
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER (CHAIR), CHARLES PATRICK, MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER

MEMBERS ABSENT: KENNETH LOUSH

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)

VISITORS PRESENT: DALLAS BASHA, KIM CARRELL-SMITH, TODD CHAMBERS, ANN HUNSICKER, CHRISTINE USSLER

MEETING DATE: MAY 16, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on May 16, 2022, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 21-23 East Third Street

Property Owner: Ann Hunsicker

Applicant: Todd Chambers, MKSD Architects

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is an attached, 2-story, 5-bay commercial building with stucco over masonry construction. The building dates from circa 1920; however, the original storefront was significantly modified during the mid- to late 20th century and has a recessed entry with entrance door/shop window storefront combination flanked on either side with display windows. The building has an upper parapet with low sloping roof, a heavy upper projecting cornice with decorative brackets and a simpler intermediate cornice with no supporting brackets above the sign band. Various façade modifications prevent assignment of a specific architectural style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to install a new storefront and new display windows at the entry level, to install aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated divided lite (SDL) muntins at the upper floor level and to install one wall sign, one projecting sign as well as one window sign.

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 Storefronts'**
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Applicant appeared before HCC during April 18, 2022, meeting with various proposals to rehabilitate existing front façade. Following

comprehensive assessment of various proposals and resulting discussion, HCC unanimously adopted proposal that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness for following façade improvements:

- Glen-Gery Shrewsbury Modular thin-brick (or comparable) veneer masonry units in variegated dark red-brown color installed directly onto existing entry-level stucco façade, with assurance from Applicant that existing façade can adequately support new veneer; **note:** Applicant agreed to submit relevant details (including mortar style and type, headers and sills at display windows, apron beneath display windows, junction with sign band, etc.) via City of Bethlehem for review by HCC Chair, Historic Officer and Chief Building Inspector prior to fabrication and installation
- replace existing awnings over windows at both floor levels with new Sunbrella (or comparable) canvas fabric in black color and no front flap valances; new awnings include no design graphics, are open on both sides and do not include internal illumination

Current COA Application offers revised proposals to rehabilitate front façade that respond to previous HCC commentary about appropriate entry-level storefront assembly, display windows and signage while initial proposals for upper-level windows and blade sign remain unchanged.

Entrance doors are increased to 8-feet in height, resulting in reduced (and more appropriate) height of transom above -- see Drawing Page 9. Divided lites are now removed from storefronts, which is appropriate. Height of lowest horizontal metal rail is increased to 10-inches, implying previously requested apron detail. Relevant design guidelines suggest aprons typically differ in material from storefront assembly and stand proud slightly from storefront, so discussion is warranted ... although metal aprons are found within Historic Conservation District. Revised transom includes several vertical divisions as extensions of doorframes below; such details are not typical and should be considered for omitting. Transoms with Simulated Divided Lites (SDL) similar to proposed are found within Historic Conservation District; however, appropriate lite divisions are taller in dimension than wide (depicted lites appear square). Proposed Kawneer EnCORE Framing system (or comparable) for new storefront is appropriate; **note:** Applicant previously confirmed that minimum required frame dimensions are being used to avoid more contemporary bulkier aesthetic.

Previously inappropriate "Colonial" display windows flanking either side of recessed storefront now include more appropriate single central vertical division with implied transom above -- see Drawing Page 9. As previously mentioned, transoms with divided lites are found elsewhere within HCD; however, appropriate divisions are taller in dimension than wide (depicted lites appear square). Display windows also receive apron detail, which is appropriate; however, notation on Drawing Page 6 indicates Applicant's intent to retain and paint existing stucco for requested apron. In combination with proposed brick veneer, stucco apron will be somewhat recessed while appropriate apron typically stands proud slightly from display window, so discussion is warranted. Drawing Page 7 depicts inappropriate "Colonial picture window" with divided lites and no apron where exterior wall returns to recessed storefront -- note window without awning at right angle to front and recessed façades. Appropriate display window should be similar to larger front display windows, with no divided lites but with apron detail beneath and transom above.

Current COA Application repeats original proposal to remove five existing upper-level windows and replace with Pella Lifestyle Series (or comparable) aluminum-clad wood double-hung windows in black color with Simulated Divided Lites (SDL). Applicant previously confirmed proposed double-hung replacements are custom-sized to fit existing openings, which is appropriate. Relevant design guidelines note "[new] windows ... should have similar muntin or grid patterns as the neighborhood's historic buildings." On Drawing Page 8, Applicant provides image of building across East Third Street that indeed includes windows with multiple lite divisions. However, those are casement windows, so Applicant can revise proposed double-hung windows to casements if multiple lites are desired; otherwise, double-hung windows within existing streetscape have no intermediate divisions (except for immediately adjacent structure with 2-over-2 divide lites) so window replacements should be revised to 1-over-1 lite or 2-over 2 lite configurations.

Applicant previously confirmed all doors and windows will not include inappropriate tinted, colored and/or reflective glazing.

COA Application concludes with proposals for three types of new signage: back-lit aluminum letters on rigid backer installed at sign band, double-sided blade sign installed at far left of sign band and graphics installed on left storefront window.

Proposed main signage installed at sign band is 1-inch-thick rigid backer (material and color of backer not identified) measuring 30-inches tall x 130.5-inches wide, installed using concealed fasteners, with 1/4-inch-wide offset pinstripe detail around sign perimeter in off-white color. Individual letters spell out word "Toastique" in serif lettering; each aluminum letter is 1 1/2-inches deep, painted off-white in color, stands proud 1-inch from face of rigid backer with standoff spacers and back-lit resulting in halo effect. At left of lettering is corporate logo of stylized toast outline within diamond frame measuring 14-inches tall x 14-inches wide; similar to lettering, aluminum logo is 1 1/2-inches deep, stands proud 1-inch from face of rigid backer with standoff spacers and back-lit resulting in halo effect but painted gold in color. Proposed main signage is appropriate, pending clarification about material and color of rigid backer along with confirmation that no conduits, raceways or junction boxes for illumination are visible on building exterior. It should be noted that relevant design guidelines do not specifically mention back-lit lettering for desired halo effect; however, HCC recently recommended that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness for similar back-lit signage elsewhere within HCD ... but limiting depth of aluminum letters to maximum 1-inch thick, rather than Applicant's current lettering and logo thickness of 1 1/2-inches.

Design of proposed blade signage installed at far left of sign band was not amended from previous COA submission: 30-inch round sign fabricated from 2-inch-thick aluminum and hung from contemporary aluminum wall bracket with two support arms and outer frame (for lack of better term) off-set 2 inches from sign. Bracket components and sign background are painted black in color while corporate toast logo in center of sign is metallic gold in color; upper slogan "GOURMET TOAST" in sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in white color is within upper round portion of sign and set off by two white circles from slogan "& JUICE BAR" in same sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in white color within lower round portion of sign. Relevant design guidelines encourage double-sided blade signs to be hung from decorative iron scroll bracket that extends out over public right-of-way rather than proposed contemporary wall bracket; several structures nearby also offer examples of decorative scroll brackets. Appropriate rigid sign should be reduced to maximum 1-inch thickness and include off-set pinstripe detail in complementary color around sign perimeter. HCC also encourages warm white or ivory as appropriate alternative to proposed bright white color while serif lettering is also preferred. Relevant design guidelines continue by noting "wall-mounted lights with low-wattage bulbs directed towards signage" is appropriate, so two spot wall sconces with 3000K LED bulbs proposed to illuminate blade sign are appropriate.

Vinyl graphics measuring 16-inches tall x 24-inches wide to be approximately centered within left storefront window and include corporate toast logo, company name "Toastique" in serif lettering along with slogan "GOURMET TOAST & JUICE BAR" in sans-serif, all upper-case lettering. As previously stated, HCC prefers serif lettering and warm white or ivory over bright white color; however, HCC has previously accepted storefront signage in bright white color for better visibility, so proposed storefront signage is appropriate pending confirmation that all graphics will be installed on inside surface of window glazing.

In recent newspaper article, current property owner referred to select renovations intended for rear building façade, which is visible from public right-of-way. Applicant is encouraged to submit COA Application for HCC review of proposed rear façade renovations during on-going planning.

Discussion: Todd Chambers and Ann Hunsicker represented proposal to install new storefront and new display windows at entry level, to install aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated divided lite (SDL) muntins at upper floor level and to install one wall sign, one projecting sign as well as one window sign.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's decision to retain divided lites within upper-level windows based upon previous HCC recommendation that appropriate windows have no divisions; Applicant responded with strong desire to retain multiple divided lites, noting windows with divided lites in nearby building across East Third Street. Mr. Cornish explained windows with multiple divided lites in nearby structure were never reviewed by HCC while appropriate window replacements assessed by HCC have few, if any, divided lites. Applicant inquired why HCC "does not like divided lites". Mr. Cornish explained HCC does not base assessments on "likes" or "dislikes" but rather on design guidelines; continued that time period of Historic Conservation District (HCD) includes mainly 1-over-1 double-hung windows (meaning: no divide lites) at upper floor levels and occasionally 2-over-2 double-hung windows, in contrast with Bethlehem's Central Historic District (North Bethlehem) where buildings are much older and have earlier windows with multiple divided lites. Mr. Lader agreed that predominant style of upper-level windows within HCD is mostly 1-over-1 and occasionally 2-over-2 divided lites; however, select examples of multiple divided lites are found within HCD so he might consider current proposal appropriate.

Mr. Lader inquired about vertical muntins that interrupt transom of recessed storefront at entry level; Applicant confirmed need to structurally breakup storefront and transom so logical breaks are at left and right of entrance doors. Mr. Lader repeated Historic Consultant's assessment that divide lites in transoms and in upper-level windows should be more vertical than horizontal.

Mr. Lader requested clarification about apron beneath front display windows; Applicant explained that proposed apron detail will be clarified in satisfaction of previous COA that all window details must be submitted via City of Bethlehem for review by Chief Building Inspector, HCC Chair and Historic Officer prior to fabrication and installation. Applicant confirmed current intent is to retain existing stucco façade beneath display windows, with potential for cast or brick sills and lintels. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant could delineate apron with application of additional material (tile, stone, composite panel, etc.). Applicant was hesitant to install tile at apron due to potential for poor weathering but confirmed need to consider options before submitting details, as required by terms of previous COA.

Mr. Lader inquired if letters at main signage can be reduced to more appropriate 1-inch thickness; Applicant was amenable to reducing thickness of signage letters, noting proposed 1.5-inch thickness was intended to hide any visible lighting components. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring if Applicant would consider appropriate scroll hanging bracket for proposed blade sign; Applicant responded that blade sign is standard design element of brand franchise, so size and design cannot be amended ... including wall brackets rather than suggested scroll bracket. Applicant also confirmed blade sign will include requested off-set pinstripe detail around border as well as all lettering and graphics are warm white or ivory in color, including details of proposed window signage.

Public Commentary:

Christine Ussler: proprietor of business located across East Third Street; confirmed her building has upper-level casement windows with divided lites but also noted adjacent building has two double-hung windows with multiple divide lites at third floor level that perhaps date from 1920s, even though building itself is older; recalls select examples of multiple divided lites within Historic Conservation District and considers current proposal appropriate.

Kim Carrell-Smith: shared historical image of Applicant's building façade that depicts upper-level double-hung windows with no divided lites.

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Evans 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 as follows:

1. Proposal to install new storefront and new display windows at entry level, to install aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated divided lite (SDL) muntins at upper floor level and to install one wall sign, one projecting sign as well as one window sign was presented by Todd Chambers and Ann Hunsicker.
2. Appropriate details for new recessed storefront include:
 - a. Kawneer EnCORE Framing System (or comparable) aluminum storefront assembly measuring approximately 12-feet high x 20-feet wide in black color, with existing single entrance configuration revised to accommodate two separate tenants; two entrance doors measuring 8-feet high x 3-feet wide are fully glazed while adjacent display windows include no divided lites
 - b. bottom horizontal aluminum rail measures 10-inches high and serves as storefront apron while aluminum frames at each door extend vertically through transom
 - c. transom extends across entire width of recessed storefront and includes three rows of Simulated Divided Lite (SDL) muntins; height of lite divisions is taller in dimension than width
 - d. minimum required frame dimensions will be used, and front glazing is installed as near as possible to front façade (not centered or further recessed); glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
3. Appropriate details for two new display windows include:

- a. Kawneer EnCORE Framing System (or comparable) aluminum display windows measuring approximately 7-feet high x 5.5-feet wide in black color installed into existing openings; each display window includes one central vertical division but no divided lites
 - b. transom extends across entire width of each display window and includes one row of Simulated Divided Lite (SDL) muntins; height of lite divisions is taller in dimension than width
 - c. minimum required frame dimensions will be used, and front glazing is installed as near as possible to front façade (not centered or further recessed); glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
 - d. wall surface area approximately 2.5-feet high x 5.5-feet wide beneath each display window to receive apron detail; Applicant agreed to submit relevant details via City of Bethlehem for review by HCC Chair, Historic Officer and Chief Building Inspector prior to fabrication and installation
- Note:** no details of new display window adjacent to recessed storefront entrance were included within COA Application; Applicant agreed to detail new window to match appropriate details of new display windows
4. Appropriate new window replacements at upper floor level include following details:
 - a. Pella Lifestyle Series (or comparable) aluminum-clad wood double-hung windows in black color with 8-over-8 Simulated Divided Lite (SDL) muntins
 - b. window replacements are custom sized to fit existing openings
 - c. height of lite divisions is taller in dimension than width; glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
 5. Appropriate details for new main signage at sign band include:
 - a. 1-inch-thick aluminum rigid backer painted in black color measuring 30-inches high x 130.5-inches wide to be installed using concealed fasteners; includes 1/4-inch-wide offset pinstripe detail around sign perimeter in warm white or ivory color
 - b. individual letters spell out word "Toastique" in serif lettering; each aluminum letter measures 1-inch deep, painted warm white or ivory in color, stands proud 1-inch from face of rigid backer with standoff spacers and is back-lit resulting in halo effect
 - c. at left of lettering is corporate logo of stylized toast outline within diamond frame measuring 14-inches tall x 14-inches wide; aluminum logo measures 1-inch deep, is painted gold in color, stands proud 1-inch from face of rigid backer with standoff spacers and is back-lit resulting in halo effect
 - d. no conduits, raceways or junction boxes for illumination are visible on building exterior
 6. Appropriate details for the new blade sign include:
 - a. 30-inch-round sign fabricated from 2-inch-thick aluminum and hung from contemporary aluminum wall bracket set off 7-inches from wall surface using two 2-inch-square support arms, with outer frame off-set 2 inches from sign; brackets connect to 1/4-inch-thick aluminum wall plate installed with 1/4-inch lag bolts
 - b. bracket components and sign background are painted black in color while corporate toast logo in center of sign is metallic gold in color; upper slogan "GOURMET TOAST" in sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in warm white or ivory in color is within upper round portion of sign and set off by two warm white or ivory circles from slogan "& JUICE BAR" in same sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in warm white or ivory color within lower round portion of sign
 - c. sign includes offset pinstripe detail around sign perimeter in warm white or ivory color
 - d. two new Endurance Energy Star spot wall sconces by WAC Lighting (or comparable) in black color with 3000K LED bulbs installed at sign band illuminate new blade sign; no conduits, raceways or junction boxes for new illumination are visible on building exterior
 7. Appropriate details for the new window signage include:
 - a. graphics measuring 16-inches high x 24-inches wide to be approximately centered within left storefront window

- b. signage includes corporate toast logo, company name “Toastique” in serif lettering along with slogan “GOURMET TOAST & JUICE BAR” in sans-serif, all upper-case lettering; all graphics and lettering are warm white or ivory in color

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item

Property Location: 114 West Fourth Street

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant is requesting an informal review of proposed new in-fill construction of a 3-story twin residential building at the rear of the Grace Mansion site. The project also includes demolition of the detached rear garage and an addition to the rear of the Grace Mansion.

Dallas Basha and Christine Ussler summarized initial design proposal, with desire for HCC guidance before officially submitting COA Application. Applicant reminded HCC of 2018 proposal (different Applicant) for 5-story residential building at same location that almost touched Grace Mansion, noting previous project was ultimately denied by City Council upon recommendation by HCC as inappropriate. Current Applicant subsequently purchased property and conducted initial façade renovations on mansion; however, Applicant now reports that financing to support on-going exterior work and subsequent interior rehabilitation of mansion depends upon development of remaining site. Applicant described proposed project as low-density residential development as alternative to mixed-use (commercial and residential) high-rise proposals recently assessed by HCC. In contrast, current proposal is 3-story structure with traditional materials (brick façade, aluminum-clad wood windows, etc.); admitted 3-level front porch with steel details is non-traditional (size, scale, materials, etc.) but noted several 2-story porches in South Bethlehem ... admittedly not within Historic Conservation District. Applicant clarified area of property between new construction and existing mansion (approx. 15-feet wide) would be common area for tenants of both structures; proposed project is intended for general housing market ... not specifically targeting university students but could serve as student housing. Applicant admitted success of proposal depends upon demolition of existing detached garage at rear corner of property ... noting garage is not visible from West Fourth Street but can be discerned from Martel Street. Applicant noted garage was constructed between 1904 and 1912, meaning Mr. Grace potentially constructed and/or used structure but that fact is inconclusive; continued that garage is “not architecturally significant, with original brick walls and slate roof but with significant alterations to original doors and windows.” Applicant requested HCC approval for proposed demolition, claiming that resulting development project would “overrule historical significance” of compromised garage; continued that proposed project would “benefit surrounding community by filling existing void within streetscape” with new project that is “cohesive for neighborhood in size and scale by paying homage to style of community with steel-like details (reference to Bethlehem Steel) and brick of Grace Mansion.” Applicant concluded by noting streetscape of 6-story Lehigh University structure and contemporary commercial building nearby.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s intentions with existing stone wall along West Fourth Street and Martel Street; Applicant confirmed intention to retain most of existing wall but would terminate it just north of proposed development project to delineate existing mansion from new construction. Mr. Evans questioned proposed shed roof of project, noting previous examples of similar roofs assessed by HCC that were not successful upon execution; continued that new building “should echo style and design elements of existing neighborhood” and explaining that proposed shed roof does not meet that parameter. Applicant admitted original design with gable roof was modified to accommodate mechanical units on rear flat roof (units currently not depicted) and front portion was designed to limit overall building height; agreed to consider other roof styles but noted nearby (non-contributing) structures have flat roofs, so current proposal strives to locate flat roof at rear of project and out of public view. Mr. Simonson inquired if flat roof would have parapet; Applicant admitted such details have yet to be addressed, noting parapet would help to screen needed mechanical equipment.

Mr. Lader recalled assessment of previous development proposal in 2018, noting HCC ultimately concluded that existing garage structure contributes to overall site ... admittedly not best architectural example within Historic Conservation District but garage still exhibits elements of other structures considered as contributing to district. Applicant repeated contention that success of proposed development as well as on-going rehabilitation of existing mansion depend upon approval to demolish existing garage “that most people are not even aware exists” and stressed that new project as well as rehabilitated mansion would

greatly improve overall neighborhood. Mr. Patrick inquired about Applicant's intentions with existing mansion; Applicant described on-going efforts to secure rezoning that limits commercial use to front (facing West Fourth Street), with remaining components at side, rear and upstairs as residential units, common space, hallways, etc. Applicant stressed desire to retain existing historical elements of mansion and noted roof has already been replaced, siding was repaired in-kind and new landscaping is pending. Mr. Simonson requested clarification about previous HCC statement to deny request for demolition of garage structure; Applicant recalled in late 2018 through early 2019 (while serving as Historic Officer consultant), HCC deliberated about existing garage and noted own personal desire to retain as many historic structures as possible but countered that current development proposal differs from other recent high-rise development proposals and now accepts that "loss of historic secondary (i.e. garage) structures justifies good development". Mr. Cornish repeated recent concerns about demolition of contributing structures within district; empathized with Applicant's need to develop remaining site to finance on-going rehabilitation of Grace Mansion but noted existing garage was indeed used by Mr. Grace (if not constructed by him) so main house and detached garage have historical connection. Mr. Cornish continued by expressing appreciation of current design proposal, noting many Secretary of Interior's Standards are respected but recalled HCC's previous conclusion with earlier developer to avoid demolition of garage by integrating it into overall design proposal. Applicant suggested relevant city ordinance that created HCC and accompanying design guidelines are less stringent than those associated with Central Bethlehem Historic District (North Bethlehem) whereby secondary structures are not to be reviewed; continued by appreciating difficulty for HCC members but believes recent approvals for demolishing historic structures facing main streets represent more of loss for South Bethlehem than proposed loss of existing garage at rear of property.

Mr. Simonson inquired about exact location of garage and requested summary of important details concerning size, construction, materials, etc. ... noting current lack of supporting documentation typically associated with requests for demolition. Applicant agreed to include such details within official COA Application. Mr. Lader recounted recent presentation of so-called "alley buildings" (Southside Alley House presentation by Wesley Hiatt at Lehigh University on May 6th at Brinker Lofts), noting appropriate scale for alley-facing structures is 1 ½- to 2 stories tall; appreciated common space between existing mansion and proposed structure for use by tenants but expressed concern that 15-foot wide area is insufficient. Mr. Lader continued by expressing appreciation of Applicant's desire to offer balconies as amenity for tenants but did not believe proposed 3-story porch is appropriate for current streetscape and felt that provided renderings of multi-story porch resemble something expected at rear of property rather than for front façade. Mr. Hudak inquired if Applicant investigated typical monthly rental rates for use of garage structures within district and noted tenants of mansion might be able to use existing garage, if not for vehicles than perhaps for storage; continued with personal inclination that existing garage structure intrinsically belongs to overall site, noting important spatial relationship between garage and adjacent mansion. Mr. Evans recalled Applicant's previous comment that Grace Mansion would include common spaces for tenants and suggested existing garage could also support such amenities. Applicant suggested dismantling and reusing select elements of garage within proposed development project as way of respecting historical integrity of site; also explained that retaining existing garage with new construction placed in front would visibly block garage from public view and therefore remove need for HCC assessment. Mr. Lader explained HCC could not discuss merits of proposal to integrate historical components into new design without seeing specific details; Mr. Cornish noted reusing elements of existing structure still results in loss of contributing structure and suggested such approach is inappropriate according to Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) for rehabilitation. Mr. Lader requested input from Historic Officer concerning relevant SIS; Mr. Long referenced following SIS as potentially relevant to current discussion while also noting standards do not envision demolition of contributing structures:

Standard 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.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

General Business:

Minutes from HCC meeting on April 18, 2022, were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, and with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

Mr. Lader inquired about solar collector installed atop so-called Flat Iron building (301 Broadway), recalling associated COA included condition that collector must be removed if no longer functional. Mr. Evans noted original proposal indicated collector is designed to track path of sun but recalled subsequent conversation with Applicant that collector is more efficient when static. Mr. Simonson suggested that Mr. Lader as HCC Chair contact Applicant about status of solar collector; Mr. Lader agreed to call Applicant. Mr. Evans recommended such communication should be in writing. HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Mr. Patrick adopted unanimous proposal that Mr. Lader contact Applicant to inquire about status of solar collector atop Flat Iron building, reminding Applicant that collector must be removed if no longer functional.

Mr. Lader inquired about status of HCC desire to issue Preservation Awards. Mr. Simonson agreed to cooperate with City staff to pull HCC records from previous 3-5 years but must rely on longer-term members to assess successful completion of proposed projects during that period. Mr. Evans encouraged receipt of list in advance of next HCC meeting via email to allow ample time for considering potential award recipients; also encouraged consideration of residential projects for well-rounded list of awards because most COAs issued by HCC are specific to commercial projects.

There was no further business; HCC 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