

CITY OF BETHLEHEM

HARB CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

DATE: 2 April 2025

APPLICANT MUST ATTEND MEETING FOR CASE TO BE HEARD

Deadline for submittals is by noon, three weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Applications for demolition and new construction must be submitted four weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Submit original plus 10 copies.

HARB MEETING MINUTES AND SUBMISSION

MEMBERS PRESENT

Connie Postupack
Diana Hodgson
Michael Simonson
Joe McGavin
Rodman Young
Nik Nikolov

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

H. Joseph Phillips, Historic Officer
E-Mail: jphillips@phillipsdonovanarchitects.com

VISITORS PRESENT

Adam Waldron, 442 High Street
Owner, 25 East Wall Street
Leonard De Roche, 408 High Street
Todd Chambers, MKSD Architects, 555 Main St.
Shayne Serrano, MKSD Architects, 555 Main St.
Lou Pektor, Rubel Street II, L.P., 555 Main Street
Gabe Solms, Rubel Street II, L.P., 555 Main Street
Julie Bernstein, legal counsel for, Rubel Street II, L.P., 555 Main Street
Mary Feliciatto, 323 Center Street
Chris Carson, Bethlehem Resident
Marty Smith, Bethlehem Resident

The 2 April 2025 meeting of HARB was called to order by Chairperson, Connie Postupack at 5:03 PM.

MINUTES

There were no comments on the 5 March 2025 Minutes and upon a Motion by Diana Hodgson and a Second by Joe McGavin, the Minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

Item #1: The applicant/owner of the property located at 442 High Street proposes to replace an existing slate roof with GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in the Antique Slate color, rebuild two brick chimneys on the North and South ends of the ridge on the main roof, repair spalling brick and deteriorated mortar, repair soffits, fascias, wood window frames & sash, wood siding, wood doors, and wood shutters.

Property Location: 442 High Street
Property Owner: James & Johannah Valentine
Applicant: James & Johannah Valentine

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 442 High Street proposes to replace an existing slate roof with GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in the Antique Slate color, rebuild two brick chimneys (reusing existing brick and new lime mortar) on the North and South ends of the ridge on the main roof, reflash existing chimneys using real copper flashing, repair spalling brick and deteriorated mortar on the building facades, (remove existing Portland Cement mortar and repoint brick with a lime mortar blended to match the existing, remove and replace heavily eroded brick with new brick to match existing, resurface minimally deteriorated brick using a repair mortar specifically formulated for brick repair and blended to match the color of the original brick), repair soffits, fascias, wood window frames & sash, wood siding, wood doors, and wood shutters. The existing pole gutters and round downspouts will be retained.

All paint shall be manufactured by Sherwin Williams in the colors as follows.

- Wood Trim & Siding: Duration Satin – West Highland White SW 7566
- Wood Doors: Duration Gloss – Heartthrob SW 6866
- Shutters: Duration Gloss - Tricorn Black SW 6258
- Metal Railings & Hardware: Oil based Gloss Black

Character Defining Features: This two and one half-story home with smooth brick walls is topped with a cross gabled roof fronting High Street and an intersecting gable roof that tops the rear portion of the home, portions of which are visible from East Wall Street. There is a brick dormer with low sloping roof centered on the High Street facing roof. The dormer has an ornate frieze over two equally spaced double hung windows with arched muntins in the top sash and no muntins in the bottom sash. Roof water is collected in recessed pole gutters and conveyed to the ground in round downspouts. The three bay High Street facing façade is punctuated with one over one lite double hung windows on the first and second floors. All windows are fitted with 3 panel, solid panel shutters. There is a shallow pent roof between the first and second floor windows. The pent roof is punctuated by a shallow, pedimented porch roof that frames the main entrance door on the right most bay of the façade.

Discussion: The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project. The Applicant confirmed that existing pole gutters and round galvanized downspouts are to remain. If necessary, galvanized downspouts will be replaced in-kind. The Applicant also confirmed the paint colors as outlined in the “Proposed Work” above. Diana Hodgson asked if any windows are going to be replaced. The Applicant advised that all original windows will remain and would be repaired and repainted as required. The Applicant further advised that the only building material to be replaced will be the roof shingles. Ms. Hodgson asked if the door to be painted is the original wood door and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Mr. Phillips asked if the Applicant would be using real copper flashing and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. The Applicant further advised that the existing downspouts are galvanized steel and will be reused or replaced in-kind. The existing “barrel” roof will be replaced with real copper roofing utilizing soldered seams. Mike Simonson asked if South Mountain Masonry would be performing the brick repair and replacement, as well as repointing. The Applicant responded in the affirmative. The Applicant further advised that the color of the lime mortar will be DGM Red and the mortar joints will be flush struck.

The HARB agreed to recommend that the Bethlehem City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing slate roof with GAF Slate Line shingles, rebuild two chimneys, repair spalling brick and mortar deterioration, and repair soffits, fascias, window frames, window sash, wood siding, wood doors, and wood shutters.

Motion: Michael Simonson made a motion to approve the replacement of the existing slate roof with GAF Slate Line shingles in the Antique Slate color, rebuild two chimneys, repair spalling brick and mortar deterioration, and repair soffits, fascias, window frames, window sash, wood siding, wood doors, and wood shutters, in accordance with the discussion outlined above and the Guideline Citations outlined below.

Second: Connie Postupack

Result of vote: The vote was unanimous to approve the replacement of the existing slate roof with GAF Slate Line shingles in the Antique Slate color, rebuild two chimneys, repair spalling brick and mortar deterioration, and repair soffits, fascias, window frames, window sash, wood siding, wood doors, and wood shutters, as per the motion, and with the following conditions.

1. The Applicant must submit for and secure a Building Permit from the City of Bethlehem.
2. All roof flashings must be of a real copper material.
3. All roof edge materials shall match the color of the adjacent trim.
4. All paint shall be manufactured by Sherwin Williams in the colors as follows.
 - Wood Trim & Siding: Duration Satin – West Highland White SW 7566
 - Wood Doors: Duration Gloss – Heartthrob SW 6866

- Shutters: Duration Gloss - Tricorn
Black SW 6258
 - Metal Railings & Hardware: Oil based - Gloss Black
5. Mortar color shall be DGM Red

Guideline Citation: Secretary of Interior Standards No.(s)

#2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#5 Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

#6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

#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 historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

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

Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines

Page 7: Roofing

The HARB encourages,

- Replacement of roofing materials when beyond repair, matching original color, pattern, material, and texture
- Replacement roof materials or new materials for additions and new construction that are sympathetic in appearance to historic materials
- Retention of decorative roof elements such as chimneys, cupolas, cresting, finials, eaves, and cornices
- Maintaining existing roof forms and heights for existing buildings or additions and using sympathetic roof forms and heights for new construction
- Retaining built-in gutters and open valley flashing
- Installing shingle caps along ridge or extending vents continuously to end of ridge
- Painting drip edges to match adjacent trim
- Installing half-round gutters and plain round downspouts
- Installing flashing on top of cornices to prolong their longevity, painted to match cornice color

The HARB discourages,

- Adding or altering rooftop features at areas visible from a public way that change a roof configuration, such as skylights, television antennae or dishes, solar collectors, mechanical equipment, roof decks, chimney stacks, and dormer windows

- Adding new features that are out of character, scale, materials, or detailing to the historic building
- Altering, enclosing, or removing historic eaves and cornices

Page 8: Exterior Woodwork & Siding

The HARB encourages,

- Regularly maintaining and repainting exterior woodwork including repainting, and addressing potential areas of moisture including clogged gutters and downspouts, groundwater, leaky pipes, and interior condensation
- Retaining decorative woodwork since it is a character defining element that can be difficult to replace
- Repairing smaller areas of deterioration by reinforcing or patching – small cracks and checks can be repaired with an exterior wood filler, glue, or epoxy – Loose elements can be refastened with nailing or drilling and screwing
- Selectively replacing deteriorated wood elements that are beyond repair with wood pieces that match the size, profile, exposure and pattern, and character of the historic wood element – Wood filler in the joints between the new and old wood will help provide a smooth finish
- Large scale or significant replacement of exterior wood siding with paintable material that match the size, profile, exposure, pattern, and character of the historic wood

The HARB discourages,

- Removing or encapsulating with vinyl or aluminum siding, trim, decorative features, and trim elements such as brackets, spindles, cornices, columns, posts, etc.
- Vinyl or aluminum siding over wood, brick, stone, or stucco
- Wood grained, wavy edged, vertical, and textured plywood simulated siding
- Installing non-wood trim

Page 8: Paint

The HARB encourages,

- Hand washing with mild detergent and bristle brush, hand scraping, and hand sanding

The HARB discourages,

- Rotary tools – disks can leave circular marks and wires can tear into the surface
- Heat guns and heat plate – can ignite paint or underlying surface if left in one location too long
- Chemical paint removers – can raise grains, be expensive, and potentially volatile; runoff can be hazardous
- Flame tools, blow torches to soften paint – smoldering sparks can potentially start a fire; lead components in paint can vaporize and create highly toxic fumes
- Sandblasting – can be abrasive to surface, wear away protective exterior coating and raise the wood grain
- High-pressure water wash – forces water into open joints affecting interior finishes and structural framing; can be abrasive to exterior surface and raise the grain

Page 9: Masonry & Stucco

Exterior masonry, including stone, brick, terra cotta, and stucco, provides a strong, durable, and attractive appearance with relatively low maintenance. Historic masonry walls tend to protect a building's interior from weather and act as the principal load bearing system. Aesthetically it acts as an important design feature, helping to define a building's style and add visual interest to the streetscape.

Mortar: Mortar, which bonds masonry units, was generally composed of a few ingredients: sand, lime, and water, and possibly additives such as animal hair or oyster shells. Starting in the mid-19th century, a small amount of Portland cement was added into the mix to improve the workability and hasten the setting time. In the early 20th century, Portland cement in mortar was increased, corresponding with the manufacture of harder bricks.

The HARB encourages,

- Regular maintenance, repair and selectively repointing deteriorated areas with compatible mortar in material, hardness, composition, color, joint style. Incompatible mortar is often too hard and can lead to spalling or chipping of the bricks or stones, it can also be visually mismatched.
- Installing fasteners for signs and other devices into mortar joints rather than brick or stone faces
- Installing local stone and pointing with ribbon joints

The HARB discourages,

- Using Portland cement-based mortar for repointing – it is typically too hard for most historic masonry and can result in damage, including spalling

Stucco: Stucco is a relatively inexpensive material that can provide a more finished appearance to brick, stone, or wood framed buildings. In some cases, the surface was scored to look like stone. It acts as a weather repellent coating, protecting the building from the elements including rain, sunlight, and wind, and can moderately increase its fire resistance. Stucco can also provide an insulating layer to a wall, reducing the passage of air to the interior.

The HARB encourages,

- Matching the color and texture of historic stucco when repairing or applying stucco to new construction

The HARB discourages,

- Installing stucco over brick, stone, or terra cotta walls
- Installing artificial stucco (EIFS Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems) which can trap moisture within the thickness of a wall and cause long-term damage

Masonry & Stucco Cleaning: Appropriate masonry and stucco cleaning can enhance the character and overall appearance of a building. However, improper cleaning of historic masonry can cause damage to the historic surfaces and cause more harm than good both physically and aesthetically.

The HARB encourages,

- Cleaning masonry and stucco with the gentlest means possible, typically low-pressure water, with the possible use of a gentle detergent and brushing

The HARB discourages,

- Masonry cleaning unless a building is heavily soiled
- Masonry and stucco cleaning with harsh chemicals, sand blasting, power washing over 400 psi, grinders, or metal brushes

Masonry Coatings & Paint: Water repellent and waterproof coatings, which include paint, are generally applied to prevent water from entering a masonry and stucco wall, but tend to be unnecessary on weather-tight historic buildings. Water tends to enter masonry buildings through open mortar joints, surface cracks and areas of poor or deferred maintenance. In instances where the surface of the masonry has been severely compromised, such as at sandblasted brick, the use of water repellent coatings might be appropriate.

The HARB discourages,

- Applying water repellent or waterproof coatings
- Painting of previously unpainted masonry or stucco

Page 10: Windows

The HARB encourages,

- Regular window maintenance, repair, and repainting
- Installing interior or exterior storm windows
- If the applicant can demonstrate evidence of window deterioration requiring replacement, installing true divided lite replacement windows with an exterior painted finish that match the material, historic size, shape, operation, muntin pattern, profiles, and detailing to the greatest extent possible

The HARB discourages,

- Decreasing, increasing, or altering window size, shape, or operation to allow for installation of stock window sizes or picture windows
- Encasing or capping window surrounds with aluminum or vinyl
- New window openings at publicly visible elevations
- Installing tinted or colored glazing
- Installing vinyl or aluminum-clad replacement windows at window openings that are visible from a public right-of-way

Page 10: Shutters

The HARB encourages,

- Maintaining historic shutters
- Installing new shutters where they existed historically
- Operable shutters with smooth, paintable finish
- Shutters and operable shutter hardware, including hinges, hasps, and dogs, of the appropriate style for the building and location
- Appropriately sized and shaped shutters for the window opening, fitted to cover the window when closed

Evaluation, Effect on Historic District, Recommendations: The proposed work conforms with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines and will have no negative impact to the historic district.

Item #2: The applicant/owner of the property located at 25 East Wall Street proposes to replace the existing roof shingles at the rear of the existing home with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color.

Property Location: 25 East Wall Street

Property Owner: Sarah McIntosh

Applicant: Sage Rosenberry, Alan Kunsman Roofing & Siding, Inc.

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 25 East Wall Street proposes to replace the existing roof shingles at the rear of the existing home with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color. New cream-colored aluminum drip edge will be installed at the perimeter of the roof. New real copper chimney flashing will be installed to replace the existing chimney flashing. Timbertex ridge shingles will be installed over the Cobra Snow Country ridge vent. (This is consistent with the COA issued for the garage building at the rear of the property in December of 2024.)

Character Defining Features: This two and one half-story twin home with smooth, painted brick walls is topped with a cross gabled roof fronting East Wall Street and a single slope shed roof that tops the rear portion of the home facing Milton Street. There are two, simply, but elegantly detailed, gable roofed dormers equally space on the East Wall Street facing roof. The dormer windows are two over two lite double hung windows. Roof water is collected in half round gutters and conveyed to the ground in round downspouts. The three bay East Wall Street facing façade is punctuated with two over two lite double hung windows on the first and second floors. The first-floor windows are fitted with 3 panel, solid panel shutters. The second-floor windows are fitted with 2 panel louvered shutters. The first-floor facade is punctuated by a shallow, gabled porch roof, supported by chamfered square columns and simple but elegant bracketry, that frames the main entrance door on the left most bay of the façade. The first-floor porch is elevated four steps above grade.

Discussion: The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project and noted that the proposed work is consistent with a COA recommended for the garage building in December of 2024. Diana Hodgson asked if there would be any changes to the existing gutters and the Applicant advised that no changes are proposed for the gutters and the existing gutters will remain. Ms. Hodgson further asked if the dormer that can be seen from the rear of the property is on the neighbor's roof and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Rod Young asked if the roof over the entrance door on the rear façade is also being replaced and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Connie Postupack asked if the roof on the front of the house had already been replaced and the Applicant responded in the affirmative and that it is the same manufacturer and color as proposed in this current Application.

The HARB agreed to recommend that the Bethlehem City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing roof shingles at the rear of the existing home with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color.

Motion: Rodman Young made a motion to approve the replacement of the existing roof shingles at the rear of the existing home with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color, in

accordance with the discussion outlined above and the Guideline Citations outlined below.

Second: Diana Hodgson

Result of vote: The vote was unanimous to approve the replacement of the existing roof shingles at the rear of the existing home with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color, as per the motion, and with the following conditions.

1. The Applicant must submit for and secure a Building Permit from the City of Bethlehem.
2. All roof flashings must be of a real copper material.
3. All roof edge materials shall match the color of the adjacent trim.
4. Any touchup or new painting shall be done with paint that matches the existing paint color.
5. Existing gutters and downspouts will remain in place.

Guideline Citation: Secretary of Interior Standards No.(s)

#2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#5 Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

#6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

#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 historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

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

Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines

Page 7: Roofing

The HARB encourages,

- Replacement of roofing materials when beyond repair, matching original color, pattern, material, and texture
- Replacement roof materials or new materials for additions and new construction that are sympathetic in appearance to historic materials
- Retention of decorative roof elements such as chimneys, cupolas, cresting, finials, eaves, and cornices

- Maintaining existing roof forms and heights for existing buildings or additions and using sympathetic roof forms and heights for new construction
- Retaining built-in gutters and open valley flashing
- Installing shingle caps along ridge or extending vents continuously to end of ridge
- Painting drip edges to match adjacent trim
- Installing half-round gutters and plain round downspouts
- Installing flashing on top of cornices to prolong their longevity, painted to match cornice color

The HARB discourages,

- Adding or altering rooftop features at areas visible from a public way that change a roof configuration, such as skylights, television antennae or dishes, solar collectors, mechanical equipment, roof decks, chimney stacks, and dormer windows
- Adding new features that are out of character, scale, materials, or detailing to the historic building
- Altering, enclosing, or removing historic eaves and cornices

Evaluation, Effect on Historic District, Recommendations: The proposed work conforms with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines and will have no negative impact to the historic district.

Item #3: The applicant/owner of the property located at 408 High Street proposes to replace the existing roof shingles with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color and replace the existing gutters with half round gutters and round downspouts.

Property Location: 408 High Street

Property Owner: Leonard De Roche

Applicant: Seifert Contracting LLC

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 408 High Street proposes to replace the existing roof shingles with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color and replace the existing gutters with six-inch half round gutters and four-inch round downspouts. Applicant is also proposing to replace an existing rubber roof with .060 EPDM rubber roofing.

Character Defining Features: This two and one half-story home with painted brick walls is topped with a central hipped roof and gable roofed extensions, one of which faces High Street. A wood shake sided, pediment roofed dormer is located on the main roof and above the small shed roofed entrance porch. Roof water is collected in half round gutters and conveyed to the ground in round downspouts. The homes façades are punctuated with varying sized double hung windows with shallow arched brick heads and heavy wood sills. Some of the more prominent windows contain a muntin pattern of small square lites in their upper sash. The first-floor porch is elevated four steps above grade.

Discussion: The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project. Mr. Phillips asked if rubber roofing was proposed as a part of this Application and the Applicant advised that an existing rubber roof will be replaced with a .060 EPDM rubber roof. Mike

Simonson asked if this was an in-kind replacement and the Applicant responded in the affirmative.

The HARB agreed to recommend that the Bethlehem City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing roof shingles with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color, replace an existing rubber roof in-kind, and replace the existing gutters and downspouts with half round gutters and round downspouts.

Motion: Michael Simonson made a motion to approve the replacement of the existing roof shingles with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color, replacement of an existing rubber roof in-kind, and replacement of the existing gutters with half round gutters and round downspouts, in accordance with the discussion outlined above and the Guideline Citations outlined below.

Second: Joseph McGavin

Result of vote: The vote was unanimous to approve the replacement of the existing roof shingles with GAF Slateline shingles in the Antique Slate color, replacement of an existing rubber roof in-kind, and replacement of the existing gutters with half round gutters and round downspouts, as per the motion, and with the following conditions.

1. The Applicant must submit for and secure a Building Permit from the City of Bethlehem.
2. All roof flashings must be of a real copper material.
3. All roof edge materials shall match the color of the adjacent trim.
4. Any touchup or new painting shall be done with paint that matches the existing paint color.

Guideline Citation: Secretary of Interior Standards No.(s)

#2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#5 Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

#6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

#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 historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

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

Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines

Page 7: Roofing

The HARB encourages,

- Replacement of roofing materials when beyond repair, matching original color, pattern, material, and texture
- Replacement roof materials or new materials for additions and new construction that are sympathetic in appearance to historic materials
- Retention of decorative roof elements such as chimneys, cupolas, cresting, finials, eaves, and cornices
- Maintaining existing roof forms and heights for existing buildings or additions and using sympathetic roof forms and heights for new construction
- Retaining built-in gutters and open valley flashing
- Installing shingle caps along ridge or extending vents continuously to end of ridge
- Painting drip edges to match adjacent trim
- Installing half-round gutters and plain round downspouts
- Installing flashing on top of cornices to prolong their longevity, painted to match cornice color

The HARB discourages,

- Adding or altering rooftop features at areas visible from a public way that change a roof configuration, such as skylights, television antennae or dishes, solar collectors, mechanical equipment, roof decks, chimney stacks, and dormer windows
- Adding new features that are out of character, scale, materials, or detailing to the historic building
- Altering, enclosing, or removing historic eaves and cornices

Evaluation, Effect on Historic District, Recommendations: The proposed work conforms with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines and will have no negative impact to the historic district.

Item #4: The applicant/owner of the property located at 555 Main Street proposes to construct additional stories above the existing building.

Property Location: 555 Main Street
Property Owner: Rubel Street II, L.P.
Applicant: MKSD Architects

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 555 Main Street proposes to construct additional stories, for multi-family residential use, above the existing building. Two additional stories (20'-0") will be added and set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street with a 27'-3" balcony (Plus the width of the front façade). Three additional stories (31'-4") will be added at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street. Proposed materials include the following.

Main Street Façade

Brick (primary brick field): Glen-Gery Burnt Almond

Brick (surround with rowlock sill & Soldier Course): Belden Dutch Gray smooth

Brick Joints & Mortar: Colonial Brown color struck joint to match existing.

Windows (in addition): Pella Lifestyle Aluminum Clad double hung windows, Iron Ore in color

Windows (in existing openings): Pella Lifestyle Aluminum Clad double hung replacement windows, Brick Red in color to match existing windows.

New Mansard Roof: Atas Dutch Seam, Standing Seam Metal in Matte Black color

New Dormers in Mansard Roof: Atas Dutch Seam, Standing Seam Metal in Matte Black color

Rubel Street Façade

Brick (right side at street level): Existing Red Brick

Brick (left side painted brick façade at street level): Paint brick to match Prairie Clay synthetic stucco color

Brick Joints & Mortar: Existing

New Windows: New Pella Lifestyle Aluminum Clad double hung windows, Fossil in color.

Window Trim: B.O.D. “Dryvit” synthetic stucco in Timberland Suede & Prairie Clay colors. (To match color of adjacent wall finish.)

Wall Finish (EIFS): B.O.D. “Dryvit” synthetic stucco in Timberland Suede & Prairie Clay colors.

Metal Coping Cap: Aluminum to be painted Prairie Clay color.

Character Defining Features: The existing two-story Main Street façade is distinguished by its street level storefront façade consisting of storefront glass, painted tile façade, and oversized letters spelling out “555 WOOLWORTH BLDG.” The storefront is topped by a second-floor brick façade of varying brick patterns and stylized brick keystones over the one over one lite double hung windows. The existing two-story Rubel Street façade is comprised of yellow and red flat brick facades with little distinguishing characteristics. This façade faces a parking structure on the other side of Rubel Street, which is a relatively utilitarian service street to the back of buildings that front on Main Street. On the rear side of, and well below, the above-mentioned parking structure lies the colonial Industrial Quarter.

Discussion (from 4 December 2024 HARB Meeting): *The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project. The Applicant advised that two additional stories would present themselves from Main Street, but one of these stories would be partially screened by the existing parapet wall. The Applicant further stated that the proposed height of the new addition is consistent with the adjacent Main Street Commons building and other buildings to the South, the rhythm and pattern of windows is consistent with Main Street, and the materials are consistent with Main Street & Historic Bethlehem. Mr. Phillips brought attention to the proposed Main Street Facade window grouping, comprised of 3 differently oriented units, and their differentiation from the existing windows in the same façade. Joe McGavin asked why the proposed new windows are more contemporary and grouped as they are and why they are not more similar to the existing windows. The Applicant replied that the new window groupings are meant to distinguish themselves from the existing building as outlined in the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. Joe McGavin stated that the new windows are not compatible with the Historic District and the Applicant respectfully disagreed and*

feels that there is enough variety of windows on Main Street that the new windows are compatible. Diana Hodgson questioned the color of the brick and the Applicant advised that they would provide brick samples for review by HARB. Rod Young asked if any windows would be located on the South Façade of the addition and the Applicant responded that there will not be any new windows on the South Façade. Diana Hodgson asked for clarification of the location of the terrace and the Applicant advised that the Terrace will be located on the roof above the Main Street Façade containing the "Woolworth" letters. Ms. Hodgson further questioned the location of utilities and related equipment and the Applicant advised that mechanical units and other equipment would not be visible from a public right of way. Ms. Hodgson asked where the parking for the 27 residential units would be located and the Applicant advised that parking is not required by the Zoning Ordinance in the Historic District. Mike Simonson asked what the proposed height of the addition will be as it relates to the existing parapet and the Applicant advised that the addition would be approximately 11 to 12 feet above the parapet on the Main Street Façade. Nik Nikolov stated that he likes the pattern of the brick between the third and fourth floor windows, but the façade could take on more texture and be set back deeper at the windows to create depth and shadows. Mr. Nikolov also questioned why red was chosen for the new window color. The Applicant responded that the red would match the color of the existing wood windows on the second floor and on the Main Street Commons Building Façade. Mr. Nikolov responded by asking if this would be too much red in one small section of Main Street. The Applicant agreed to consider a different color for the windows and come back to HARB. Connie Postupack asked if there was another way to differentiate the new windows and if the color of the new brick could speak more to the existing building. Nik Nikolov suggested that perhaps the transom window could be eliminated from the grouping of 3 windows and simplify the grouping to a combination of 2 vertically oriented window components. Mr. Nikolov also stated that he feels the new brick texture and color should be differentiated from the existing brick.

Public Comment

Dana Grubb, a Bethlehem resident, stated that the proposed design raised many issues with an existing building that is so important to Main Street and that the Secretary of Interior's Standards should apply both District wide and in a specific context such as this building and property. Mr. Grubb asked if the approval of this project, as presented, would open the door to compromising the historic character of Bethlehem. Mr. Grubb is concerned with the scope of the project and the impact it will have on this building and the Historic District.

Marsha Fritz, a Bethlehem resident, stated that setting the new Main Street Façade back from the existing façade does not make it disappear and that the rear of the proposed building addition will be visible from the Broad Street Bridge. She advised that historically, buildings were designed with a base, shaft, and capital as can be witnessed in the composition of many of the buildings on Main Street. This is what distinguishes the character of Main Street. Ms. Fritz feels that the proposed addition's shaft is not compatible with the existing building's base and the new addition does not have a capital or top. The existing building represents its time in history and represents the merchandising concepts of the time of the Five & Dime Store. Furthermore, Ms. Fritz does not feel that the red window color is appropriate in the Historic District.

AJ Jordan, Chairperson of the Allentown Historic Architectural Review Board, stated that he sees a diversity in the type of windows in buildings located in Bethlehem's Historic District, but does not see diversity in the organization, groupings, and patterns of windows in Bethlehem's Historic District.

At the completion of the Public Comment outlined above, HARB continued their deliberation. Connie Postupack asked the Applicant what they thought of the comments received thus far. The Applicant stated that no one wants to bastardize the architecture of Main Street, they appreciate HARB's comments, and they are willing to review their proposal and come back next month with a revised design. Diana Hodgson asked if the project could be done with one less floor and the Applicant stated that the economics of the project do not work with one less floor. Nik Nikolov stated that work in the Historic District is guided by the Secretary of Interior's Standards as a framework, but styles do not abruptly begin and end, they overlay, mix, and blend with each other. So, the question is how do we apply neoclassical style across various other styles in history, such as Art Deco. Is the proposed addition not different enough or is it too different? Mr. Nikolov would like the design to celebrate newness and difference, and not repetition. Mr. Nikolov asked if the first-floor storefront windows are original and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. The Applicant asked if HARB would consider a change to the color of the original first floor Woolworth façade. Connie Postupack responded that a change in the existing first-floor façade color would likely not be looked at in a positive light.

Based on the Discussion outlined above and with the consent of the Applicant, HARB agreed to table a decision on this Application and the Applicant agreed to come back to HARB with a revised Application.

Motion: *Connie Postupack made a motion to table a decision on this Application, in accordance with the discussion outlined above and the Guideline Citations outlined below.*

Second: *Joe McGavin*

Result of vote: *The vote was unanimous to table a decision on this Application, as per the motion, and with the following conditions.*

- 1. The Applicant will come back to HARB with a revised Application.*

Discussion (from 8 January 2025 HARB Meeting): *The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project. The Applicant advised that they have addressed the discussion items regarding materiality, form, mass, and scale from the December 2024 HARB Meeting and they have revised the window grouping on the Main Street Façade to be more traditional and have setback the center portion of the building an additional 18 to 24 inches. The Applicant further reviewed the new rendering for the Rubel Street Façade and the new materiality proposed for that façade. Connie Postupack asked how far the Main Street façade is set back. The Applicant advised the main façade of the Main Street Addition remains 6 feet back from the existing building façade and the center of the new Main Street façade is held back an additional 18 to 24 inches. Ms. Postupack asked if the windows on the second floor of the existing Main Street façade are being replaced. The Applicant responded in the affirmative and noted that the existing wood sash need replacement and will be replaced with Pella Clad windows. Mike Simonson asked if there are any changes proposed to the first floor Woolworth façade and the Applicant confirmed that there will not be any changes to the first floor Woolworth façade. Connie Postupack expressed her concern with the height of the proposed addition and stated that the variation in height of building facades contributes to the character of the City of Bethlehem and Main Street. Joe McGavin stated that this proposed addition and change to the*

character of Main Street will be a detriment and he is concerned with this proposed major change. Mike Simonson asked, what is the pattern on Main Street? Mr. Simonson further stated that the pattern and character of Main Street varies greatly and that there is no consistency. New additions are not supposed to match existing buildings and facades per the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The Applicant advised that the height of the building is within the zoning guidelines, the have addressed HARB comments from the December 2024 meeting, and the new design is more compatible with the surroundings. Mike Simonson stated that he prefers the brick panel design option that is presented on page 14 of the submission.

Public Comment

Connie Postupack read a letter submitted by Mary Toulouse. This letter has been attached to these Minutes.

Marsha Fritz stated her opposition to this Application stating that it violates Standards #1, #2, #3, #9, and #10 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. (See attachment to these Minutes.) Ms. Fritz expressed her agreement with the letter submitted by Mary Toulouse. She feels that the basic premise of the proposed addition is wrong, so she will not even comment on the materials or details of the Application. Ms. Fritz stated that originally colonial buildings were given priority, but we have now recognized the importance of other subsequent building styles, such as the Woolworth Building. Our buildings and neighborhoods are a product of time, place, and use. What does Main Street tell us about the history of the city? The Woolworth building represents an important retail period in our history. Ms. Fritz requested that HARB deny this Application.

Chris Carson stated his opposition to this Application. A written copy of his comments has been attached to these minutes.

The HARB agreed to recommend that Bethlehem City Council deny a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street.

Motion:

Connie Postupack made a motion to deny construction of two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street, in accordance with the discussion outlined above, the Guideline Citations outlined below, and the following citations.

- 1. Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines, page 16, Compatible Design Principles for Additions & New Building Construction, including but not limited to the following:
(1) Scale: Height & Width - Proportions and size of the addition/new building compared with existing building/neighborhood buildings.
(2) Building Form & Massing - Three-dimensional relationship and configuration of the addition/new building footprint, its walls and roof compared with existing building/neighborhood buildings.*

2. *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*
 - #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.*
 - #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.*
 - #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 historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.*
 - #10 New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

Second:

Joseph McGavin

**Additional Comment/
Discussion:**

Michael Simonson stated that the Applicant has made the revisions requested by HARB at the December 2024 Meeting and asked why HARB did not bring up the Secretary of Interior's Standards citations at the December Meeting. Connie Postupack responded that the setback of the addition was discussed at the December Meeting. Diana Hodgson reminded the Applicant that, at the December Meeting, she asked if the building addition could be reduced by one story and she was told by the Applicant that this was not feasible. The Applicant stated that HARB has had multiple opportunities for the building massing to be mentioned and it has not been brought up until this time.

Result of vote:

The vote was 3 yes to 1 no to deny construction of two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street, as per the motion.

Result of roll call vote to deny this Application.

Connie Postupack: Yes

Diana Hodgson: Yes

Joseph McGavin: Yes

Michael Simonson: No

Discussion 3/5/25: *The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project. Mr. Phillips reminded HARB that, at its meeting on 4 February 2025 Bethlehem City Council unanimously chose to return this matter to HARB for further proceedings at its discretion. In Inter-Departmental Correspondence from Council to HARB dated 5 February 2025, Council stated that, "At a minimum, the proceedings should result in the issuance of a further report to Council setting forth recommendations for changes to the Applicant's plans and specifications that would, in the opinion of the Board, satisfy conditions for protecting the distinctive historical character of the district." Mr. Phillips further advised HARB that it appears as though the Application and proposed building design have not changed since HARB's most recent review at their meeting on 1/8/25. The Applicant confirmed that the building design has not changed and that they were before HARB to discuss changes that would satisfy conditions for protecting the distinctive historical character of the district. Diana Hodgson asked if HARB could extend the review and discussion and have additional meetings related to this Application. Matthew Deschler advised that review and discussion could be extended to future meetings as long as the Applicant agrees. The Applicant's attorney stated that she felt that all HARB's previously requested revisions had been met and they are asking HARB to reconsider their previous denial. Joe McGavin disagreed with this stating that HARB had previously raised issue with the window pattern and placement, as well as bringing up and requesting that the Applicant reduce the number of floors/stories. Mr. Phillips advised the Applicant's attorney that HARB's denial was also based on much more basic design issues of mass, form, and proportion, rather than just the materials and finishes she was referencing. The Applicant's attorney stated that the building size/height is permitted. Mr. Phillips clarified that the size/height is permitted by zoning, but that doesn't mean that it is what is best for the Historic District. Connie Postupack stated that this proposal is important to the character of the Historic District and HARB wants to be sure that all parties work together to get it right.*

Joe McGavin thanked the administration for providing the documents that were provided to HARB Members before the meeting and stated his thoughts on the current Application. He stated that HARB is to consider the architectural appropriateness of an Application as stated in Article 1713, section 173.11 of the City's Codified Ordinances. He further stated that he would be referencing Preservation Brief 14 published by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Technical Preservation Services. A copy of his comments and supporting documents in total are attached to these Minutes. In general, his comments were as follows.

- *Chapter 14, page 4 states that the goal of a new addition is to preserve the existing building's historic character*
- *The historic character of each building may be different*
- *These points must be kept in mind as the Application is reviewed*
- *Chapter 14, page 12 specifically discusses rooftop additions. Page 13, Figure 24 illustrates how to evaluate sight line studies for a rooftop addition*
- *Based on this guideline, the addition should be limited to one story in the front and the setback would need to be increased due to the roofline of the adjoining building*
- *Chapter 14, page 14, Designing a New Exterior Addition to a Historic Building – This guidance should be applied to help in designing a compatible new addition that will meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.*
- *Chapter 14, pages 7 & 8 – The pattern of the windows on the addition does not tie into the base, rhythm, and alignment of the window and door openings of the historic building.*

- *Article 1713.02, page 2 – provides the definition of what buildings must comply with the Historic District regulations/guidelines as further outlined in Article 1712.11 (b) as follows. “The appropriateness of exterior architectural features which can be seen from a public street or way.”*
- *The Broad Street bridge is a public street that is located in the Historic District. Therefore, the rear of the building addition is viewable from the Broad Street Bridge and Old York Road in the Colonial Industrial Quarter and should be setback adequately so that it would not be viewed from the Broad Street Bridge or Old York Road.*
- *The materials proposed for the rear of the building are not acceptable. The materials in this location should be similar to the historic structure and compatible with the adjacent buildings as referenced in Chapter 14 and Article 1713.11 (c).*
- *Mr. McGavin noted that HARB did make an exception for a small residential addition on West Street, however, the rear of that property was only viewable from a small alley behind the property and at a distance.*
- *Mr. McGavin asked for guidance on the text included in Preservation Brief 14 that called for new rooftop additions to be set back from the existing building façade by a minimum of one full bay.*

Matthew Deschler stated that the fact that the addition is viewable from a public way in the Historic District is not sufficient reason for denial of the Application.

Connie Postupack cited page 7 of Preservation Brief 14 stating that proposals should avoid designs that combine new and existing buildings into a single whole. She further stated that she feels that the materials on the rear of the building are not appropriate and they should be compatible with the materials on the adjacent buildings. The Applicant asked how to define a setback of one full bay. Mr. Phillips acknowledged that this is unclear in the Preservation Brief and he would recommend setting the rooftop addition back as illustrated in Figure 24 on Page 13. Mr. McGavin suggested that the Applicant could locate flags identifying the location of the addition and then photograph them to show how visible the addition would be from the street. Mr. McGavin advised that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that a rooftop addition should be a maximum of one story for a building such as the existing building. Rod Young directed HARB to pages 159-160 of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. (attached to these Minutes) Joe McGavin reiterated that the materials proposed for the rear of the building are unacceptable. The Applicant clarified that they proposed the siding material on the rear of the building because the Secretary of Interior’s Standards look favorably on contrasting the new materials with the existing materials. Nik Nikolov stated that HARB’s duty is not to save money for the Applicant/Developer and that there should be an overall strategy developed for the building’s façade materials. The building does not need to be different on all sides, but should be more homogenous. Mr. Nikolov advised that HARB can give guidelines and recommendations, but cannot design the building. Mr. Deschler read text from Historic District Law and a general, spirited discussion followed. The Applicant’s attorney stated that the Applicant would like to work in good faith with HARB to reach a solution. Connie Postupack suggested the Applicant work creatively with materials. Mr. Phillips warned that focusing only on the building’s exterior materials would be putting the cart before the horse and there are more basic design issues of size, scale, massing, etc. that must be explored and addressed first. Mr. Nikolov asked rhetorically, how do we break a big building down to an acceptable scale and suggested the Applicant undertake a volumetric study. The Applicant responded that he didn’t think a volumetric study would be easily understood and that

preparing revised exterior views with materials identified would be more easily understood. Connie Postupack asked what façade material the Woolworth letters are attached to. The Applicant is unsure of the exact makeup of the material, but they are 16-inch x 16-inch panels. Mike Simonson asked HARB to give the Applicant good, comprehensive input on a direction to move forward. Mr. Simonson cited the height of the addition, the façade materials, sight lines from the street, and the height of the addition at the rear of the building. Diana Hodgson advised that she has no opinion on the South and West Elevations. Mr. Phillips asked for HARB's input on the setback of the South facing façade and advised that the guidelines recommend setbacks and delineation of old and new on all facades. HARB agreed that all new facades should be setback from the existing facades. Diana Hodgson stated that she feels no addition to the roof of the building is the best solution. The Applicant's attorney asked if HARB felt that a two-story addition could be disguised to look like a one-story addition. Mr. Phillips responded he feels that if the design can meet the height/setback and view suggestions shown in Preservation Brief 14, Figure 24, then an addition of more than one story may be something that could be considered. Rod Young stated that the guidelines say no addition, but he could support a one-story addition and is open to creative solutions. Joe McGavin recommended flagging the proposed addition and photographing the flags to determine the view of the proposed addition from the street. The Applicant's attorney stated that she feels an alternative/revised design could be prepared and asked how quickly they could come back before HARB. She was advised that the next HARB meeting is on Wednesday 2 April 2025.

During the forming of the Motion Mr. Nikolov noted differences/discrepancies in the layout of the plans and elevations that were included in the Application. The Applicant agreed that the renderings did not completely match the floor plans and agreed to update the information for the next meeting. Mr. Nikolov added that he feels the addition could perhaps be more contemporary in style and could incorporate shading devices on the façade(s) to provide more depth. Mr. Nikolov also suggested that stepping the addition back from the existing building's façades could provide roof terrace spaces that are accessible to the tenants.

Based on the Discussion outlined above and with the consent of the Applicant, HARB agreed to table a decision on this Application and the Applicant agreed to come back to HARB with a revised Application.

Motion: Michael Simonson made a motion to table a decision on this Application, in accordance with the discussion outlined above and the Guideline Citations outlined below.

Second: Diana Hodgson

Result of vote: The vote was unanimous to table a decision on this Application, as per the motion, and with the following conditions. The Applicant will come back to HARB with a revised Application. The changes to be explored in an attempt to meet the conditions for protecting the distinctive historical character of the Historic District are as follows.

1. Investigate the height of the proposed addition. HARB prefers a one-story addition, but is open to solutions that comply with Figure 24 found in Preservation Brief 14 with

and emphasis on the primary elevation of the addition that faces Main Street.

2. *Explore setbacks of the rooftop addition on the West and South Elevations that will clearly distinguish the addition from the existing building.*
3. *Explore materiality on the facades of the addition. The materials on rear façade should be more compatible with, but distinguishable from the materials on the existing and adjacent buildings.*

Discussion 4/2/25: The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, noted that this Application has previously been before HARB a number of times and asked the Applicant to review the proposed design changes. The Applicant advised that they have addressed the direction given by HARB at the March HARB Meeting and have revised the design to address; 1. The height of the addition on the Main Street side of the building in accordance with Figure 24 found in Preservation Brief #14, 2. The setbacks of the West and South facades, 3. The materials to be used on the Rubel Street façade. The Applicant advised that their goal is not to completely hide the new addition from view. They further advised that they studied a single-story addition, but it was not economically feasible. The Main Street façade of the addition has been moved back more than one full “bay” from the existing front façade. It is now setback 28’-8”. (One full bay was determined to be approximately 20’-0” by the Applicant.) The existing parapet of the Main Street façade mostly conceals the rooftop addition. The second or top story, as viewed from Main Street, has been changed to a mansard roof similar to existing buildings at 525 and 546 Main Street. This mansard roof helps to break down the scale of the new addition. Two options are presented/represented for the materials of the proposed mansard roof. The first option is a slate grey color standing seam metal roof and the second option is a composite slate shingle. There is now only one story visible from Main Street and it is disguised as a roof. In lieu of a significant setback of the addition facing Rubel Street, the Applicant is asking for approval of a material change or a minimal 1’-0” setback. The South façade, in certain areas, is now being setback between 6’-0” and 10’-0” as shown on the floor plan. Mr. Phillips asked how much of the addition’s façade will be seen from across Main Street, and the Applicant advised that it will be approximately 5’-0”. Rod Young asked if the new Rubel Street façade will be setback from the front of the existing façade and the Applicant advised that it would not and only a material change is proposed to minimize the scale of the addition. Connie Postupack asked what colors are proposed for the rear/Rubel Street façade materials. The Applicant directed her to page 17 of the red tabbed submission packet and further directed her to page 16 of the red tabbed submission packet for the view of the addition from the Broad Street Bridge. Ms. Postupack further questioned the appearance of the proposed addition’s new brick façade from Main Street. The Applicant advised that the new addition’s brick façade will not be visible from Main Street. The Applicant advised that the existing building’s parapet is as tall as a person at its center as viewed from Main Street. This parapet hides the view of a majority of the new addition. Mr. Phillips asked the Applicant what material the dormers will be sheathed in if they choose to install synthetic slate on the mansard roof. The Applicant advised the dormers will be sheathed in standing seam metal no matter the material of the mansard roof. Mr. Phillips stated that using standing seam metal on the mansard roof differentiates it from the slate shingle roof of the adjacent building. Mike Simonson questioned the window color proposed for the Rubel

Street façade. The Applicant Advised that the windows in the Rubel Street façade will be the Fossil color, the windows in the front/Main Street façade of the addition will be the Iron Ore color, and the replacement windows in the existing façade facing Main Street will be the Brick Red color. Mr. Simonson asked if the total height of the building at the rear/Rubel Street façade will be 61'-0" and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Nik Nikolov stated that he feels that the Applicant has addressed HARBs comments and recommendations from the March HARB Meeting, that he likes the mansard roof, he applauds the Applicant's effort, that the massing is proportional, the color palette is appropriate, the addition will have minimal impact on the Historic Colonial Quarter, and appreciates the way the rear façade is broken down into 3 proportional volumes. Rod Young also advised that he was pleased with the Applicants effort and solution. Mike Simonson stated that he feels the additional setback of the addition's Main Street façade works well and is successful. Joe McGavin stated that he still feels that a two-story addition is too much as viewed from Main Street when approaching from Market Street. Mr. McGavin feels the most recent revisions are better, but not perfect and that a less visible addition would be even better. Mr. McGavin is concerned that the rear of the addition is still visible from the Broad Street Bridge. However, Mr. McGavin is pleased that this façade fits in with the other adjacent buildings. Regarding the front façade of the addition, Mr. McGavin feels that upper most floor/mansard roof of the addition should not be visible from Main Street. Connie Postupack asked if the dormer roofs could be softened. The Applicant advised that roof overhangs could be added to the dormers to soften them, but they do not want to add ornament for the sake of adding ornament. Additional ornament may start to mimic and be confused with an historic architectural element. Joe McGavin asked if the two front apartments on the second floor of the addition could be removed and replaced with flat roofed balconies. The Applicant advised that these two apartments are premium apartments and the rent of the other apartments would need to be increased if these two apartments are eliminated. The Applicant's legal counsel stated that they are not required to totally hide the new addition, just create an addition that is architecturally appropriate and distinct from the existing historic fabric. Connie Postupack stated that she feels that a roof overhang on the proposed dormers will reduce the scale and height of the dormers. Joe McGavin questioned the Applicant's legal Counsel's interpretation that the Cities Ordinance governs work in the Historic District over and above the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Rod Young stated that HARB interprets the Secretary of Interior's Standards and City of Bethlehem Historic District Guidelines that say to limit highly visible additions. Nik Nikolov agreed that HARB must interpret the spirit of the Guidelines and if new additions can't be hidden, then they should be differentiated from the adjacent historic fabric. Mr. Phillips stated that he feels a happy medium or balance must be struck between historic concerns, economic development concerns, and financial concerns. Connie Postupack stated that she feels the Applicant has done a good job, but feels Joe McGavin's idea of reducing the number of apartment units at the front of the addition and adding balconies is good and should be studied. The Applicant replied that the two units being questioned are already minimally sized one-bedroom units and can't be reduced any further. A poll was taken regarding the preference for the mansard roof material and dormer roof overhangs. Diana Hodgson, Rod Young, Mike Simonson, and Nik Nikolov prefer a standing seam metal mansard roof, while Joe McGavin and Connie Postupack prefer a synthetic slate mansard roof. All HARB members agreed that a roof rake overhang of six inches and roof eave overhang of 1'-0" would be appropriate for the dormer roofs.

Public Comment

Marty Smith commented that he is in support of the Applicant's proposed design revisions and feels that they are good.

Chris Carson feels that the addition is still too tall, but agrees that great strides have been made and recommended that HARB approve the current proposed design. He also feels that it is a slippery slope when the Secretary of Interior's Standards are interpreted and urged HARB to use due caution when doing so. He also asked if the Applicant could possibly pursue Rehabilitation Tax Credits for this project.

Mary Feliciotto feels that the project has improved, but echoed the previous Public Comment and Joe McGavin's concerns regarding the height of the proposed addition.

The HARB agreed to recommend that Bethlehem City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street.

Motion:

Nik Nikolov made a motion to approve construction of two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street, in accordance with the discussion outlined above, the Guideline Citations outlined below, and with the following conditions.

1. The design shall be in accordance with the revised drawings submitted to HARB at the time of their presentation to HARB at the 2 April 2025 HARB Meeting.
2. The mansard roof and dormer material shall be standing seam metal.
3. The proposed dormers located in the Mansard roof shall have a roof rake overhang of six inches and a roof eave overhang of 1'-0".
4. Half round gutters and round downspouts in a Slate Grey color to match the standing seam mansard roof shall be installed on the proposed dormers.
5. The Applicant will submit the revised dormer design to the City of Bethlehem for review and approval by the HARB Chair, Building Code Official, and Historic Officer.
6. Building material colors shall be as submitted in the documents included in the most recent Application.

Second:

Rodman Young

Result of vote:

The vote was 4 to 2 to approve construction of two additional stories set back from the existing two-story façade that fronts Main Street and three additional stories at the rear of the building that fronts Rubel Street, as per the motion.

Result of roll call vote to approve this Application.

Connie Postupack: Yes

Diana Hodgson: No
Joseph McGavin: No
Michael Simonson: Yes
Rodman Young: Yes
Nik Nikolov: Yes

Guideline Citation: Secretary of Interior Standards No.(s)

#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.

#2 The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#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.

#5 Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

#6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

#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 historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

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

Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District – It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance, and preserve historical 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 historical interest or importance within the City.

Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines

Page 16: Compatible Design Principles for Additions & New Building Construction, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (1) Scale: Height & Width - Proportions and size of the addition/new building compared with existing building/neighborhood buildings.
- (2) Building Form & Massing - Three-dimensional relationship and configuration of the addition/new building footprint, its walls and roof compared with existing building/neighborhood buildings.
- (3) Setback: Yards (Front, Side, and Rear) - Distance of the addition/new building to the street and property lines when compared with the existing building or other buildings on the block.

- (4) Site Coverage - Percentage of the site that is covered by addition/new building compared to comparable nearby sites.
- (5) Orientation - The location of the addition/new building and its principal entrance relative to other buildings on the block.
- (6) Architectural Elements and Projections - The size, shape, proportions, and location of doors, porches, balconies, chimneys, dormers, parapets, and elements that contribute to an overall building's shape and silhouette relative to neighboring buildings.
- (7) Alignment, Rhythm, and Spacing - The effect the addition/new building will have on the existing street patterns.
- (8) Façade Proportions: Window and Door Patterns - The relationship of the size, shape, and location of the addition/new building façade and building elements to each other, as well as to other buildings on the existing building/block.
- (9) Trim and Detail - The moldings, decorative elements, and features of a building that are secondary to major surfaces such as walls and roofs and how they related to the existing and neighboring buildings.
- (10) Materials - The products with which something is composed or constructed and how they related to the existing and neighboring buildings.

Together with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, these Design Guidelines establish a framework of encouraging additions to existing buildings and new construction that are sensitive to neighboring spatial relationships, forms, and materials while differentiating new construction from historical building fabric.

Page 8: Exterior Woodwork & Siding

The HARB encourages,

- Regularly maintaining and repainting exterior woodwork including repainting, and addressing potential areas of moisture including clogged gutters and downspouts, groundwater, leaky pipes, and interior condensation
- Retaining decorative woodwork since it is a character defining element that can be difficult to replace
- Repairing smaller areas of deterioration by reinforcing or patching – small cracks and checks can be repaired with an exterior wood filler, glue, or epoxy – Loose elements can be refastened with nailing or drilling and screwing
- Selectively replacing deteriorated wood elements that are beyond repair with wood pieces that match the size, profile, exposure and pattern, and character of the historic wood element – Wood filler in the joints between the new and old wood will help provide a smooth finish
- Large scale or significant replacement of exterior wood siding with paintable material that match the size, profile, exposure, pattern, and character of the historic wood

The HARB discourages,

- Removing or encapsulating with vinyl or aluminum siding, trim, decorative features, and trim elements such as brackets, spindles, cornices, columns, posts, etc.
- Vinyl or aluminum siding over wood, brick, stone, or stucco
- Wood grained, wavy edged, vertical, and textured plywood simulated siding
- Installing non-wood trim

Page 9: Masonry & Stucco

Exterior masonry, including stone, brick, terra cotta, and stucco, provides a strong, durable, and attractive appearance with relatively low maintenance. Historic masonry walls tend to protect a building's interior from weather and act as the principal load bearing system. Aesthetically it acts as an important design feature, helping to define a building's style and add visual interest to the streetscape.

Mortar: Mortar, which bonds masonry units, was generally composed of a few ingredients: sand, lime, and water, and possibly additives such as animal hair or oyster shells. Starting in the mid-19th century, a small amount of Portland cement was added into the mix to improve the workability and hasten the setting time. In the early 20th century, Portland cement in mortar was increased, corresponding with the manufacture of harder bricks.

The HARB encourages,

- Regular maintenance, repair and selectively repointing deteriorated areas with compatible mortar in material, hardness, composition, color, joint style. Incompatible mortar is often too hard and can lead to spalling or chipping of the bricks or stones, it can also be visually mismatched.
- Installing fasteners for signs and other devices into mortar joints rather than brick or stone faces
- Installing local stone and pointing with ribbon joints

The HARB discourages,

- Using Portland cement-based mortar for repointing – it is typically too hard for most historic masonry and can result in damage, including spalling

Stucco: Stucco is a relatively inexpensive material that can provide a more finished appearance to brick, stone, or wood framed buildings. In some cases, the surface was scored to look like stone. It acts as a weather repellent coating, protecting the building from the elements including rain, sunlight, and wind, and can moderately increase its fire resistance. Stucco can also provide an insulating layer to a wall, reducing the passage of air to the interior.

The HARB encourages,

- Matching the color and texture of historic stucco when repairing or applying stucco to new construction

The HARB discourages,

- Installing stucco over brick, stone, or terra cotta walls
- Installing artificial stucco (EIFS Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems) which can trap moisture within the thickness of a wall and cause long-term damage

Masonry & Stucco Cleaning: Appropriate masonry and stucco cleaning can enhance the character and overall appearance of a building. However, improper cleaning of historic masonry can cause damage to the historic surfaces and cause more harm than good both physically and aesthetically.

The HARB encourages,

- Cleaning masonry and stucco with the gentlest means possible, typically low-pressure water, with the possible use of a gentle detergent and brushing

The HARB discourages,

- Masonry cleaning unless a building is heavily soiled
- Masonry and stucco cleaning with harsh chemicals, sand blasting, power washing over 400 psi, grinders, or metal brushes

Masonry Coatings & Paint: Water repellent and waterproof coatings, which include paint, are generally applied to prevent water from entering a masonry and stucco wall, but tend to be unnecessary on weather-tight historic buildings. Water tends to enter masonry buildings through open mortar joints, surface cracks and areas of poor or deferred maintenance. In instances where the surface of the masonry has been severely compromised, such as at sandblasted brick, the use of water repellent coatings might be appropriate.

The HARB discourages,

- Applying water repellent or waterproof coatings
- Painting of previously unpainted masonry or stucco

Page 10: Windows

The HARB encourages,

- If the applicant can demonstrate evidence of window deterioration requiring replacement, installing true divided lite replacement windows with an exterior painted finish that match the material, historic size, shape, operation, muntin pattern, profiles, and detailing to the greatest extent possible

The HARB discourages,

- Decreasing, increasing, or altering window size, shape, or operation to allow for installation of stock window sizes or picture windows
- Encasing or capping window surrounds with aluminum or vinyl
- New window openings at publicly visible elevations
- Installing tinted or colored glazing
- Installing vinyl or aluminum-clad replacement windows at window openings that are visible from a public right-of-way

Page 8: Paint

The HARB encourages,

- Hand washing with mild detergent and bristle brush, hand scraping, and hand sanding

The HARB discourages,

- Rotary tools – disks can leave circular marks and wires can tear into the surface
- Heat guns and heat plate – can ignite paint or underlying surface if left in one location too long
- Chemical paint removers – can raise grains, be expensive, and potentially volatile; runoff can be hazardous
- Flame tools, blow torches to soften paint – smoldering sparks can potentially start a fire; lead components in paint can vaporize and create highly toxic fumes
- Sandblasting – can be abrasive to surface, wear away protective exterior coating, and raise the wood grain
- High-pressure water wash – forces water into open joints affecting interior finishes and structural framing; can be abrasive to exterior surface and raise the grain

Evaluation, Effect on Historic District, Recommendations: The proposed work conforms with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines and will have no negative impact to the historic district.

There being no further business, upon a Motion by Michael Simonson, a Second by Diana Hodgson, and a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H. Joseph Phillips". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "H".

H. Joseph Phillips, AIA
Historic Officer