
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), GARY LADER (CHAIR), KENNETH LOUSH (VIA GOTOMEETING), MICHAEL SIMONSON

MEMBERS ABSENT: ROGER HUDAK, CHARLES PATRICK, DESIREE STRASSER

STAFF PRESENT: MATTHEW DESHLER, JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: NONE

VISITORS PRESENT: PLAMEN AYVAZOV, JESSE FISCHER, RANDY GALIOTTO, ANDREW GRASON, MARY KATE MURPHY, JOSEPH SHADID

MEETING DATE: JUNE 27, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on June 27, 2022, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 1200 Spring Street

Property Owner: Joseph Shadid

Applicant: George Abdouche

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a three and one-half story red brick interconnected building currently used as a senior living continuous care facility. The original historic house dates from the early 20th century and is Classical Revival in style. It served as the home of Eugene Grace beginning in 1923. Mr. Grace was President of Bethlehem Steel during the period 1913-1945 and then served as Chairman during the period 1946-1957. Constructed in 1968 to the rear of the house is the attached Holy Family Manor, with a connector with angled corner to the later McShea Pavilion.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to replace the existing slate roof and damaged gutters. The new roof will be any applicable shingle-type roof and gutter replacements are to be half-round copper. Note: this is continuation of previous discussions during HCC meeting on January 5, 2022.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Applicant appeared before HCC during January 5, 2022, meeting with proposal to remove existing slate roof and replace with new

sheathing material determined by HCC as appropriate; proposal also included intent to replace existing gutters with half-round copper gutters. At that time, Historic Officer noted applicable SIS encourage repair rather than replacement of deteriorated historic features; if significant deterioration requires replacement, new features should match original. Historic Officer also noted half-round copper gutters and associated round copper downspouts are appropriate based upon relevant Design Guidelines. Historic Officer continued that if proposal to replace existing slate roof with asphalt shingles is determined appropriate by HCC during subsequent discussion, renovations should include following details:

- new roof sheathing is GAF Slateline (non-architectural) asphalt shingles in 'Antique Slate' color; all pitched roof landscapes to receive new sheathing
- during removal of existing slate, any damaged wood should be replaced in-kind, with new ice and water shield to be installed in all valleys and gutter edges and new underlayment to be installed over decking at remaining areas
- new ridge vent detail should be installed under roof-cap shingles for proper ventilation to ensure product longevity
- new copper step flashing should be installed, as needed
- all valleys should be open and lined with copper flashing, rather than woven closed with asphalt shingles
- new metal drip edges should be installed and painted to match adjacent trim

Following discussion with Applicant, HCC unanimously adopted proposal to table decision to determine appropriateness of proposed work. HCC encouraged Applicant to consider several options before returning to HCC, including: retain existing roof, with selective slate replacements (considered in-kind repair that does not require HCC review); new asphalt shingle roof, with appropriate details described above; new composite sheathing in imitation slate aesthetic.

Current COA Application is same document referenced during previous discussion and includes no new clarifications or supplemental information aside from accompanying asphalt shingle sample. Fabricator of proposed shingle is not identified and no manufacturer's specifications (including product name, style, dimensions, color, etc.) accompany Application, so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined.

Discussion: Joseph Shadid and Jesse Fischer represented proposal to replace existing slate roof and damaged gutters. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant investigated potential for retaining existing slate shingles and only repair/replace in-kind, as needed. Applicant confirmed need for several months of investigations with qualified roofer to discern if existing slates can be retained and repaired; ultimately concluded that majority of slates require replacement, resulting in overly expensive project and suggests complete replacement with asphalt shingles as more affordable solution. Applicant confirmed provided sample is GAF Slateline asphalt non-architectural shingle in 'Antique Slate' color; continued by confirming various details described by Historic Officer will be integrated into project scope, with two exceptions: copper ridge detail rather than vented shingle ridge detail and K-style copper gutters rather than half-round gutters. Mr. Lader inquired if existing soffits and/or gable ends are vented. Applicant assumes neither soffits nor gable ends are vented; however, existing vent boxes will be reused. Mr. Evans accepted lack of vented ridge cap if other provisions for venting are included to ensure longevity of new roof. Mr. Lader requested clarification about existing venting; Applicant noted multiple box vents fabricated from sheet copper currently line roof landscape and will be reused, with any new boxes to match, as needed. Mr. Lader continued that provided asphalt shingle sample is useful, but lack of associated product information is problematic; Applicant noted that requested product specifications were submitted to City Planning Office on June 8 and agreed to forward to Mr. Simonson's attention. Applicant continued that existing gutters are 7-inch K-style (profiled) copper gutters, so new gutters will be in-kind replacement rather than half-round gutters, as suggested by Historic Officer; Mr. Long noted in-kind replacement is appropriate according to relevant design guidelines. Mr. Cornish expressed disappointment that existing slate roof will be lost but sympathized with Applicant's ultimate conclusion to replace slates with asphalt shingles; also noted HCC concerns about K-style gutters typically relate to aluminum residential gutters rather than current proposal for larger-scale gutters fabricated from copper, so such concerns are not warranted in this case. Mr. Simonson inquired about associated downspouts; Applicant noted existing rectangular downspouts are fluted and include ornate

copper straps used to fasten them to existing masonry façade; new copper downspouts will match existing in size and profile while existing straps will be reused, with new straps to match originals, as needed.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. Proposal to replace the existing slate roof and damaged gutters was presented by Joseph Shadid and Jesse Fischer.
2. Appropriate details for replacement roof include:
 - a. new roof sheathing is GAF Slateline (non-architectural) asphalt shingles in 'Antique Slate' color; all pitched roof landscapes will receive new sheathing
 - b. during removal of existing slate, any damaged wood will be replaced in-kind, with new ice and water shield installed in all valleys and gutter edges and new underlayment installed over decking at remaining areas
 - c. all valleys and ridges are open and lined with copper flashing, rather than woven closed with asphalt shingles
 - d. new copper step flashing will be installed, as needed
 - e. new metal drip edges will be installed and painted to match adjacent trim
 - f. proper roof venting is accommodated by existing copper box vents; new/replacement vents to match existing, as needed
3. Appropriate details for replacement gutters and downspouts include:
 - a. new 7-inch profiled (K-style) copper gutters to match current gutters in size and style
 - b. new fluted rectangular copper downspouts to match current downspouts in size and style; existing decorative copper straps to be reused and replacements to match originals, as needed

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 925 Prospect Avenue

Property Owner: Andrew Grason

Applicant: Andrew Grason

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a two and one-half story, detached residential building with foundations, first-floor walls and front porch details of flagstone construction. Upper-floor levels are exposed half-timber construction with stucco fields between ... some with decorative detailing. The cross-gabled roof has deep overhangs with exposed construction beams and large support brackets. Constructed ca. 1920, this structure is Swiss Chalet Arts and Crafts in style while the rear extension, with first-floor sunroom and upper-level open porch, has Classical Revival details.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to install an aluminum fence and three aluminum gates around the property's perimeter.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Applicant proposes to install new 42-inch high fencing segments and gates fabricated from aluminum components between existing flagstone pillars around property perimeter. Proposed design is inspired by aluminum fence at 1505 Prospect Avenue property and includes square pickets with finials, intermediate posts with bell caps and series of horizontal rails ... all with powder-coated finish in black color. Site plan sketch of property with proposed fence layout accompanies Application; however, no front-on (elevation) drawings of typical

proposed fence segment or gates is included. Other properties identified by Applicant as inspiration for proposed aluminum fence are located beyond boundaries of Mount Airy Historic District and not considered as contributing. Relevant design guidelines “encourage use of new materials sympathetic to historic properties in streetscape ... of similar or complementary color, size, texture, scale, craftsmanship and applicability to function performed. Traditional materials such as brick, wood, stone, terra-cotta and wrought iron are recommended.” Same guidelines continue that HCC “will not recommend vinyl, aluminum or asphalt siding ... painted or exposed concrete or concrete block, ornamental pierced concrete masonry walls and screens, chain link fencing, vinyl fencing ... aluminum columns or balusters.” Assessment of Mount Airy Historic District indicates approximately half of all properties have no fencing; half of remaining properties utilize plantings (ex.: boxwoods) to delineate property boundaries while remaining properties include brick walls and wrought iron fences, including immediately adjacent property at 1007 Prospect Avenue (directly across 9th Avenue) which has similar stone piers with simple but decorative fencing segments and gates fabricated from wrought iron. 1505 Prospect Avenue (property identified by Applicant as inspiration) is only example of aluminum fencing within District; however, City records do not indicate HCC assessment of that location ... meaning existing fence was either installed prior to formation of Mount Airy Historic District or did not experience proper reviews/permitting process. Relevant design guidelines do not recommend aluminum as appropriate because it was introduced as building material subsequent to era of interpretation of District; thus, proposed fencing segments and gates fabricated from aluminum components are inappropriate. Applicant includes addendum to COA Application describing ease of maintenance, availability of materials and economics as justifications for proposing aluminum fencing and gate components, so discussion is warranted.

Discussion: Andrew Grason and Mary Kate Murphy represented proposal to install aluminum fence and three aluminum gates around majority of property's perimeter. Mr. Lader inquired about purchase history of current property. Applicant confirmed property was recently purchased in early June; also noted personal appreciation of previous two decades living in Bethlehem's historic districts. Applicant explained new property has no fence resulting in safety concerns for young child and active dog, so proposed fence and gates address those concerns. Mr. Lader appreciated Applicant's justification for proposal but noted HCC is interested in aesthetics of fence; continued that lack of any drawings complicates requested assessment. Applicant confirmed that existing fence at 1505 Prospect Avenue is inspiration for style and aesthetics of current proposal, noting desire to take advantage of existing stone pillars; however, pillars will be re-built using existing materials to improve structural integrity and increase height to 48-inch height by also using new (recycled) stones to match existing. Mr. Lader inquired if existing pillars exhibit traces of former fence around property; Applicant confirmed existing pillars include remnants of connectors used to install previous fence. Mr. Simonson noted existing pillars vary in size ... especially in height; Applicant noted rebuilt pillars will be uniform in dimension to match height of proposed fence. Mr. Simonson continued that corner property location might trigger need for site-line variance and encouraged Applicant to cooperate with Bethlehem Zoning Officer to finalize. Mr. Simonson inquired about details of proposed fence ... specifically if individual pickets extend above top horizontal rail; Applicant noted current proposal envisions pickets that terminate at top rail but might consider extending pickets above top rail. Mr. Cornish inquired with Historic Officer about design guidelines concerning pickets. Mr. Long repeated relevant design guidelines quoted earlier in meeting ... noting picket details are not specifically described; however, all existing wrought iron fences within Mount Airy Historic District include pickets with decorative spear tips that extend above top horizontal rail. Mr. Simonson explained 48-inch height reflects maximum height allowed for street-facing fences. Mr. Cornish inquired about envisioned color; Applicant confirmed COA Application indicates black as proposed color, but current preference is steel gray, as depicted in provided inspiration photos. Mr. Cornish continued by noting HCC is tasked with encouraging Applicants to use appropriate materials identified within design guidelines; continued that original fence is now missing and proposed fence does not touch existing house so HCC might consider aluminum fence as appropriate alternative to wrought iron. Mr. Evans compared proposal for aluminum as appropriate alternative to wrought iron with previous agenda item, where asphalt shingles that satisfy specific design criteria are considered by HCC as appropriate alternative to historic slate shingles; continued by clarifying aluminum fence might be considered appropriate but vinyl or composite fences are inappropriate. Mr. Simonson agreed with Mr. Evans, noting existing pillars indicate presence of former fence, so new design proposal should also take advantage of stone pillars for installation locations. Mr. Lader expressed concern that Applicant now proposes reconstruction of pillars while COA Application offers no indication of that intent; encouraged Applicant to

further study design proposal that takes advantage of existing pillars ... noting fence and gate segments could still be 48-inches in height while pillars are lower. Applicant expressed desire to move forward with approval and installation as submitted, noting concerns about lower height of pillars and/or fence segments (safety, protection, additional costs because 42-inch fence would also be special order) and desire of fence contractor to initiate work soon.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. Proposal to install aluminum fence and three aluminum gates around majority of property's perimeter was presented by Andrew Grason and Mary Kate Murphy.
2. Appropriate details for new fence and gates include:
 - a. fence segments and complementary gates installed between stone pillars around property perimeter to be fabricated from aluminum components with steel gray factory-applied finish; fence height is maximum 48-inches
 - b. existing flagstone pillars with cast masonry caps will be carefully dismantled; salvaged stones will be used for reconstructing taller pillars in current locations to improve structural integrity and to make pillars uniform in size, with new stones and all new mortar joints to match existing; **note:** reconstructed masonry pillars are subject to city inspection, so Applicant must also file for associated construction permit
 - c. design of fence is inspired by existing aluminum fence at 1505 Prospect Avenue property; new fence segments and gates to include lower, intermediate and upper horizontal rails along with individual vertical pickets with spear tips as well as intermediate vertical posts with profiled caps
3. Applicant agreed to submit relevant details (to-scale elevation drawings indicating all critical dimensions and depicting typical fence segments as well as each gate) along with associated cut sheets and product specifications via City of Bethlehem for review by HCC Chair, Historic Officer and Chief Building Inspector prior to fabrication and installation.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3: withdrawn from meeting agenda

Agenda Item #4

Property Location: 128 East Third Street

Property Owner: Monocacy Development

Applicant: Michael Metzger, Alloy 5

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a one-story, detached, brick masonry commercial building that is partially clad in vertical metal-panel siding. It was originally constructed in the late 1800s as a three-story furniture store, but the front façade has been significantly altered and currently includes a recessed commercial entrance with contemporary storefront windows and an applied shed roof with asphalt shingles. The distinctive gable detail centered within the shed roof references previous use as an A&P grocery store. The structure experienced several rear additions so that it extends the entire depth of the block to Mechanic Street, with side and rear facades of brick masonry dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as evidenced by segmental brick arched window and door openings. Architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to construct a new, six-story, mixed-use building. The building will be clad in aluminum storefront framing, brick masonry, cement plaster and aluminum-clad wood windows.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- see Agenda Item #3
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Storefronts'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meetings in October and November of 2021, Applicant presented proposal to demolish existing, non-contributing main structure along with all rear additions and replace with new development project. Accompanying drawing sheets depicted replacement structure as six-story, mixed-use building. Proposed entry level included commercial space located at corner of East Third Street and Webster Street, with remaining square footage dedicated to support spaces for residential tenants. Proposed upper floor levels included mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments, with private terraces for select upper-level units but no below-grade basement/cellar level or on-site parking spaces. Following lengthy discussion with HCC and two public comments from private individuals not supporting proposed development project, HCC adopted proposal that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to demolish existing single-story building and construct new, six-story, mixed-use structure at 128 East Third Street was presented by Plamen Ayzov, Paul Harak and Antonio Fiol-Silva.
2. Appropriate new building includes following details:
 - a. demolish existing (non-contributing) main structure along with all rear additions and replace with new commercial and residential building; **note:** new project is contingent upon Applicant obtaining all necessary approvals and building permits for replacement structure including COA prior to issuance of demolition permit
 - b. replacement detached structure with flat roof is approx. 80-feet wide, approx. 135-feet deep and approx. 68-feet high, with no mechanical penthouse, no below-grade basement/cellar level and no on-site parking
 - c. entry level includes approx. 2,500 SF of commercial space located at corner of East Third Street and Webster Street, with remaining square footage dedicated to support spaces for residential tenants; upper floor levels include mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments totaling 55 units, with private terraces for select upper-level units
 - d. entry-level façades include glazed entrance doors flanked by display windows along with glazed transoms above, interrupted by arcades of brick piers at front (north) and at both side façades; **note:** appropriate glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
 - e. overall building mass shifts in materiality from dark brown brick to dark metal panels as front façade sets back at upper floor levels and as building turns corner along Webster Street; side (east) façade also includes decorative metal screen at entry level while remaining side (west) façade also has applied stucco
3. Subsequent COA Application should include product submittals for such details as window and door types, sills and lintels, metal panels and screens, handrails as well as cornices along with concepts for exterior lighting and overall building signage.

Motion for proposed work was approved 5-2, with Mr. Cornish and Mr. Lader not supporting motion. Both noted Historic Officer's assessment that proposed building height is inappropriate due to negative impact of six-story building on existing streetscape of one-, two-, and three-story buildings as well as based on its failure to comply with: Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with the historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment"), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District along with Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

Current submittal responds to previous COA that subsequent reviews should include assessment of proposed architectural details. However, it should be noted that Applicant's Architect of Record has changed since HCC last assessed proposed development project; with that change, certain details referenced within original COA have also changed while certain concerns originally expressed by HCC have yet to be addressed. Though conceived as one structure, overall building mass still shifts in materiality from dark brown brick to dark grey stucco panels as front façade sets back at upper floor levels and as building turns corner along Webster Street. Select individual private terraces are no longer depicted, East façade no longer includes decorative metal screen at entry level while protruding portions of West façade are now brick rather than stucco, as originally proposed. According to relevant design guidelines, brick and stucco are appropriate façade materials; however, previous design proposal of West façade included implied window openings to delineate overall wall surface while current West façade includes large areas of blank brick masonry walls with no delineations and should be discussed. Proposed rhythm and patterns of punched windows remain contemporary in style; however, overall proportions of window openings to closed façade walls have been reduced and are now more appropriate. Similarly, window openings now appropriately align vertically (amended from previous design where windows did not align vertically). Relevant design guidelines note windows should be functionally similar (such as double-hung windows) and have similar muntin or grid patterns along with expressed sills and lintels as neighborhood's historic buildings so current windows without expressed sills, lintels and muntins are inappropriate ... although overall heights of aluminum-clad wood windows have been reduced and now integrate panels within top segments of openings. Revised design also includes series of vertical louvers which were not part of previous development proposal, so discussion is warranted. Relevant design guidelines depict design components of appropriate storefronts, including apron at sidewalk level, glazed entrance doors flanked by display windows and with transoms above as well as overall sign band and cornice across full width of façade to delineate commercial entry level from residential floors above. Proposed storefront of full-height plate glass segments inappropriately recesses back from public sidewalk and is interrupted by arcade of brick piers; appropriate storefronts are also flush with exterior walls. Proposed storefront lacks lower apron, upper sign band and cornice above that typically defines entry level from upper floor levels and is inappropriate due to missing design components. Applicant should be aware that tinted, colored and reflective glazing is inappropriate. Applicant should also reference 'Guidelines for Storefronts' before finalizing components and details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, 'Guidelines for Signage' offer suggestions for building signage concepts to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals.

Discussion: Randy Galiotto and Plamen Ayvazov represented proposal to construct new, six-story, mixed-use building clad in aluminum storefront framing, brick masonry, cement plaster panels and aluminum-clad wood windows. Applicant presented product samples of proposed bricks (three different colors) as well as aluminum-clad wood casement windows. Applicant admitted building façades have been revised "to be more constructable and more appropriate within Historic Conservation District"; continued by confirming intent to submit details and products for exterior signage and lighting for subsequent HCC consideration. Applicant summarized various revisions in response to previous HCC comments; confirmed buff-color bricks are intended for East façade along Webster Street while darker bricks are intended for remaining façades. Applicant noted aluminum-clad windows and aluminum storefronts are black in color; color of proposed stucco panels is not yet finalized but brick mortar color and stucco color will match ... noting black brick façades will have differing mortar color from façades with red brick.

Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's goal from current discussion; Applicant admitted submittal includes much new information, so desire is to foster collaboration with HCC as Design Development process moves forward. Mr. Lader inquired about decorative metal screen; Applicant explained that proposed metal screen is intended as backer for required street number (address) and potentially for future signage ... more details will follow with subsequent signage submittal. Mr. Simonson inquired about dimensions of setback at upper floor levels along East Third Street façade; Applicant noted setback is approximately 10-feet. Mr. Simonson continued by inquiring if proposed windows are still recessed within overall building façade, as originally conceived; Applicant confirmed punched windows as well as storefront are indeed recessed within building façades. Mr. Evans noted missing apron detail for glass storefronts (typical detail within Historic Conservation District). Applicant noted inspiration from other nearby structures with full glazed façades, which also better accommodates potential restaurant tenants; Mr. Long noted inspiration structures are located outside boundaries of Historic Conservation District and not considered as contributing. Mr. Lader

explained benefits of apron but acknowledged such detail results in less contemporary aesthetic ... also noting compromise with similar recent Applicant, where apron was reduced in height and integrated into overall storefront assembly rather than fabricated from differing building material; Applicant expressed willingness to explore apron detail. Mr. Lader inquired about vertical louvers within façade; Applicant admitted louvers require further development but are intended to organize anticipated mechanical vents within façade to avoid perception as “after thoughts”, with subsequent submittal to include more details. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about envisioned coping detail atop parapet walls; Applicant admitted such details are pending but expressed desire to avoid parapets where possible while flat walls will terminate in heavy-gauge metal with thin profile. Mr. Simonson noted previous design submittal had significant decorative metal screen components ... specifically at street level of east façade; Applicant confirmed metal screens are now limited to signage and no longer serve as façade screens. Applicant continued that panels at tops of casement windows are metal panels that help constructability while screening interior ceiling systems; also confirmed that implied window delineations at west façade (depicted on previous design scheme) will be integrated into on-going design. Mr. Evans requested clarification about anticipated utilities and trash removal, considering proposed design has no basement; Applicant noted various mechanical rooms depicted on entry-level floor plan drawings and noted interior trash collection room to avoid exterior trash corrals. Mr. Cornish admitted desire to consider proposed materials in more detail but noted difficulty in discussing due to lack of depictions that illustrate design intent; Mr. Lader agreed that current drawings are insufficient for needed discussion which could lead to motion. Mr. Lader requested clarification about proposed buff-colored brick units; Applicant noted east façade (facing Webster Street) includes lighter bricks, which continues along rear façade and wraps around to west façade as well. Applicant also called attention to proposed brick sample that includes subtle color delineations rather than one uniform color. Mr. Lader observed that proposed bricks are intentionally contemporary and quite different from bricks within Historic Conservation District ... noting samples are smooth faced with contemporary colors and formats; Applicant agreed that product selections are intentionally contemporary in nature to differentiate from adjacent historical buildings. Mr. Cornish expressed concern about proposed contemporary bricks, noting similarity of buff-colored units to mid-20th century institutional (school) structures in Bethlehem; felt such bricks would not fit within streetscapes along East Fourth Street and Webster Street. Mr. Lader admitted that provided perspective depictions of southeast corner (day and night views) are dramatic; however, front-on to-scale elevation drawings with true color representations of proposed color schemes would be more helpful for HCC purposes ... to also include adjacent building context, if possible.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Lader and seconded by Mr. Evans adopted the proposal to table the decision to determine appropriateness of the proposed work. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to approve the current proposal and encouraged the Applicant to further develop certain details before returning to HCC, including:

- to-scale elevation drawings of each façade, including adjacent building context; indicate proposed materials as well as suggested brick colors along with accompanying mortar joint selection(s)
- clarify metal panels at top segments of aluminum-clad wood casement windows
- better understanding of vertical louvers in façades
- consider more traditional details for storefront ... especially apron detail
- potential exterior lighting and signage details, including proposed metal screen

The motion to table a decision about the appropriateness of the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Discussion Items:

Mr. Cornish expressed desire to convene with fellow HCC members outside traditional meeting format to discuss general topics; cautioned against discussing specific projects or Applicants during such meetings to avoid conflict with so-called “sunshine laws”. Mr. Lader agreed that such discussions might prove useful for instructing newer HCC members about process and procedures by longer-term members, who have more experience and more training. Mr. Simonson noted HARB has similar occasional conversations by initiating monthly meetings 30 minutes early to discuss general issues and concerns; continued that such

discussions are advertised and open to general public to avoid violation of any laws. HCC agreed to consider similar scenario for future meetings.

Mr. Cornish expressed aversion to multi-story high-rise development projects and admitted difficulty participating in subsequent discussions about architectural details when overall project is personally inappropriate. Mr. Long noted many large-scale development projects fail to garner unanimous HCC support and select projects recently denied by HCC were subsequently overruled by City Council, so other members might have similar concerns. Mr. Evans inquired if HCC might potentially submit multiple Certificates of Appropriateness for same agenda item, with each Certificate relating to different project elements and reflecting differing levels of support by individual HCC members. Mr. Long noted assistant city solicitor Mr. Deschler already departed HCC meeting, so his legal guidance is not currently possible; Mr. Simonson assumed multiple Certificates specific to one agenda item are possible and agreed to clarify with City's legal staff.

General Business:

Minutes from HCC meeting on May 16, 2022, were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, and with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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