from west façade. Mr. Simonson inquired about acceptable set back dimensions from each façade; Applicant requested opportunity to further explore before finalizing revised set back dimensions and expressed appreciation to HCC for supporting on-going efforts to design permanent rooftop shade structure.

Public Commentary: Peg Church expressed support of permanent shade structure as part of on-going development of rooftop Biergarten but also noted concern about patrons having access to parapet wall ... especially due to risk of items placed atop parapet falling onto street below.

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Ms. Starbuck adopted proposal to table decision about proposed permanent steel and glass "shade structure" for rooftop Biergarten at Broadway façade. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to determine appropriateness of current proposal and encouraged Applicant to return for subsequent review of proposal that responds to concerns. HCC implied potential determination of appropriateness of rooftop solar array and structural steel frame if set back from both facades (opinions ranged from 12-feet to 20-feet setback) but anticipates details for subsequent review that satisfy requirements identified within COA Application (to-scale drawings of floor plans, elevations, site plan; identification and sizes of proposed materials, etc.).

The motion to table was unanimously approved.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application includes revised proposal to renovate existing portions of West Fourth Street façade, including damaged lower cornice. In reaction to initial HCC assessment of appropriateness to restore upper-level façade by cleaning and re-pointing brick and cast masonry, Drawing Sheet 6 indicates Applicant's intent to "repoint chiseled-off frieze to prevent water damage". During previous discussion about this issue, HCC requested samples (preferably to-scale mock-ups) of intended parging approach before appropriateness can be determined.

Accompanying text clarifies that entry-level use was reconsidered so previous façade proposal with cast stone and glass is now replaced with aluminum-wrapped pilasters and aluminum storefronts with divisions. Previous sectional garage door has been removed and bay remains open while all aluminum components are dark bronze in color to match similar elements previously determined as appropriate by HCC. Applicant offered two in-fill options for resulting storefront openings: perforated metal screen in black color for all openings or horizontal Geolam extruded aluminum slats measuring 5 1/8" x 2 1/8" within concealed steel frames at lower openings while transoms above include perforated metal screen in black color. Spacing between slats is not indicated and Applicant references relationship of material with proposed siding for rooftop addition ... yet to be discussed. It should be noted that similar perforated metal screens were previously determined by HCC as appropriate for nearby parking garage structure. Relevant design guidelines do not mention options for storefront infill beyond transparent glass and spandrel glass so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. Should HCC determine one of proposed options as appropriate, Applicant is encouraged to amend design of far-left bay (best visible on Drawing Sheet 6) so right side of opening aligns with existing window opening above.

Discussion: Mr. Lader inquired about current submission with two screen/panel options for framed openings; Applicant responded that two options might improve prospect for HCC determination that one is appropriate. Applicant continued that on-going project development resulted in large opening in place of segmental garage door (previously determined by HCC as appropriate) in far-right bay so nearby parking garage structure served as inspiration for perforated metal screens within large openings while proposed sheathing system for new rooftop addition (yet to be discussed) could also inform material selection for louvers within openings. Mr. Lader continued by requesting clarification about proposed sheathing for

entry-level pilasters; Applicant responded that current proposal for anodized aluminum sheathing in dark bronze color would match aluminum with dark bronze finish for windows and doors along with standing-seam sheathing of rooftop additions previously determined by HCC as appropriate elsewhere at project location. Mr. Lader inquired if gauge of proposed sheathing would be sufficient to prevent denting or dimpling; Applicant suggested that sheathing would be adhered to solid panel backing to avoid denting. Mr. Lader continued that sheet metal would require construction or expansion joints (not currently depicted) which would also delineate what appear as monolithic pilasters; encouraged Applicant to explore resulting joint patterns so they relate with other façade components. Ms. Starbuck noted that relevant design guidelines indicate appropriate materials for new façades should be compatible with historical structures, with preference for brick, wood and cast or natural stone; continued that current façade is not comparable with nearby parking garage structure so proposed screening options are inappropriate. Mr. Lader recalled previous HCC suggestions for Applicant to explore brick masonry or cast units as façade options. Applicant noted brick infill to match existing historical brick at upper parapets was determined as appropriate but explained that custom approach would be cost prohibitive for street-level façade; continued that contemporary brick infill (brick units applied to panels and then assembled on site) would result in very different aesthetic from historical brick façade at upper level. Ms. Starbuck expressed disappointment that previous HCC suggestions were ignored ... noting project fatigue from reviewing different approaches with each new COA Application and reiterating that aluminum sheathing is inappropriate for street level while upper level is brick masonry. Applicant countered that use of entry level is limited to parking so current proposal inspired by nearby garage represents valid design approach. Mr. Lader noted personal difficulty interpreting appropriate new materials but also recalled that design guidelines require new construction to differentiate itself from historical building fabric. Ms. Starbuck clarified that current design proposal would bifurcate building façade into two very different levels ... with metal siding below and brick masonry above, resulting in appearance of two very different structures. Mr. Evans returned to issue of proposed metal screens within openings, noting nearby garage uses screening at secondary façade (facing greenway) but not along main façade to camouflage use as parking garage; continued by noting that current project location (facing major street) is not comparable to nearby garage even if interior use is similar and expressed concern that current design results in appearance of two very different building façades. Mr. Hudak inquired if screening within openings is required; Applicant responded that openings could remain open, with bollards or wheel stops to prevent cars from hitting outside walls but believes that screens or proposed horizontal slats help to complete entry-level façade ... noting desire to consider final discussion item to help determine if proposed material at both locations is appropriate.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application includes proposal for new rooftop addition visible from West Fourth Street. Drawing Sheet 2 indicates proposed “Penthouse Apartment” just behind parapet at north façade and extending to rooftop structures at south. Main structure is flanked on west side by smaller addition that steps back from parapet (resulting in narrow roof terrace) and on east side by mechanical equipment behind screen. Drawing Sheet 2 also depicts yet another rooftop terrace atop main penthouse element behind privacy screen; however, drawing is “not to scale”, dimensions of proposed elements are not indicated and various items are not labeled. Similarly, accompanying to-scale drawings of floor plans and elevations of all proposed façades (as required on COA Application for new construction) are not provided. Accompanying summary states that new rooftop addition reflects stepped parapet of original façade while adjacent equipment screen combines with new structure to provide symmetry. Summary continues that “new (façade) materials distinguish (new addition) from historic(al) brick and cast stone” of existing structure. Drawing Sheet 6 indicates Geolam “wood-look” siding as proposed horizontal sheathing for rooftop addition; materials of larger façade elements as well as for terrace windows and doors are not indicated. Relevant design guidelines state “new construction should use materials ... in a manner that is sympathetic to the historic(al) buildings in the streetscape (and) should be of similar or complementary color, size, texture, scale. Traditional materials common within the Historic Conservation District (HCD), such as brick, wood, stone and terra-cotta are recommended.” As previously stated, SIS recommend new rooftop additions should be designed so they are inconspicuous from public right-of-way, are set back from primary building façade and do not damage character-defining features of historical building. While current proposal does not damage character-defining features of existing historical building and reflects symmetry of historical roof parapet, it does not set back from primary façade and appears incompatible with character and materials of specific property and historical district in general;

thus, current proposal is inappropriate. Should HCC determine new rooftop addition as appropriate during current discussion, HVAC equipment screen at east of main element and terrace door of addition at west of main element warrant further development so they align with window bays of historical structure below. It should also be noted that similar Geolam façade treatment was recently determined by HCC as appropriate horizontal sheathing for nearby development project for select elements at rear of property. For on-going project development, Applicant should note that tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate.

Discussion: Mr. Lader noted Historic Officer's assessment that proposed design is inappropriate but also expressed personal appreciation for design, noting acceptable symmetry and scale. Ms. Starbuck noted that proposed façade sheathing was recently determined by HCC as appropriate at nearby project site; however, installation of that material is not at main (front) façade but rather at secondary (rear) façade. Ms. Starbuck continued by inquiring how far rooftop addition sets back from historical parapet; Applicant confirmed main element of rooftop addition sets back approx. 4 feet while adjacent secondary element sets back approx. 6 feet from historical parapet. Applicant continued with willingness to submit samples of proposed façade sheathing via City of Bethlehem for consideration by HCC. Ms. Starbuck inquired about Applicant's choice for metal and "wood-look" sheathing rather than traditional masonry construction; Applicant responded that masonry construction is much heavier (uncertain if existing structure could carry additional loads) and also more expensive to construct. Ms. Starbuck continued that resulting appearance of proposed sheathing is very dark and utilitarian ... suggested rooftop addition should set back min. 12 feet from parapet; continued that deeper setback would allow for consideration of less traditional façade treatment and would be more appropriate than similar aesthetic at street-level façade. Mr. Evans expressed concern that design proposal results in façade of three very different floor levels with no relation to one another and prevents understanding of overall building. Mr. Lader noted HCC preference for cast elements at entry level would also result in three different floor levels; Mr. Evans acknowledged he has no appropriate solution but was simply sharing his personal observation. Ms. Starbuck agreed with Mr. Evans's observation that current proposal appears to be three desperate buildings; continued with willingness to consider appropriateness of current rooftop addition if significantly set back from parapet but unwilling to accept metal panel sheathing at entry level and encouraged Applicant to explore brick masonry or cast stone ... even if result is intentionally different from upper-level historical façade.

Applicant responded to various commentary, calling attention to historical rhythm and pattern of entry-level fenestration; justified misalignment at left bay because of garage door opening at right bay so repeated at left for sake of symmetry; noted that proposed cladding reflects rhythm of existing structural columns behind. Applicant recalled previous willingness to repair damage to existing upper façade at great expense, including significant custom-match brick masonry infill at raised central portion of front parapet; continued by challenging HCC to appreciate balance of old (historical) and new (proposed) construction, noting street-level façade "remains wide open and desires bold approach". Applicant concluded by explaining additional setback of rooftop addition (beyond current depiction) would render floorplan unusable and no longer economically viable.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's willingness to investigate use of brick or cast masonry for entry-level façade; Applicant rejected suggestion "because new elements would contrast with historical façade and never match". Ms. Starbuck noted Applicant is already matching historical brick for infill portions of existing upper parapet and inquired why same approach cannot be used at entry level as well. Applicant explained that entry-level façade must communicate rhythm of structural columns behind while upper parapet is one uninterrupted brick façade; continued that traditional brick masonry façade to match upper parapet would be cost prohibitive. Mr. Evans requested clarification about Applicant's claim that proposed metal sheathing for entry-level pilasters matches other products previously determined by HCC as appropriate. Applicant noted window and door frames in dark bronze finish were previously determined by HCC as appropriate, as was standing-seam metal panel sheathing at existing rooftop elements. In response, Ms. Starbuck expressed preference for brick or cast masonry as appropriate façade response (even if not matching existing historical façade) rather than metal sheathing.

Mr. Lader expressed appreciation for proposed setback, difference in materials and influence of symmetry for proposed rooftop addition; continued by also sympathizing with HCC concerns about current proposal for street-level façade ... noting depiction makes pilasters appear as dark solid masses while fabrication will require joints that will delineate overall façade. Mr. Lader continued that pilasters seem proportionally large and encouraged Applicant to explore further; also expressed preference for Geolam horizontal slats (vs.

perforated metal screens) for proposed in-fill within framed openings but also appreciated HCC desire for brick or cast masonry as main façade treatment at entry level.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. Proposal to construct rooftop addition at West Fourth Street façade at 327 Broadway was presented by Lawrence Eighmy and Elliot Nolter.
2. New rooftop addition includes following details:
 - a. main component:
 - i. measures approximately 10-feet high x 43-feet wide; aligns with reconstructed central portion of brick masonry parapet of historical building façade
 - ii. sets back from reconstructed parapet approximately 4 feet and has flat roof
 - iii. consists of three structural bays, each of similar dimension; each bay includes one pair of sliding-glass terrace doors (glass must be clear and not tinted or reflective), with centerlines that align with centerlines of existing window openings of historical building façade below
 - iv. includes upper rooftop terrace above central structural bay, with steel cable guardrail painted in light gray color
 - b. secondary component (adjacent to west wall of main component):
 - i. measures approximately 9-feet high x 13-feet wide
 - ii. sets back from front and side parapet of historical building façades approximately 6 feet and has flat roof
 - iii. includes one pair of sliding-glass terrace doors (glass must be clear and not tinted or reflective), with centerline that aligns with centerline of existing window opening of historical building façade below
 - c. mechanical penthouse (adjacent to east wall of main component):
 - i. measures approximately 9-feet high x 13-feet wide
 - ii. sets back from front parapet of historical building façade approximately 6 feet
 - iii. includes one large opening, with centerline that aligns with centerline of existing window opening of historical building façade below
 - d. exterior cladding for all rooftop addition components (except steel cable guardrails) is Geolam “wood look” siding, with finish of horizontal louvers at mechanical penthouse to match; final color rendition to be determined as appropriate by HCC following product submittal by Applicant via City of Bethlehem prior to fabrication and installation

Note: Appropriateness of Geolam siding for rooftop addition is conditional upon Applicant’s ability to secure Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior cladding at street level of West Fourth Street façade during subsequent COA Application and review process.

The motion for the proposed work was approved 5-2, with Ms. Starbuck and Mr. Cornish opposing the motion by noting the rooftop addition is too tall while also not set back far enough from the parapet of the existing historical façade (minimum 10-feet setback suggested) and is therefore inappropriate.

Agenda Item #3 -- note: Mr. Loush confirmed a conflict of interest with this agenda item, abstaining from discussion and resulting resolution.

Property Location: 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 327 South New Street

Property Owner: 325 South New Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn

Submittal represents Applicant’s response to commentary expressed during HCC meeting on January 25, 2021 to proposal for demolishing four existing buildings and constructing new, twelve-story mixed-use building; current discussion is continuation of COA Application reviewed at that time.

Previous HCC meeting included presentation by Applicant, with contention that all four existing structures 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 current zoning ordinance (150-feet height limitation) and explained that style and architectural details of demolished structures inspire portions of proposed replacement. Applicant summarized various amenities as justification for maximum development to financially support new project: food-court for entry-level commercial space; rooftop terrace available to tenants and general public; 80+ upper-level apartments, including 1-bedroom/1-bathroom and 2-bedroom/2-bathroom units; affordable housing. Applicant also described architectural features and materials in deference to design guidelines for new construction within Historic Conservation District (HCD).

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 inappropriate and incompatible with relevant design guidelines. HCC sympathized with Applicant's desire to maximize allowed development and admitted that proposal would result in positive economics for developer while encouraging economic activity at project location; however, members also noted HCC is not charged with encouraging economic development but rather with preserving and rehabilitating contributing historical structures within HCD. HCC encouraged Applicant to explore integration of one or more existing buildings into overall design proposal ... especially 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 HCD; Applicant was encouraged to consider development options beyond HCD if intent on construction of high-rise building.

Public support for Applicant's development project was expressed by Missy Hartney, SouthSide Arts District Downtown Manager, who stated current pandemic and resulting restrictions indicate that economic success of South Bethlehem depends upon accommodating (Lehigh University) students with places to live and to patronize; no public dissent was expressed.

HCC adopted proposal to table decision to assess appropriateness of proposed demolition and resulting project development: 6-0-1 (abstention by Mr. Loush). HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to assess proposal for demolition of four existing 1-story and 3-story structures resulting in development of 12-story structure; encouraged Applicant to return for subsequent review of development proposal that responds to expressed concerns.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish four buildings and construct a new, twelve-story mixed-use building.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **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
- **Historical 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** -- see Agenda Item #2

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: No written description accompanies current revised design proposal dated Feb. 15, 2021, which includes computer-generated views of development project from various vantage points along with photomontages of 300 block of South New Street (current conditions and proposed development). Drawing sheet labeled "Proposed Streetscape" is scale drawing of front elevation (façade) of development project; however, architectural scale is not indicated, critical dimensions are not included and references to proposed building materials

are absent. Additional to-scale drawings as required for COA Application for demolition and new construction (ex.: site plan, floor plans, all building façades, etc.) are not provided.

Assessments of historical appropriateness should focus on three main concepts: demolition of existing structures; size and scale of overall development project; proposed new construction, with appropriate storefronts at street level and façade treatments for upper floor levels.

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 undo 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. Existing structure at 321-323 South New Street is now integrated into overall development project, as previously encouraged by HCC. Clarification is warranted if all or only select portions of existing building are to be retained and if front façade (only) will be rehabilitated or reconstructed.

Size and Scale: Should HCC determine proposed demolition is appropriate, 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 front façades; however, revised design now rises another ten stories, resulting in 13-story building ... which significantly digresses from roof heights of adjacent buildings and represents increase of one floor level to previous 12-story building. While current design approach might succeed at street level, broader issue is impact of proposed high-rise building on overall HCD. Based upon relevant design guidelines, current proposal for 13-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. Though conceived as one structure, building massing shifts in materiality to appear as two buildings that share common party wall. Integration of existing structure at 321-323 South New Street is reflected within provided drawings; however, relationship of that structure to proposed upper floor levels (ex.: alignment of window bays, window types, etc.) is lacking and warrants further development. Similarly, window bays of second- and third-floor levels on either side of retained structure do not align with window bays above and warrant further development. Architectural features include double-hung windows, bay windows, expressed cornices and lintels; though not labeled, proposed materials seem to consist of brick masonry, limestone, concrete and terra-cotta. Overall development proposal successfully addresses relevant guidelines concerning design features and elements found elsewhere within HCD; however, subsequent reviews with HCC should consider specific details such as proposed masonry types, window and door styles, cornice profiles, handrails, lighting fixtures, etc. For on-going project development, Applicant should note that tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate. Applicant should also reference ‘Guidelines for Storefronts’ before

finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant should reference 'Guidelines for Signage and Awnings' to conceive building signage concept to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals and also to create informed designs for awnings at street-level storefronts.

Discussion: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn represented proposal to demolish three buildings, to rehabilitate existing façade of one contributing building and to construct multi-story mixed-use building. Applicant requested current HCC review to focus on proposed demolition of existing buildings, noting motion in support of demolition will enable development team to continue with on-going design of proposed replacement; continued that no demolition permit will be pulled until all required reviews are successfully completed ... including future assessment by HCC that results in motion to support appropriate development project. Mr. Lader explained that HCC resolutions in support of demolition proposals are predicated on Applicant's ability to present design of appropriate replacement structure; however, current proposal fails to address concerns expressed during previous HCC assessment. Applicant cited various City departments and personalities already involved with initial reviews; conceded that previous design included 12 stories but justified current proposal with 13 stories (approx. height = 135 feet) by not exceeding 150-foot zoning height limitation. Applicant described current proposal as having "great architectural details resulting in ... great streetscape" and noted having already garnered project support from Mayor Donchez and various members of City Council ... especially because of affordable housing component. Applicant continued that upper-level living units include post-COVID design features and target Lehigh University graduate students while street-level commercial space includes public food market. Applicant concluded by describing revisions to building façade in response to previous HCC commentary while also cooperating with city's Public Works Department to address needed improvements to adjacent Greenway and alley that services interior of city block as well as needed infrastructure.

Mr. Lader requested clarification about historical façade integrated into current design proposal. Applicant confirmed desire to retain façade of contributing structure (Italianate building at 321-323 South New Street) and incorporate into new street-level façade; continued that future investigations are required to confirm façade is indeed salvageable. Mr. Lader requested explanation for current proposal of 13 stories, considering commentary during previous HCC meeting about inappropriateness of 12-story structure. Applicant agreed that further project development is required to finalize issue of building height and stressed need for balance between HCC opinion on height limitation vs. need to make project economically viable. Mr. Cornish responded with concern about proposed building height, recalling his own detailed explanation to Applicant during previous HCC meeting about what qualifies as appropriate height and massing of new construction within HCD; continued by expressing disappointment that Applicant ignored previous commentary by increasing rather than decreasing number of floor levels and repeated previous statement that appropriate development within HCD should be limited to five stories. Ms. Starbuck agreed with Mr. Cornish and expressed frustration that Applicant returned to HCC with even taller structure based upon clear messages previously stated by HCC and Historic Officer. Mr. Lader expressed disappointment that nearby contemporary development project with overall height of 90 feet (306 South New Street) did not serve as example for Applicant; Mr. Cornish countered that nearby building is 6-stories tall (commercial floor heights are greater than residential floor heights) while Ms. Starbuck noted nearby contemporary building is considered non-contributing to HCD and should not serve as appropriate design example for current development. Applicant noted need for on-going design development to determine ultimate height of replacement structure; expressed willingness to compromise during on-going project development if HCC would support motion for proposed demolition. Ms. Starbuck questioned Applicant's willingness to compromise because current design proposal is taller than previous proposal, which already received HCC criticism. Applicant explained one additional floor level resulted from design that incorporates existing façade of contributing Italianate structure; what was initially two taller floors at street level are now three shorter floors while residential component remains unchanged. Applicant continued that current design now follows pitch of streetscape by including various street-level entrances that meet public sidewalk while previous design only included one street-level entrance and did not respond to pitch of streetscape.

Returning discussion to Applicant's initial request, Mr. Lader inquired with HCC about appropriateness of proposed demolition. Mr. Cornish expressed support for motion to demolish non-contributing structures if replaced with appropriate design but could not support current high-rise structure. Mr. Hudak expressed concern that current design encroaches on existing alley that services interior of city block ... especially for emergency and service vehicles. Applicant responded that improvements to alley are part of project

proposal and summarized on-going cooperation with City Public Works and Engineering divisions to ensure new design accommodates emergency and service vehicles; continued that HCC support of motion for demolition would foster on-going discussions with various City entities. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant would be willing to reduce overall building height by half; Applicant responded with need for more project development before determination of building height could be made ... noting ever-increasing project expenses associated with retaining existing façade of contributing building, all new infrastructure to support proposed development, etc. Ms. Starbuck inquired why lack of HCC support for motion to demolition prevents Applicant from moving forward with design development, noting Applicant's previous comment that no permits will be sought until approval from all entities is received. Ms. Starbuck continued by inquiring what percentage of residential units qualify as affordable housing; Applicant noted ten percent of residential units are currently envisioned as affordable housing, with potential to increase overall percentage as project continues to develop. Mr. Simonson had no express concerns about demolition component of proposed project but could not support current building height.

Public Commentary:

Dan Church called attention to nearby high-rise structure across East Fourth Street (so-called "Rooney Building") to express dislike of taller buildings within HCD; appreciates elements of current proposal to retain portions of existing historical structures.

Peg Church expressed appreciation for affordable housing component of current proposal; commented that 13 stories are too many for project location but might support 8-10 stories as acceptable.

Anna Smith introduced herself as life-long resident of South Bethlehem; recalled previous similar arguments from potential developers wanting to maximize allowable building height within HCD based upon short-term economics but noted HCC is charged with determining long-term solutions; recognized select examples of nearby structures that are 8, 10 and 12 stories high but must consider them as exceptions rather than examples to follow, noting that none can be considered as contributing to HCD; continued that Applicant seems to be "gaming" HCC with proposal of 12-13 floor levels, knowing that elicited responses will reject overly-tall proposal by citing design guidelines that limit building height to 4-5 stories ... resulting in "compromise" of 8 stores although that was always developer's intention; continued by stressing support of development at project location and appreciates proposed affordable housing component but cannot support developer unwilling to work within parameters of design guidelines for new construction within HCD; encouraged HCC not to compromise with current developer in order to sustain planning measures that protect South Bethlehem's identity.

Rachel Leon appreciated previous commentary but noted that "affordable housing" does not necessarily mean affordable to current residents of South Bethlehem; continued by expressing concern about potential for compromised air quality during demolition of so many structures ... especially at adjacent greenway and nearby school.

Dana Grubb recalled previous professional involvement with City of Bethlehem when original ordinance was passed to create HCD and to adopt associated design guidelines but now questions existence of HCC if City continues to encourage overly tall projects from developers; explained personal support for redevelopment of project location and supports proposal to incorporate historical façade into overall project but rejects concept of 12-13 story buildings anywhere within HCD ... especially at proposed location that would combine with nearby 6-story office building and adjacent large-scale parking garage to result in "building canyon" along 300 block of South New Street; continued that City should reject similar future development projects that require significant concessions to design guidelines and pondered how City officials and general public would respond to similar high-rise development proposed for Bethlehem Historic District (in North Bethlehem); welcomed investment in rehabilitation and new construction as "organic to on-going viability of Bethlehem" but would reject proposals that violate basic design guidelines and concepts; concluded that current proposal "does not fit" within surrounding neighborhood.

Kim Carrell-Smith stated HCC design guidelines were created so City could benefit from identified amenities; cited several studies of successful communities with similar guidelines that conclude "context compatibility is best for urban vitality ... with mix of older, smaller structures resulting in more successful urban environment" so in-fill projects with new construction of compatible size for existing context is always best response; quoted from HCC design guidelines that height and massing matter to streetscape and to

overall HCD; continued by noting typical building height within HCD is 3-4 stories so if developer's ultimate intention is 8 stories (as alluded in previous comments) that would still be out of scale, with sensitive response to existing context limited at maximum 5 stories; aimed criticism at Applicant for only offering views of proposed project from select vantage points and noted missing view from south looking north would clarify how imposing current proposal would loom over remaining blocks of South New Street; noted HCC is commissioned with maintaining integrity of design guidelines and questioned why prospective developers are not challenged to respect guidelines as well; concluded by noting that every lost contributing structure represents loss to historical fabric of overall historic district which also threatens urban vitality and long-term economic viability of what remains.

Adrienne McNiel (Assistant Vice President for Community and Public Affairs, Lehigh University) explained Lehigh University's "Path to Prominence" expansion plan envisions significant increase in student population but noted university's intent to accommodate resulting increase in overall student body by constructing six new residence halls (noting four are already under construction) so Applicant's claim that development project addresses student housing shortage is not supported by Lehigh University.

Breana Holland encouraged HCC to deny Applicant's request for demolition until design proposal for new development project is finalized ... noting importance of understanding compatibility of replacement structure based upon proportion, size, scale, etc.; also criticized Applicant for referencing non-contributing buildings within HCD as justification for proposed high-rise structure, noting HCC previously determined design of nearby 6-story structure as appropriate and as exception to relevant design guidelines but resulting project is deemed by many as intrusive and overall failure based upon height and scale ... now serving as proof that relevant design guidelines are needed to avoid similar future mistakes; continued by noting architectural views provided by Applicant imply ample sunlight at street level while proposed high-rise structure would actually turn 300 block of South New Street into tunnel or dark canyon ... noting street is already quite narrow.

Seth Moglen expressed appreciation "to many who have eloquently spoken" and recalled that HCC already concluded building height of current proposal is inappropriate ... also noting similar commentary by HCC during previous meeting; continued that Applicant's design proposal violates relevant guidelines so current design is demeaning to HCC and to South Bethlehem, especially considering design is more than twice as tall for what is allowed and Applicant failed to reconsider building height after previous HCC criticism and then returned with even taller design proposal; continued by confirming that current public commentary supports development of project location, noting most speakers are already involved within local community and therefore represent overall sentiment of South Bethlehem so comments are intended as strong signal to Applicant that any intended design proposals within HCD should be properly scaled and must abide relevant design guidelines ... meaning new construction with fewer than six stories in height.

Al Wurth expressed agreement with most public sentiments concerning scale of proposed building and resulting negative impact on South Bethlehem; continued that development this large should be considered "opportunistic" and not what neighborhood prefers in place of existing smaller-scale structures; noted how height of design proposal would loom over HCD ... especially over adjacent to Greenway ... and questioned how City would agree to allow development of air rights above public right of way (access alley), noting Applicant gains at least 10% more overall development opportunity; concluded by summarizing current design proposal as "symbolic of developer overreach".

Conclusion of Discussion: Mr. Cornish recounted during his tenure on HCC that mistake was previously made when support of demolition proposal was awarded without fully understanding Applicant's intentions for replacing demolished structure ... noting resulting empty lot remains vacant ... and admitted learning from that experience; continued that HCC traditionally does not entertain motion in support of demolition without having clear understanding of project specifics for proposed replacement. Ms. Starbuck agreed with Mr. Cornish that resulting empty lot serves as reminder that HCC cannot support demolition without passing motion in support of appropriate replacement development; continued that HCC would not necessarily block motion in support of demolishing non-contributing structures at project location but cannot personally support motion without confirmation of appropriate replacement project. Applicant responded by repeating earlier statement that HCC support of proposed demolition will allow continued planning to finalize approach to integrate contributing Italianate building façade into project scope and to determine economically viable building height. Mr. Lader suggested HCC might be prepared to support motion to

demolition three existing structures, to retain front façade of contributing structure and to assess appropriateness of replacement structure with five or six floor levels. Mr. Cornish repeated previous commentary that anything higher than five stories is inappropriate within HCD. Mr. Evans explained personal inability to support motion for demolition without accompanying motion in support of appropriate replacement development as part of current COA Application; continued by understanding Applicant's desire to secure motion in support of proposed demolition but also noted Applicant's need to understand that HCC cannot pass motion in support of redevelopment based upon current design proposal.

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Ms. Starbuck adopted the proposal that City Council DENY a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work as described as follows:

1. Proposal to demolish three buildings, to rehabilitate existing façade of one contributing building and to construct multi-story mixed-use building was presented by Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn.
2. Motion to DENY recommendation to issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed development project was approved: 6-0-1, with abstention by Mr. Loush; therefore, proposal to secure COA for demolishing three buildings, for rehabilitating existing façade of one contributing building and for constructing multi-story mixed-use building was DENIED. Those voting in support of denying recommendation to issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposal expressed support for developing project location, including potential demolition of select non-contributing existing structures; however, proposal to replace 1-story and 3-story buildings with 12-story or 13-story structure was determined to be inappropriate for existing streetscape and for overall Historic Conservation District 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 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 the Historic Conservation District, Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

Discussion Item: note: Mr. Lader confirmed a conflict of interest with this item, abstaining from discussion and resulting resolution.

Mr. Simonson presented walk-in discussion item (not represented by Applicant) concerning requested amendment to COAs previously issued to Mr. John Tripani specific to ZEST Bar & Grille located at 306 South New Street; **note:** Case #690 adopted by HCC on April 15, 2019 and Case #729 adopted by HCC on August 17, 2020. In response to outdoor dining option as preferred approach during current pandemic, Applicant requests approval to extend allowed timeframe for seasonal use of rooftop terrace awning. Original COA allows seasonal awning from May 1 until October 15 of each year while subsequent COA allows seasonal awning from May 1 until December 1 or until first snowfall of the season. Applicant currently requests permission to install seasonal awning on April 1.

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

1. Proposal to amend allowed timeframe for rooftop terrace seasonal awning was presented (in absentia) by John Tripani.
2. Seasonal use of rooftop terrace awning is amended to allow from April 1 through December 1 or until first snowfall of the season, whichever comes first.

Motion for proposed work was approved: 6-0-1 (abstention by Mr. Lader)

General Business: Minutes from HCC meeting on January 25, 2021 were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, with abstention by those not previously in attendance. Mr. Evans expressed appreciation to Historic Officer for level of detail within minutes. Mr. Cornish also expressed appreciation for quality of minutes but urged caution that HCC should formulate assessments of projects as "historically appropriate" and not with "personal approval" to avoid statements reflected within meeting minutes that

include such formulations as "Mr./Ms. approved ..." or "HCC approved ..."; Ms. Starbuck continued that HCC should refrain from stating "I like ..." and "I don't like ..." but rather "This item is appropriate because ..." and "This item is inappropriate because ..." to avoid misconception that assessments are based upon personal opinion rather than adherence to relevant guidelines.

Mr. Lader expressed appreciation to HCC and also to General Public for expressed opinions concerning various agenda items.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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