

CITY OF BETHLEHEM

HARB CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

DATE: 3 December 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

Ken Grieshaber, Trinity Episcopal Church, 38-44 East Market Street
Joanne Gulya, Trinity Episcopal Church, 38-44 East Market Street
Ben Moderic, Alvin H. Butz Inc., 38-44 East Market Street
Stuart Johnson, Minno & Wasko Architects, 33 Walnut Street
David Gardner, Larken Associates, 33 Walnut Street
Mark Bahnick, Van Cleef Engineering, 33 Walnut Street
Bruce Haines, 63 West Church Street
Michael Bianco, Bethlehem Resident
Martin Romeril, 26 West Market Street
Ed Courier, Bethlehem Press

The 5 December 2025 meeting of HARB was called to order by Chairperson, Connie Postupack at 5:00 PM.

MINUTES

There were no comments on the 1 October 2025 Minutes and upon a Motion by Michael Simonson and a Second by Rod Young, the Minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

Item #1: The applicant/owner of the property located at 443 Center Street Wall proposes to construct a 250 S.F. raised bluestone and clay brick patio off of the West side of the residence, install a 2'-0" high retaining wall around the patio that is faced with clay brick and capped with bluestone, install a 67 S.F. bluestone and clay brick pad off of the West side of the property, and install new plantings in the rear yard.

Property Location: 443 Center Street

Property Owner: Carlisle & Andrew Krakowski

Applicant: Michael Domitrovits, Plantique

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 443 Center Street Wall proposes to construct a 250 S.F. raised bluestone and clay brick patio off of the West side of the residence, install a 2'-0" high retaining wall around the patio that is faced with clay brick and capped with bluestone, install a 67 S.F. bluestone and clay brick pad off of the West side of the property, and install new plantings in the rear yard.

Character Defining Features: This structure is a two- and one-half story stone dwelling with a cross gabled slate roof punctuated by an intersecting gable roof and gable roofed dormers. The façade, on the opposite side of the intersecting gable roof, is punctuated by an angled stone bay. Defining features include 1-over-1 double-hung windows with heavy sills. Some of the windows have arched brick heads. The house is generously adorned with ornate scrollwork and trim in the upper portions of the gable roofs and rake boards. There is a wraparound, hipped roof porch punctuated by a gable roofed entrance element facing the street. The gable end, porch posts, brackets, soffits, and rake trims are beautifully detailed with built up wood trims and cutouts. The slate porch roof is fitted with pole gutters and round downspouts. The perimeter of the property is bordered by a low, black, wrought iron fence with a gate at the entrance sidewalk.

Discussion: The Applicant was unable to attend this meeting. Therefore, no discussion took place regarding this Application.

The Applicant was unable to attend this meeting. Therefore, HARB did not make any recommendation to Bethlehem City Council regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item #2: The applicant/owner of the property located at 38-44 East Market Street proposes to construct a new elevator and tower addition at the rear of the building (South Façade).

Property Location: 38-44 East Market Street

Property Owner: Trinity Episcopal Church

Applicant: Ben Maderic, Alvin H. Butz Inc.

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located at 38-44 East Market Street proposes to construct a new elevator and tower addition at the rear of the building (South Façade). The addition will be clad with a brick veneer in style and color to match the existing brick as closely as possible. The addition will also include fixed windows facing Milton Street and square aluminum scuppers and downspouts. It appears that the new elevator tower addition will be constructed against the left side wall of the 4-story flat roofed portion of the building.

Character Defining Features: The Milton Street frontage, where the work is proposed, is characterized by two wings of the building with a small service courtyard between them. The left most wing is a 3-story gable roofed structure with arch topped service doors on the ground floor and a pointed arch window centered on the third floor of the gable end. The right most wing is a 4-story flat roofed, “boxy” structure with small rectangular windows located close to grade on the ground floor. All facades are clad in smooth red brick. While this façade is clearly the back or service side of the building, the proposed new construction will be visible from Milton Street. There is a paved parking area between Milton Street and the rear of the building.

Trinity Episcopal Church was established in 1869 as a mission of the Cathedral of the Nativity. Its first services were held in 1872. It was created to serve the North Side of Bethlehem, beginning with a Sunday school on what is now Market Street.

Discussion: The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project based on the Application package. The Applicant advised that they simply want to extend the existing brick tower and eliminate the fire escape. Diana Hodgson asked if the new addition would extend the full length of the existing wall that it is adjacent to. The Applicant advised it would not extend the full length and will end approximately 8'-0" from the end of the existing wall. Ms. Hodgson asked if the new addition would include any spaces other than a stair, corridor, and elevator and the Applicant advised that it would also include one man door at grade level for exiting. Michael Simonson asked if the new corridor and stair will pick up and satisfy the existing exiting requirements. The Applicant responded in the affirmative and advised that the existing doors to the fire escape would now enter into the new corridor. The Applicant advised that the brick proposed for the addition would be similar to the existing brick and would be Glen Gery 52DD, Cushwa Series with sand finish. Connie Postupack stated that the new brick does not have to match the existing brick. The Applicant advised that there are a number of different brick types on the rear of the building and they chose a similar brick to one of the existing brick types and color. Diana Hodgson asked if the new addition would have a flat roof. The Applicant advised that there

would be a low sloped roof that would be hidden behind the parapet. Ms. Hodgson asked how rainwater conveyance would be handled. The Applicant advised that rainwater would be conveyed to grade by two scuppers and downspouts. The scuppers and downspouts will be a brownish red color to match those on the church. Mr. Phillips asked what the material of the scuppers and downspouts would be. The Applicant advised that the scuppers and downspouts will be aluminum. Rod Young asked if there would be new windows. The Applicant advised that there will be four new windows, one on each floor, located at the end of the new corridors. The windows will be fitted with a 12 lite colonial grille pattern. Nik Nikolov questioned the height of the new parapet and Mr. Phillips asked if the new parapet will match the height of the existing brick tower or the height of the main "box" of the existing building. The Applicant advised that the parapet of the addition is proposed to match the main "box" and that the existing brick tower will be lower than the addition. Mr. Nikolov raised concern over the number of brick types. The Applicant advised that they chose to match the color of the existing brick tower as closely as possible. Mr. Nikolov asked if control joints would be installed in the brick walls as required by code and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Diana Hodgson asked if any equipment was proposed to be located on the roof of the addition. The Applicant advised that there would be no equipment located on the roof of the addition, but the kitchen hood will be relocated to the roof of the existing building and will not be visible from the street. Nik Nikolov asked what type of windows are proposed. The Applicant advised that the new windows will be Anderson 100 Series, picture windows with a white Fibrex finish. Connie Postupack asked if the proposed brick would be of individual units or larger panels. The Applicant advised that the proposed brick will be installed using individual units. Ms. Postupack asked if the mortar would match the existing color and joint profile. The Applicant responded in the affirmative and advised that the mortar color will be Colonial Tan as manufactured by Heidelberg Materials. Rod Young asked if there was any new lighting proposed. The Applicant advised that there is one new lighting fixture proposed to be located above the man door at grade. Michael Simonson asked if they would be changing any of the existing lighting fixtures and the Applicant advised that they are not. Diana Hodgson asked if the new at grade exit door would also be used as a primary entrance from the rear parking area. The Applicant advised that it would not and would be used only by those using the rear parking, would always be locked, and would be equipped with a call button. Ms. Hodgson asked what the material of the door will be and the Applicant advised that it will be a steel door painted Classic Ivory. Rod Young asked if there is any mechanical equipment proposed as part of the project. The Applicant advised that the existing window air conditioning units will be removed and that cassette type units will be mounted on the East wall and will be no more visible than the existing units. Michael Simonson asked what is proposed for the existing exhaust and the Applicant advised that it will be moved to the roof of the existing building. Nik Nikolov asked if there would be any regrading of the existing parking lot and the Applicant advised that there would be no new grading.

The HARB agreed to recommend that the Bethlehem City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new elevator and tower addition at the rear of the building on the South Façade.

Motion:

Nik Nikolov made a motion to approve construction of a new elevator and tower addition at the rear of the building on the South Façade, in accordance with the discussion outlined above, the Guideline Citations outlined below, and with the following conditions.

1. Applicable permits shall be secured by the Applicant prior to any work taking place.
2. The Applicant should consider the final height of the new parapet wall of the addition and, if possible, it should be lower than the parapet on the existing adjacent building so as to differentiate the new addition from the existing building.
3. All trim and fascia materials shall be painted Classic Ivory.
4. There will be a single lighting fixture located above the at-grade exit door.
5. Brick shall be Glen Gery 52DD, Cushwa Series, red brick in a sand finish.
6. Mortar shall be Colonial Tan as manufactured by Heidelberg Materials.
7. Windows shall be Andersen 100 Series picture windows with Fibrex finish and 12 lite Colonial Grilles, painted Classic Ivory.

Second:

Michael Simonson

Result of vote:

The vote was unanimous to approve construction of a new elevator and tower addition at the rear of the building on the South Façade, as per the motion.

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

#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 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 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.

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 adjacent to the parking garage on West Walnut Street proposes to construct a 7-story mixed-use building. The building's first-floor will contain commercial, retail, restaurant, and/or personal service spaces and the upper floors will house 105 dwelling units.

Property Location: West Walnut Street
Property Owner: Bethlehem Parking Authority
Applicant: Larken Associates

Proposed work: The applicant/owner of the property located adjacent to the parking garage on West Walnut Street proposes to construct a 7 story mixed-use building. The building's first-floor will contain commercial, retail, restaurant, and/or personal service spaces and the upper floors will house 105 dwelling units.

The proposed new building is generally described as follows:

- The design of the building façade has been divided into a base, middle, and top
 - Base: Brick veneer on floors 1 & 2
 - Brick to be Watsonstown, Fox Craft Brick – made in wooden molds to look like handmade brick
 - Middle: Combination of brick veneer & fiber cement panels & floors 3, 4, & 5.
 - Top: Fiber cement panels on floors 6 & 7
- Cast Stone cornices are located at the top of the second floor
- Brick cornices are located at the top of the fourth and fifth floors
- Cornices constructed of composite materials are located at the top of the sixth and seventh floors (must confirm material)
- Façade stepping/depth: Various elements of the façade step back and forth, horizontally and vertically, a distance of between 12” and 18”
- The seventh floor of the building steps back from the footprint of the other floors at the rear of the building (see Building Section & Sight Line Diagram)
- The seventh floor of the building steps back 7’-0” from the footprint of the other floors at the front of the building to allow for private terraces (see Building Section & Sight Line Diagram)
- Street Level Storefront System: Black Aluminum Frames and glass
- Street Level Canopies: Architectural Metal slung canopies are proposed on the West Walnut Street façade & the façade facing Main Street
- Windows in Living Units: Black Architectural vinyl window
- Window Shades: All living units to have the same window shades
- Exterior Lighting: Building mounted lighting is proposed to accent the building
- Rear Courtyard: Set back from rear property line
- Rear Courtyard Screening: 6’-0” high brick wall with landscaping in front of it
- Access Easement: Access Easement for neighboring properties has been maintained at the rear of the building
- Landscaping Buffer: A landscaped buffer is proposed between rear access drive and the building
- Mechanical Equipment Screening: All mechanical equipment will be located on the roof and stepped back from the perimeter of the roof approximately 25’ to 28’ so it is not visible from the street

Discussion: 8/13/25 *The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project based on the Application package. The Applicant reviewed the Application graphics systematically and provided a detailed overview of the proposed project as follows.*

- *Parking for the proposed building will be located in the new Walnut Street parking garage that is currently under construction.*
- *The proposed use and height comply with the zoning for this site*
- *The primary residential access will be off of West Walnut Street*
- *The entire building, on all floors, will be accessible with elevator service (total of 3 elevators)*
- *There will be a total of 108 residential units including 60 one bedroom units and 48 two bedroom units*

- *There will be interior trash chutes and collection areas*
- *The ground floor will include a boutique hotel style lobby, a coworking space, an event space for residents, and a lounge area for residents*
- *The ground floor will contain approximately 2,500 square feet of retail space*
- *The front façade of the building is aligned with the parking garage*
- *There is a wide sidewalk on West Walnut Street, of approximately 10', containing street trees*
- *The wider sidewalk areas could also accommodate café tables*
- *The rear building façade steps back from the rear of the parking garage and maintains access for the Market Street neighbors to get to their garages*
- *The seventh-floor steps back approximately 8' to 10' at the rear of the building*
- *The Applicant reviewed images of other buildings that are in and out of the Historic District to show both positive and negative examples of architectural character (These images are included in the Application packet.)*
- *The Applicant reviewed the renderings of the proposed building*
- *The first and second floors of the proposed building form a base*
- *Cast Stone is used to form both a belt line and cornice lines*
- *There is a vertical expression formed by the brick piers*
- *There is a brick sub cornice located just under the composite paneled upper floor*
- *Window heads for the residential units are set at 8'-0" above the finished floor line*
- *The floor to ceiling height in the residential units is set at 9'-0"*
- *The face of the building steps in and out approximately 12" to 18"*
- *A cornice line at varied heights is utilized to diminish the overall scale of the building*
- *The Applicant provided material samples for HARB to review*
 - *Brick: Watsontown old world brick*
 - *Mortar Color: Light tan/buff*
 - *Composite Panels: James Hardie in Iron Gray, Gray Slate, and Pearl Gray*
 - *Slung Canopies: Deep Black Color*
 - *Cast Stone: American Art Stone in color Sample #B-19 and #B-22*

Connie Postupack asked if lighting would be located on the building. The Applicant advised that any building lighting will be located at a pedestrian level only. There will be no exterior building mounted lighting on the upper residential floors.

The Applicant further advised as follows:

- *The slung canopies will receive raised dimensional cut letters and will be halo backlit*
- *The floor to ceiling dimension/height on the ground floor will range from approximately 17' to 20' as the site slopes down along West Walnut Street. The ceiling elevation will remain consistent while the floor line will step down to follow grade at the sidewalk and street.*
- *The rear of the building facing the Market Street neighbors will utilize the same building materials and details as the other building facades*
- *A 6'-0" brick screen wall will be located at the edge of the rear courtyard*

- *There will be a landscaping buffer between the building and the access drive for the Market Street neighbors*

The Applicant reviewed winter and spring views from West Market Street

- *The scale and height of the proposed building are similar to the previous parking garage*
- *The upper most floor of the proposed building is a darker color to help this floor fade into the background*

The Applicant reviewed the Building Cross Section/Site Line Diagram.

- *The building steps back at the rear to meet the maximum 75' height restriction at the rear of the property*

The Applicant reviewed the front and rear façade views and the digital material board.

- *The Applicant feels that the design conforms with the goals and objectives of the zoning for this site*
- *The Applicant feels that the building is attractive, well designed, and well scaled*

Connie Postupack asked if the same materials are proposed for the south and north facades and the Applicant responded in the affirmative stating that the height of the brick varies on the different facades. Ms. Postupack asked how far the top floor steps back at the rear and the Applicant responded approximately 10'. Joe McGavin asked if halo lighting is proposed for the building text and the Applicant responded in the affirmative stating that the halo lighting will be behind the channel cut letters located on the slung canopies and will be very subtle. Connie Postupack asked if all of the mechanical equipment will be located on the roof. The Applicant responded in the affirmative and noted that the equipment will be located approximately 25' to 28' from the roof edge. The condensing units will be approximately 42" high and will not be visible from the ground. The Applicant advised that they are willing to screen any equipment that will be visible from the ground. However, some equipment may be visible from the neighboring taller buildings. Michael Simonson asked where the proposed aluminum and vinyl windows start and end. The Applicant advised that all first-floor windows and doors will be fabricated from aluminum and glass storefront systems. The first through seventh floor windows will be aluminum clad to match the first-floor storefront system. There will be no vinyl windows used on this project. All windows will be fitted with the same integral window shades. Michael Simonson asked if all stair towers will be located on the interior of the building. The Applicant responded in the affirmative. Mr. Simonson asked if any lighting from the stairs will be visible on the exterior of the building. The Applicant advised that there will be no windows in the stair towers that will be visible from an exterior wall/façade. Nik Nikolov asked the Applicant to explain the courtyard at the rear of the building. The Applicant explained that the building is "U" shaped to allow for adequate light and air to the residential units. This building configuration creates a courtyard space on the ground floor that will be for use by building residents and their guests. Mr. Nikolov asked if there would be noise emanating from this courtyard and if it would be used as a party space. The Applicant advised that this space would be self-policed by the residents living in the units immediately adjacent to it on the ground and upper floors. In addition to this, there will be limits placed on the occupancy of the courtyard, it will be used by residents and guests only, there will be no activities by parties outside of the residents, there will be a 6'-0" brick wall at the rear of the courtyard, and there will be landscaping on the interior and exterior of the brick wall. The Applicant advised that in addition to the ground level courtyard, there will be a small amenity

space/deck located on the roof at the West Walnut Street corner. This is away from residents and neighbors at the rear of the building. Connie Postupack asked the Applicant to review the proposed ceiling heights. The Applicant reviewed the Building Cross Section and advised that the living units will have 9' ceilings with window heads at 8'. The ground floor will have ceiling heights of a minimum of 10' on the uphill end of the building and approximately 17' to 19' on the downhill end/corner of the building. Ms. Postupack advised that she is a little concerned with the overall height of the building. She feels that it is pushing the envelope a bit from a height standpoint. The Applicant stated that they do not think that the height is inappropriate based on the zoning allowance of a 150' tall structure. The Applicant noted that the facades are designed with quality materials that are detailed and expensive to build, the façade steps comfortably to create a sensitive scale and massing, and the building meets the zoning requirements for this site. Joe McGavin asked if 18 residential units would be lost if the height of the building was reduced by one floor and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Diana Hodgson stated that HARB was opposed to the massing and height of the adjacent parking garage. Joe McGavin stated that if you are walking up West Walnut Street, and the height of the building was reduced, you would be looking at the flat, blank façade of the parking garage. Diana Hodgson stated that the building design is stunning, but it is too tall. Connie Postupack agreed. Michael Simonson asked why some HARB members thought the building was too tall if it matches the height of the parking garage. Joe McGavin reiterated that if you reduce the height of this building, you will be looking at the bare wall at the top of the parking garage. The Applicant advised that at one point the proposed building design was a total of ten stories but was reduced to seven stories as presented in this Application. The height is now on the edge of financial feasibility. If the building is too small, it can't carry the cost of the required staffing. The Applicant pointed out that the eye is drawn to the cornice line at the fifth floor. This doesn't change the overall height, but it does change how the height of the building is read/perceived from the street. Joe McGavin stated that if you are looking to have a certain level of design and class of building, reducing the height of the building will require the overall cost of the building to be reduced which will result in reducing the quality of the building materials, the quality of the design, and the quality of the building details. Mr. McGavin agreed that we don't like the design of the parking garage, but it is already there. Connie Postupack agreed with the economic concerns and raised a concern that there are a couple of other similar buildings in the city that are not fully occupied. Michael Simonson stated that the fact that one building is not occupied has no bearing on the design and look of this building. Rod Young recognizes that a lot of thought was put into this building and loves the design. However, Mr. Young is not fully on board with the building's height as it will be the second tallest building in the Historic District, so he is struggling a bit with the size. Mr. Young also noted that in the Applicant's presentation the other examples of the tall buildings in the area, with the exception of the Hotel Bethlehem, were all buildings outside of the historic district. Joe McGavin feels the building design is beautiful and reducing its height will only make the parking garage more visible. Nik Nikolov stated that this building is located on the border/edge of the Historic District and feels that this building communicates more with buildings that are outside of the Historic District, not the buildings that are in the Historic District. He feels that this is a positive aspect of the design. Furthermore, Mr. Nikolov feels that the building is well scaled and broken down on the Historic District side. This side of the building is not designed like the back end of a building. The south façade is as rich as the north façade. The building is appropriately designed. Unfortunately, this building is in the

shadow of the tainted history of the parking garage. Connie Postupack asked if the Applicant could reduce the height of the building without destroying the look of the building.

Public Comment

Melis Carroll – Kaleidoscope Collective

Ms. Carroll stated that she used to live in Payson House Condominiums and that she owns a business on Guetter Street. She feels that Guetter Street is a forgotten street and that the new retail spaces proposed for this building and the parking garage are exciting. These new retail spaces will draw people up Guetter Street and past her business. She applauds this project and is looking forward to it.

Bruce Haines – 63 West Church Street

Mr. Haines indicated that his concern lies in the fact that this new building will be located in one of the most authentic Historic Districts in the nation and he feels that the sixth and seventh floors are too tall. He feels that the city is being disrespectful to the Historic District by allowing the zoning for this type of development to take place. Mr. Haines stated that on the East side of Main Street there are no buildings taller than three stories. He feels that if the proposed building stopped at the top of the fifth floor it would still be a beautiful building. He stated that the height of the proposed building looks more like it should be located in Allentown, not Bethlehem. He doesn't think the height of this building is appropriate for Bethlehem. He advised that the only reason Hotel Bethlehem is nine stories is the fact that it was built at a time when cities were trying to entice tourists traveling by automobile to visit them and stay the night in them. He stated that some of the example projects shown by the Applicant were not located in the Historic District. He further stated that the new parking garage is five stories, and the proposed building is seven stories. He urged HARB to preserve and protect the integrity of the Historic District.

Doug Leidl – 77 West Broad Street (owner of Payson House Condominiums)

Mr. Leidl stated that HARB's job is to protect the Historic District. He disagreed with the Applicant's statement that the proposed building is the same height as the parking garage. It is not the same height and is higher than the parking garage. He also commented that the city should not have been stuck with the height of the new parking garage and stated that we are not stuck with the height of the proposed building. He also commented that no one would have accepted the Applicant's previous design for a ten-story building. He feels that the Applicant should stick to a five-story height that is similar to the parking garage height.

Paige Van Wirt – 42 West Market Street

Ms. Van Wirt stated that the city approved the parking garage because of pressure from the Parking Authority who needed a functional garage to satisfy the area's parking needs. She feels the building is beautifully designed but is nevertheless too tall. She understands that the Applicant is doing what is logical to them, but this building's design must be treated carefully since it is located in an important buffer zone between the Historic District and non-Historic District. Ms. Van Wirt feels that the height of the proposed building should be decreased by a minimum of one story.

Marty Romeril – 26 West Market Street

Mr. Romeril stated that he appreciates the Applicants endeavors to minimize the impact to the Historic District and that the Applicant is not at fault for this project on this site. He feels that the property was improperly rezoned years ago to allow this type of development. He wishes the building would be smaller and feels that City Council has already approved this project in its mind. Mr. Romeril also stated that the Parking Authority has not talked to all of the neighbors on Market Street regarding this site. Lastly, Mr. Romeril questioned why the statement regarding the ability to submit questions and comments regarding an Agenda item in advance of the HARB Meetings is no longer included on the Agenda published on the city's website. Mr. Romeril feels that this practice should be reinstated so that residents who are unable to attend a HARB Meeting can share their questions, comments, and concerns.

There being no other residents wishing to speak, the Public Comment Session was closed.

The Applicant advised HARB that they would like to take some time to think about the input received, as well as possible potential design revisions and come back for further discussion at a future HARB Meeting. The Applicant feels that they may be able to step the top of building back on the West Walnut Street side, similar to the way the top of building steps back in the rear. Connie Postupack asked if there was a treatment that the Applicant could propose for the façade on the end of the garage building that would be exposed if the height of the Applicant's building was reduced. The Applicant advised that the parking garage building is not their building, therefore there is nothing the Applicant can do to modify its façade. Diana Hodgson asked if the sixth and seventh floors could be eliminated altogether. The Applicant advised that they likely will not be able to do that. The Applicant advised that they probably will not be able to make it back to the September HARB Meeting and will shoot for coming back to HARB at their October Meeting.

Recommendation to Bethlehem City Council regarding issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

There was no action taken regarding this Application since the Applicant agreed to come back to HARB with a revised design at a future meeting.

Discussion: 12/3/25 The Historic Officer, Joe Phillips, gave an overview of the project based on the Application package. The Applicant ran through a new presentation of drawings that is dated 7 November 2025. The Applicant advised of the following.

- The ground floor has remained essentially the same as the previous submission
- Floors 2 through 6 have remained essentially the same as the previous submission
- Floor 7 has been revised to provide private terraces at all sides
- The Walnut Street side of the seventh floor has been set back approximately 7'-0" from the face of the rest of the building.
- The number of units has been reduced from 108 to 105
- The unit count is as follows.
 - The current number of one-bedroom units has been increased to 67 from the previous 60

- The current number of two-bedroom units has decreased to 38 from the previous 48
- The Applicant feels that the building will appear as six stories since the eye will be drawn to the cornice line at the top of the sixth floor and the seventh floor will fade away since it is stepped back from the main body of the building on all sides.
- The Applicant reviewed a site line diagram that they prepared showing the site lines from Main Street. The Proposed building will not be visible from the sidewalk on Main Street except for the view up Walnut Street from Main Street.
- The Applicant reviewed the existing context slides as viewed from Guetter and Walnut Streets and reiterated that the eye will be drawn to the cornice line at the top of the sixth floor and the seventh floor will fade away since it is stepped back from the main body of the building on all sides.
- The proposed building materials remain the same from the previous submission
- The Applicant feels that the aesthetics of the building are appropriate for its context
- The Applicant reviewed a new perspective drawing from the intersection of Guetter & Walnut Streets, looking toward the parking garage, and feels that the proposed building maintains the massing of the garage and compliments the parking garage.
- The Applicant reviewed a perspective drawing looking up Walnut Street from Main Street and feels the proposed building reads as a 6 story building.
- The Applicant reviewed a perspective drawing looking East from West Walnut Street and stated that the seventh floor is largely not visible.
- The Applicant stated that the new Parking Garage now provides context for the proposed building.

Michael Simonson asked if the seventh floor was now set back 7'-0" on the West Walnut Street side of the building and 12'-0" from the rear of the building and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Mr. Simonson asked what the distance is from the rear property line to the rear of the building at the interior of the courtyard and the Applicant advised that it was approximately 70 feet. Therefore, if the seventh floor is set back another 12 feet, then it will be approximately 82 feet from the rear property line to the face of the seventh floor at the rear of the proposed building. Joe McGavin asked what the proposed building height will be relative to the height of the old/previous parking garage. The Applicant advised that the previous parking garage was approximately 71 feet high and the height of the proposed building will have an average height from grade of approximately 88 feet. The new parking garage tower is just slightly higher than the top of the parapet at the seventh floor of the proposed building. The previous parking garage ended approximately 45 to 50 feet away from the Westerly property line that is closest to Main Street. The Proposed building will end approximately 25 to 30 feet from the same Westerly property line. Since the ground level drops from East to West, on West Walnut Street, the proposed building will be taller than the previous parking garage because it is located further down grade. The height of the sixth floor at the Westerly end of the proposed building is approximately 72 feet. Michael Simonson asked if the sixth-floor cornice will be located at approximately the same height as the previous parking garage stair tower and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. The Applicant advised that the sixth-floor

cornice is actually lower than the new/current parking garage tower and the Westerly offset of the proposed building is in approximately the same location as the old parking garage and was positioned to respond to the bend/turn in West Walnut Street. Connie Postupack stated that she visited the site in the afternoon and West Walnut Street was very congested with school buses, delivery trucks, and cars. There is also a dumpster enclosure that is located at the edge of the Sun Inn Courtyard and adjacent to West Walnut Street. Ms. Postupack questioned whether the proposed building footprint could be stepped back to alleviate this congestion on West Walnut Street. The Applicant responded that stepping the footprint of the building in this location would not alleviate the congestion that is caused by the existing West Walnut Street configuration and that street congestion is a tangential but separate issue. The Applicant stated that the design of the new parking garage's blank wall anticipated a new building that would be constructed to screen the blank wall of the new parking garage. Michael Simonson advised that the matter of street congestion and traffic will be part of the review that is done during the land development process. Nik Nikolov stated that HARB finds itself in a strange situation that started with the demolition of the old, unfriendly parking garage building and now the design of the new parking garage has set a precedent that HARB did not approve. Mr. Nikolov stated that he appreciates the seventh-floor step back and the courtyard adjacent to the Market Street neighbors, and he feels that the Applicant has shown good will in coming back with a revised design. Furthermore, he feels that the Main Street facing façade will be the most active façade of the building and is appropriately designed.

Public Comment: 12/3/25

Bruce Haines – 63 West Church Street

Mr. Haines reminded all present that he spoke at the last meeting about the character and importance of Main Street and that Main Street is the essence of the Historic District. Mr. Haines asked the Applicant to show the slide of the West Walnut Street view. He noted that Main Street has primarily 3 and 4 story buildings and that the proposed building is taller and closer to Main Street than the previous parking garage. Mr. Haines feels that the proposed design is 1 to 2 stories taller than the old parking garage. Mr. Haines doesn't feel that HARB can approve a building design that is taller than the parking garage that it did not approve and will be located closer to Main Street than the old parking garage was. He feels that it is disrespectful that the Applicant did not reduce the proposed building's height to five stories.

Michael Bianco – Center Street

Mr. Bianco asked if the main difference between this design and the previous design is that the seventh floor is stepped back on the West Walnut Street side of the building and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Mr. Bianco asked if there is now a patio provided for the units on the West Walnut Street side of the seventh floor and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. Mr. Bianco asked if a railing for these patios would be seen from the street and the Applicant stated there would not be a railing visible from the street. Mr. Bianco asked if umbrellas would be allowed to be located on the seventh-floor patios. The Applicant advised that the leases would likely not allow umbrellas and other patio furniture to be visible from the street. Mr. Bianco asked if the proposed building materials

have changed since the previous presentation and the Applicant advised that they have not. Mr. Bianco stated that he agrees with Mr. Haines regarding the massing and height of the building and feels that the height of the proposed building should be reduced to five stories.

Martin Romeril – 26 West Market Street

Mr. Romeril stated that two years ago he asked if the new parking garage would have fall protection to prevent falls and suicides, did not receive an answer, and there is no fall protection on the new parking garage. Mr. Romeril reminded HARB that City Council voted against HARB's decision on the design of the new parking garage. Mr. Romeril thanked the developer for trying to go through the proper process for review and discussion of the architectural features and materials of the proposed building. Mr. Romeril asked if the general public will have access to the courtyard. The Applicant advised that the courtyard will be private to the building residents, will be screened from the neighbors at the rear of the building by a brick wall and plantings, will not include a swimming pool, and will be self-policed by the residents. Mr. Romeril further stated his disappointment that there is no privacy screen at the top of the new parking garage.

There being no further public comment, HARB continued its discussion.

Joe McGavin stated that the height of the proposed building was set when the new parking garage was approved and reducing the height of the proposed building will expose the blank flank wall of the new parking garage. Rod Young asked if the proposed building could be stepped down from the parking garage toward Main Street. Joe McGavin stated that stepping the building like a stair from East to West would look strange. Mr. McGavin also feels that there are economic issues related to reducing the number of apartment units and if the building height is reduced, the cost of construction must be reduced and would result in less expensive, lower quality materials that will not look good. Mr. McGavin stated that if built at the proposed height, the building must be built using quality materials that are currently being proposed. Connie Postupack stated that she is impressed with what the Applicant has done but feels if the building is built as proposed it will feel very heavy, especially from Main Street. Diana Hodgson advised that she would not let the blank wall of the new parking garage govern decisions being made regarding the proposed building and she feels the building as proposed is too tall for the Historic District. Mike Simonson reminded HARB that if the Application is denied, HARB must provide specific reasons and provide direction to the Applicant on what revisions may result in approval. Connie Postupack stated that a new building must maintain the character of the Historic District. Mike Simonson feels that the proposed building will maintain the character of the Historic District and the new parking garage is now part of the context in which the new building will be viewed. Joe McGavin stated that HARB requested the Applicant to reduce the number of floors at their previous presentation. Mike Simonson asked if HARB asked the Applicant to decrease the number of floors or decrease the massing of the building. Joe McGavin responded that the Applicant was specifically asked to reduce the number of floors. Connie Postupack read sections of the Historic District Guidelines related to "Massing" and "Street Wall". Diana Hodgson read HARB's direction from the Meeting Minutes of the previous meeting at which the Application was reviewed and discussed. Rod Young stated that it occurs to him that the conversations taking place at this meeting are

related to the height of the new parking garage and not the proposed building's relationship to other buildings in the Historic District. Connie Postupack stated that the proposed building should be reviewed as to how it appreciates the street, location, and area.

The Applicant stated that the building's materials are contextual and that in any downtown, you will get glimpses of other buildings when looking down one street from another. The Applicant further stated that the proposed building is not viewable from Main Street, it is appropriate, and it is located in a transitional area at the edge of the Historic District. Nik Nikolov appreciates that the proposed building does not encroach on the West Market Street neighbors and called attention to the cross section through Main Street. Mr. Nikolov questioned whether stepping the building as viewed from Main Street would really have an impact on the majority of Main Street. He feels that stepping the brick cladding down as shown in the renderings visually reduces the height and massing of the proposed building. Connie Postupack reiterated her concern regarding the density of people that use West Walnut Street, including Donegal Square, the school, and the Sun Inn Courtyard and feels that the proposed building should not be so in your face when viewed up West Walnut Street from Main Street. The Applicant reminded HARB that the location and width of the existing sidewalks does not represent what is proposed. The proposed sidewalks have been increased from 5 feet wide to 10 feet wide and there are other street improvements proposed. Connie Postupack asked if the existing parking lot at the West end of the site will be removed and the Applicant responded in the affirmative. The Applicant stated that they are trying hard to respond to HARB but they can't reduce units and still make the economics work. The Applicant further stated that the corner of the building on West Walnut Street as viewed from Main Street seems to be HARB's main concern. However, the Applicant needs HARB to agree on this so that they can move in a positive direction to revise the design. They don't want to spend time and money unless HARB is clear and in agreement. The Applicant stated that perhaps they could devise a solution to provide a 6'-0" setback at the sixth floor. Nik Nikolov would like to see this to compare it to the current design but is afraid that a 6'-0" setback may not provide the result HARB is looking for. Connie Postupack advised the Applicant that there is no need to prepare expensive renderings and that design sketches would suffice. The Applicant is concerned that if they need to reduce floors, they may not be able to use the same materials and HARB will not get the beautiful building depicted in the current renderings. The Applicant confirmed that the new parking garage tower is 81'-4 3/4" high and the top of the proposed building at the seventh-floor parapet is 82'-0". Mr. Phillips advised HARB that they need to provide the Applicant with clear direction on design revisions or they need to make a motion to approve or deny the current Application. The Applicant stated that they prefer if two thirds of the units are 2 bedrooms and one third of the units are 1 bedroom. The Applicant advised that they are willing to come back with a revised design if HARB agrees that the focus should be on the West end of the building as viewed up West Walnut Street from Main Street. Mike Simonson stated that the height of the proposed building is not much different than the height of the old parking garage and the height at the Western corner of the proposed building does not concern him. Nik Nikolov stated that focusing on the corner of the proposed building may not provide a solution to the bigger picture of the overall building design. Mr. Nikolov feels that the Applicant has made great strides. He feels that

the masterplan for the new parking garage was ill-conceived and that the big picture is out of HARB's hands. Mr. Nikolov appreciates the Applicants willingness to keep tweaking the design, but if they want HARB to vote, he is willing to do so. His opinion is that a 6'-0" setback on the West end of the building will not make a big difference, but he is willing to take a look at it and compare it to the present design if that is what the majority of HARB Members would like. Rod Young advised that he has been a HARB Member for 7 or 8 years and he is struggling with this decision. The Applicant has been wonderful in their preparation and presentations. Mr. Young is not struggling with the view up West Walnut Street from Main Street but feels that each tall building sets a precedent for the next tall building and questions when this creep of tall buildings will make its way down to Main Street. Mr. Young stated that he is very much on the fence regarding the building as proposed. Diana Hodgson stated that the proposed building is aesthetically beautiful but is still way too massive. She feels that even if the building is stepped down 2 stories at the West end, it will still be too massive. Ms. Hodgson agrees with Mr. Nikolov that even if the building is stepped back 6'-0" on the sixth floor at the West end, it may not be enough. Joe McGavin doesn't feel that HARB would be setting a precedent if the proposed building height was approved. Mr. McGavin feels that the building is beautiful but the rendered view from Main Street makes it look massive. He sees value in the Historic District as a Realtor. It is what draws people to Bethlehem. He would be afraid to vote no for fear of what would come next. Mr. McGavin feels that the building is beautiful and the Applicant has been wonderful to work with. He doesn't know if a 6'-0" set back on the West end of the building would be enough but he would like to see it. Mr. McGavin questioned the accuracy of the height of the Red Stag Building as depicted in the Applicant's rendering. Connie Postupack stated that she agrees with a lot of things that other HARB Members have said and as an interior designer she can see things spatially. She feels this is a tough decision because of the previous parking garage review and approval scenario. She feels that exploring the design of the West end of the building may be just another exercise, but it is worth the effort. She stated that when we are pushed to explore things further, we just might come to a "that's it solution". Ms. Postupack feels that the proposed building can bridge the gap of the differences in the communities in which it is located and would love the Applicant to come back with a revised design if they are willing. Mike Simonson reiterated that HARB needs to provide the Applicant with clear direction. Joe McGavin stated that the Applicant should take another look at the height and massing of the West end of the building. Nik Nikolov agreed that it would be helpful to see an alternative design for the top three levels of the West end of the building. He also feels that after the Applicant returns with the revised design, HARB will need to take a vote to approve or deny the Application. The Applicant asked when the next HARB Meeting is scheduled for and was advised that it is 7 January 2026. Mr. Phillips expressed his willingness to provide relief to the normal submission deadline and stated that he could review the revised submission if it is provided to him no later than one week prior to the HARB Meeting. The Applicant advised that they are willing to take a look at a revised design and would make a submission as soon as possible after New Years.

Recommendation to Bethlehem City Council regarding issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

There was no action taken regarding this Application since the Applicant agreed to come back to HARB with a revised design at a future meeting.

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.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic District, Recommendations: Conformance with the intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Bethlehem Historic District Design Guidelines, as well as the impact to the historic district is to be determined when formal action is taken.

There being no further business, upon a Motion by Connie Postupak, a Second by Diana Hodgson, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



H. Joseph Phillips, AIA
Historic Officer