
M I N U T E S

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: TODD CHAMBERS, CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), GARY LADER (CHAIR)

MEMBERS ABSENT: MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER

STAFF PRESENT: LAURA CLIFTON (ASSOCIATE TO HISTORIC OFFICER), DARLENE HELLER (PLANNING DIRECTOR), JEFFREY LONG (HISTORIC OFFICER)

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)

VISITORS PRESENT: J.J. FINES, JOSEPH FITZPATRICK, FRANK FOX, ANDREW GEHRINGER, JOEY KUBUSHEFSKI, MARC KUBUSHEFSKI, JOSEPH MCCARTHY, JOAN MORYKIN, ANTHONY SEITZ, MARYLOU SEIXAS, WILLIAM SEIXAS, MARK WAGNER

MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2024

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on October 21, 2024, at the City of Bethlehem Town Hall Rotunda, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 14-36 West Third Street

Property Owner: Patriot Ventures, LLC

Applicant: High Hotels, LTD

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: 14 West Third Street is a 3-story, 2-bay brick masonry structure with flat roof that dates from ca. 1890 while 16-18 West Third Street is a similar three-story, four-bay brick masonry structure with flat roof that dates from ca. 1905. Both are late Italianate in style and comprise the central portion of what was originally an entire block of similar structures along West Third Street constructed between 1885 and 1910, each with business locations at the entry level and residential units on the upper two levels. 14 West Third Street is attached to a non-contributing contemporary 6-story commercial structure to the east while 16-18 West Third Street lost its neighbor to the west and is now an end structure. Original entry-level storefronts of both structures have been manipulated over time and now include recessed entrances and contemporary storefront windows with oversized frames and simple aprons. Both structures have similar cornices and glazed transoms above the storefronts, with mid-twentieth century glass blocks installed at 14 West Third Street and early (if not original) leaded glass installed at 16-18 West Third Street. Brick pilasters at 14 West Third Street frame the facade and lead to an upper decorative cornice. The second-floor level has two very large, 14-over-1 double-hung windows topped with segmental brick arches while the third-floor level has three, 8-over-1 double-hung windows topped by jack arches that support the upper decorative cornice. The simpler brick façade at 16-18 West Third Street includes four, 2-over-2 double-hung windows with flat masonry lintels at each floor level and terminates in a decorative upper cornice with stepped parapet. The end wall was not constructed as an independent façade, so removal of the adjacent building compromised its integrity and necessitated installation of wood-frame shoring as lateral bracing, which is visible along the west façade.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant is returning to HCC with revisions to an 8-story structure previously approved in June of 2021. The proposed building now hosts a hotel use rather than ground-floor commercial storefronts and multi-family residential dwellings above. Façade revisions include window sizes

and placements, addition of rooftop dining space, structural canopy at the lobby entrance and other material changes.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines** -- relevant sections concerning 'New Construction' (pp. 8-12): HCC encourages new construction that "(preserves) the cohesive ambiance of the Historic Conservation District with compatible, sympathetic, and contemporary construction, ... (matches) setbacks of adjacent buildings on a streetscape and (has) compatible siting, proportion, (size and) scale, form, materials, roof configuration, details and finishes"; also should address such concerns as shape and massing, rhythm and patterns, window and door openings, materials and textures, architectural details as well as streetscapes.
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines for Storefronts'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to revise various architectural details associated with previous design solution that was presented to HCC during series of meetings in 2020 and 2021, and ultimately resulted in HCC motion recommending that Bethlehem City Council deny Applicant's request to demolish two existing historic structures and replace with 88-foot high mixed-use building during April 19, 2021, meeting. HCC's motion was overruled by City Council on June 1, 2021, and Applicant was subsequently issued COA in support of proposed development project, including demolition of both historic structures. New Owner (Patriot Ventures, LLC) and new Applicant (High Hotels, LTD) appeared before HCC on September 16, 2024, with revised design for same location that still involves demolition of both historic structures. Following assessment of revised proposal by Historic Officer, HCC conducted lengthy discussion with Applicant to understand project in more detail. During that discussion, HCC made various suggestions for improvement, including:

- potential to salvage and reuse select elements of existing historic structures scheduled for demolition; if not possible, existing structures should serve to define or delineate new design by paying homage
- HCC is more amenable to taller structures if upper floor levels are set back to mitigate overall building height
- upper (hotel) floor levels should have more and narrower setbacks, noting smaller-scale recesses every 30-linear feet are more successful than fewer recesses every 50-linear feet
- differentiate portions of façade by using differing brick colors or other appropriate materials
- entry-level kitchen and support services take up more than half of West Third Street storefronts, resulting in overall façade that is not active for passersby
- end tower element seems very narrow without any real massing
- revise window proportions, with potential for two vertical mullions (rather than just one)
- indicate locations of visible HVAC louvers to ensure orderly placements
- EIFS for rooftop elements might receive support as appropriate façade material if subsequent submittals include defined joints and other relevant details

During Public Commentary portion of meeting, City Planning Director Darlene Heller expressed departmental support of proposed project while also noting that, as this project moves forward, improvements at nearby Greenway should occur simultaneously. With all parties in agreement, HCC

offered no motion for City Council consideration; rather, Applicant agreed to consider suggestions made by HCC and Historic Officer before returning with revised COA Application that responds to various concerns. Current COA Application represents Applicant's revisions to design proposal by responding to select suggestions made by HCC. Provided supplemental materials are labeled "Conceptual Design", so resulting assessment is general in nature as well. Applicant previously confirmed that proposed structure is limited to hotel use and height of revised design is 96-feet, representing two significant changes to "88-feet high mixed-use development" that was approved by City Council's decision to overrule HCC's recommended denial. Applicant justified need to extend height above previously approved 88-feet height to accommodate proposed rooftop bar, which necessitates extending two stair towers up to 96-feet to accommodate required emergency egress; corner tower element is also raised to 96-feet as screen for rooftop mechanical systems. Should HCC recommend current design proposal for City Council approval, these two revisions must be captured within resulting motion.

Upper-most floor levels facing West Third Street of previous Applicant's submittal were set back significantly from main façade in deference to similar setback at adjacent corner structure while current design solution does not respect that feature, so discussion is warranted. Previous Applicant's design proposal also had one taller end section facing convergence of West Third Street and Greenway while current design has series of rooftop elements that match new height of taller end section along with usable rooftop area with trellis system and glass railing system in between, so discussion of these new details is also warranted. New single-story curvilinear canopy extends out from proposed structure facing convergence of West Third Street and Greenway, which also warrants discussion.

Current design proposal appropriately aligns with setbacks of existing buildings at street level along this block of West Third Street. Current design also appropriately mitigates overall width of 204-feet and 6-inches along West Third Street and overall width of 224-feet along Greenway by integrating vertical divisions at entry level through use of pilasters between storefronts. Current design also appropriately includes lower cornices above storefronts; however, previous Applicant included cornices that varied in heights and depths to give impression of smaller-scale building segments, so current Applicant may wish to consider such details, as well. HCC previously encouraged current Applicant to include more and narrower setbacks for upper-level (hotel) floor levels to better relate with scale of existing historic structures; however, revised proposal retains original design that only steps back twice along West Third Street, resulting in building segments (from east to west) with widths that measure 16-feet and 9-inches, 50-feet and 9-inches, 76-feet and 9-inches, 31-feet and 9-inches and 28-feet and 6-inches, respectively. Upper-level setbacks inappropriately misalign with select vertical divisions at entry level that are now delineated with pilasters, so revisions are encouraged to correct this issue. HCC's recent suggestion to use bricks of differing colors to help differentiate façade segments of proposed structure is not evident in current design proposal. When compared with initial design proposal, Applicant also did not reconsider massing of end tower with current design, so discussion is warranted. Proposed porte cochère (carport) located at western end of site is intended as main drop-off location for passenger vehicles; includes large-format masonry units and wrapped with metal panel system while ceiling also has metal panels.

Aluminum storefronts with canvas awnings and open ends at entry level along West Third Street and facing Greenway are appropriate in concept, pending subsequent submittal of larger scale drawings indicating relevant dimensions along with material samples and associated specifications; appropriate storefront panels should be center set while appropriate glazing is clear and not tinted, colored or reflective. Applicant is encouraged to reference relevant Design Guidelines for appropriate storefront details ... including apron below, transom above, sign band with cornice, etc. Proposed brick masonry facades with precast sills and lintels are appropriate according to relevant Design Guidelines, pending subsequent submittal of larger scale drawings indicating relevant dimensions along with material samples and associated specifications; depicted sills and lintels appropriately extend in each direction beyond window openings. Proposed window types and certain proposed window locations are not typical of windows found within Historic Conservation District (HCD), so they are inappropriate based upon relevant Design Guidelines; appropriate windows have placement, size, scale, divisions, functionality, etc. typical of windows found elsewhere within HCD ... preferably inspired by details of two existing historic structures scheduled for demolition. Placements of entry-level storefronts, at least along West Third Street, appropriately align with bays of windows above. Provided drawings do not indicate proposed material of windows, so discussion is warranted ... noting that

relevant Design Guidelines identify vinyl windows as inappropriate while appropriate glazing is clear and not tinted, colored or reflective.

Provided drawings depict series of precast “banding” and cornice mouldings; more details along with material samples and scale drawings are needed before appropriateness can be determined. Provided drawings also propose Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS) as cladding for select upper façade elements and upper cornice. Relevant Design Guidelines identify EIFS as inappropriate within HCD; however, initial comments by HCC indicate potential support of EIFS façade treatments at upper-most floor levels pending further clarifications by Applicant. Per previous HCC request, proposed locations for ventilation louvers are now indicated on elevation drawings for consideration.

Provided drawings offer indications of exterior building signage and illumination. Applicant is encouraged to reference relevant Design Guidelines for appropriate signage and lighting fixtures before returning to HCC with scale drawings that include all relevant dimensions along with material samples and written specifications for consideration.

Discussion: J.J. Fines, Joseph Fitzpatrick, Frank Fox and Anthony Seitz represented proposed revisions to 8-story structure previously approved in June of 2021. Building now hosts hotel use rather than commercial storefronts and multi-family residential dwellings; façade revisions include window sizes and placements, addition of rooftop dining space, structural canopy at lobby entrance and other material changes. Applicant summarized various revisions to design details in response to comments made during previous HCC meeting. Windows in upper floor levels are still sized for associated hotel rooms but now include 3-pane divisions accomplished by 2 vertical mullions that relate to overall dimensions of typical window openings within Historic Conservation District; true double-hung windows are not desired due to horizontal divisions. Cast stone lintels and sills now extend beyond window openings. At street level, revised details include introduction of 36-inch-tall masonry base that differs in material and color from brick walls above; masonry piers divide segments of storefronts to delineate façades while masonry apron extends beneath storefronts and masonry sign band with cornice extends above awnings. Piers between storefronts include indication of architectural lighting; however, future lighting studies are needed to determine extent of desired exterior illumination. Applicant addressed previous concerns about organizing hotel restaurant kitchen along eastern half of West Third Street, noting programmatic challenges dictate kitchen placement; continued by proposing spandrel glass within kitchen storefronts to avoid large expanses of solid blank wall. Applicant continued by noting that several design studies were conducted to consider more recesses along main façade facing West Third Street (especially at center portions) and also to integrate additional brick colors within façade but found results “too patchwork and not cohesive”. Applicant also noted that columns for drop off porte cochère (carport) at western end of site has same masonry base cladding as piers between storefronts while roof cladding is series of aluminum composite panels. Applicant concluded by explaining that tower element with integrated signage at western end of site serves as gateway into South Bethlehem, so significantly more brick surface area emphasizes solidity of that corner. 96-foot height of end tower remains as previously proposed while heights of stair towers for rooftop bar are lowered somewhat, and original rooftop glass railing is replaced with upper masonry cornice that also serves as parapet.

Mr. Lader expressed appreciation for revised details in response to previous HCC comments; also expressed concern that design proposal does not relate to context of surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Evans noted upper floor levels seem to float above street level, agreeing with Mr. Long’s suggestion that setbacks should align with piers between storefronts. Mr. Chambers noted that spacing of piers between storefronts must not be uniform; encouraged Applicant to explore aligning entry-level piers with upper-level setbacks. Mr. Chambers continued by noting personal difficulty with kitchen location along large portion of streetscape at West Third Street, resulting in significant number of “dead” storefronts with spandrel glass; encouraged Applicant to explore relocating meeting spaces, offices, etc. (i.e. any space that benefits from windows) to storefront locations as preferable to kitchen use. Mr. Chambers continued by explaining that HCC would have appreciated receipt of studies conducted by Applicant to explore additional setbacks in upper-level façades as well as introduction of additional brick colors. Mr. Chambers also expressed concern about overall 96-foot height of end tower ... noting initial COA approved by City Council specifically mentions 88-foot height dimension ... and inquired what is intended to be screened by upper parapet. Applicant responded that various HVAC units to service most entry-level functions are intended for tower rooftop

location. Mr. Chambers continued that 15-foot high wall atop roof simply to screen HVAC units seems excessive and encouraged Applicant to reconsider overall height; continued that secondary rooftop elements are not as problematic because they are set back somewhat from building façade. Mr. Evans supported recommendation to lower height of tower and suggested that 90-foot height is more appropriate. Mr. Lader agreed that height of tower should not be extended beyond what is necessary to screen rooftop mechanical units; continued that Applicant's vertical blade sign proposed for façade of end tower should adhere to relevant design guidelines for signage before formally presenting to HCC for assessment. Mr. Chambers appreciated Applicant's proposal for various cast masonry banding and cornice elements; encouraged Applicant to include associated details (measured section drawings, written specifications and material samples) for subsequent HCC assessment.

Mr. Lader expressed concern that proposed structure will cast long shadows out over West Third Street. Mr. Chambers noted that height of proposed structure resembles height of adjacent non-contributing structure, so overall massing is not of concern. Ms. Heller confirmed that height of proposed new hotel matches height of adjacent structure. Mr. Lader clarified while heights of both structures are consistent; however, massing of proposed structure is significantly wider than existing adjacent structure, resulting in new building that is out of proportion with remaining district. Mr. Chambers noted that existing context includes nearby non-contributing, large-scale hotel while this specific block will soon include much taller structure across West Third Street.

Mr. Lader expressed concern about inappropriateness of proposed EIFS material for upper façade elements, noting that HCC considers cast stone, true stucco and even fiber cement and aluminum panels as appropriate alternatives. Applicant noted that proposed EIFS would have series of reveals to avoid large-scale flat surfaces along with textures and profiles while also noting that proposed locations to receive EIFS are well above street level and might be considered appropriate. Mr. Lader noted that use of differing materials might also offer opportunities for desired setbacks within overall façade ... explaining that simple 8-inch setback with change in material would help to mitigate perception of overall building height. Applicant explained that proposed façade system in combination with EIFS would allow for such setbacks due to lack of need for additional insulation and airspace while surface can be delineated to resemble cast stone. Mr. Chambers noted similar setbacks can be accomplished by using suggested alternative façade claddings.

Applicant concluded by expressing appreciation to HCC for helpful recommendations while also voicing concern that select comments seem beyond HCC's purview and might prove challenging with business model restraints; continued by requesting HCC to summarize most pressing concerns so they can be addressed. Mr. Lader responded that overall height of uppermost cornice should be lowered to maximum 90-foot high; continued that Applicant should relocate or at least reorganize street-level kitchen to avoid large expanses of spandrel glass within associated storefronts. Applicant countered that locating bar along West Third Street in combination with placing necessary "back of house" elements elsewhere would prevent hotel from focusing main commercial attention onto Greenway ... which was primary reason for collaborating with City of Bethlehem to reinvigorate this specific site. Mr. Evans inquired if Applicant explored other options beyond spandrel glass for kitchen storefronts. Ms. Heller commented that property use is reviewed by Zoning Office and Zoning Hearing Board, so Applicant's proposed uses along primary façades will be assessed as project advances through various reviews; continued that studies will be required to show how proposed project activates streetscape. Ms. Heller welcomed recommendations for appropriate alternatives for Applicant to consider. Mr. Chambers agreed that large expanses of spandrel glass will lead to "dead space"; continued by calling Applicant's attention to city's mural public art program as potential appropriate design solution. Ms. Heller recalled large-scale murals on such locations as Walnut Street parking garage; also noted that new community arts center will be constructed across West Third Street that includes façade locations for alternating public art.

Public Commentary:

Bill Scheirer: expressed opposition to proposed development project, commenting "this hotel represents another step in the destruction of South Bethlehem and its historic character."

William Seixas: supported comments made by Mr. Scheirer, noting he lives nearby and never anticipated such large-scale development when originally purchasing his home; continued that proposed project will extend failed business model of adjacent commercial building that pushed out local residents and small businesses but resulted in empty storefronts; suggested that proposed height is inappropriate for Historic

Conservation District while collaboration with high-end hotel chain does not fit demographic of surrounding neighborhood; continued by questioning if studies were conducted to determine more hotel rooms are in demand; concluded by expressing concern that HCC's motion to approve will result in series of high rise structures intended for wealthy tenants while South Bethlehem residents can no longer afford to live there.

Mr. Long reminded all in attendance that HCC denied Applicant's original proposal to demolish two existing historic structures and replace with 88-foot high mixed-use building; however, HCC's motion to deny was overruled by City Council so current discussions are limited to appropriateness of various architectural details of proposed development project.

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Lader 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 herein:

1. The proposal to revise details of an 8-story structure previously approved in June of 2021 was presented by J.J. Fines, Joseph Fitzpatrick, Frank Fox and Anthony Seitz. Building now hosts hotel use rather than ground-floor commercial storefronts and multi-family residential dwellings above; façade revisions include window sizes and placements, addition of rooftop dining space, structural canopy at lobby entrance and other material changes.
2. Revised design includes following appropriate features:
 - a. aligns with setbacks of existing buildings at street level along this block of West Third Street; also mitigates overall width of 204-feet and 6-inches along West Third Street and overall width of 224-feet along Greenway by integrating vertical divisions at street level through use of pilasters between storefronts
 - b. upper (hotel) floor levels step back twice along West Third Street, resulting in building segments (from east to west) with widths that measure 16-feet and 9-inches, 50-feet and 9-inches, 76-feet and 9-inches, 31-feet and 9-inches and 28-feet and 6-inches, respectively
 - c. change from mixed-use commercial and residential structure to hotel use with rooftop dining results in revised building height of maximum 90-feet, with tall end tower facing convergence of West Third Street and Greenway; additional rooftop elements set back significantly from building façade and service outdoor dining do not exceed height of tower, while upper masonry cornice also serves as rooftop parapet
 - d. aluminum storefronts have canvas awnings with open ends at entry level along West Third Street and facing Greenway; appropriate storefront panels should be center set while appropriate glazing is clear and not tinted, colored or reflective. **note:** Applicant agreed to present alternatives to spandrel glass panels at eastern series of storefronts (where restaurant kitchen is located) for subsequent HCC consideration
 - e. 36-inch-tall masonry base at street level differs in material and color from brick walls above; masonry piers divide segments of storefronts to delineate façades while masonry apron extends beneath storefronts and masonry sign band with cornice extends above awnings
 - f. single-story curvilinear porte cochère (carport) as hotel drop off extends out from new structure facing convergence of West Third Street and Greenway; includes same masonry base cladding as piers between storefronts while roof cladding is series of aluminum composite panels
 - g. windows in upper floor levels are sized for hotel rooms and include 3-pane divisions accomplished by two vertical mullions; appropriate glazing is clear and not tinted, colored or reflective while cast stone lintels and sills extend out beyond window openings
 - h. upper (hotel) floor levels include brick masonry façades accented with series of precast horizontal "banding" and cornice mouldings; **note:** Applicant agreed to present alternatives to inappropriate Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS) for select upper façade elements that set back from façade and also for upper cornice for subsequent HCC consideration
3. Applicant is required to return for subsequent HCC assessments of various details (scale drawings, written specifications, material samples, etc.) including, but not limited to, various façade claddings, storefront systems, canvas awnings, all window types with associated lintels and sills, cast

bandings and cornice mouldings, elements of porte cochère (carport), proposed signage and exterior lighting.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 116 West Graham Place

Property Owner: William and Marylou Seixas

Applicant: Fusion Solar Energy

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a detached 2 ½-story, 3-bay, brick masonry dwelling covered in aluminum siding, with a full front porch, steeply pitched central gable window and altered windows and doors. Original frame porch elements have been lost over time, replaced with painted brick masonry structural piers at each end and a painted brick balustrade. The main roof and porch roof are sheathed in single tab asphalt shingles. Dating from ca. 1880, this structure is Victorian Gothic in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to install 22 solar panels on the roof.

Guideline Citations:

- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item 1
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines** -- see Agenda Item 1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to install four (4) new photovoltaic (PV) modules, commonly referred to as solar panels, on rear (south-facing) roof of main structure, ten (10) new PV modules on roof of low-sloping roof of 2-story rear (south) addition as well as eight (8) new PV modules on roof of detached garage along Rink Street. Supplemental 'Roof Plan with PV Modules' drawing indicates that each solar panel measures 67.8-inches x 44.64 inches and will be flush-mount installed. Panels to be provided by Fusion Solar Energy include aluminum frames with stainless steel hardware and have lifespan of 15 years. Associated combiner panel (labeled P), AC disconnect (labeled D), and electric meter (labeled M) are indicated in site plan drawing at east façade of main house (near northeast corner); however, supplemental drawing depicting how these new items will be installed onto existing façade is not provided, so discussion is warranted.

There is no specific mention of solar panels within Secretary of Interior's Standards or within HCC's relevant Design Guidelines, so current assessment is based on concept of exterior alterations within Historic Conservation District. Recent walk-by inspection of property confirmed that proposed work on rear roof of main house and on roof of rear addition would not be visible from public right-of-way along Graham Place; similarly, proposed work on roof of detached garage would not be visible from public right-of-way along Rink Street. With this understanding, proposal to install 22 new roof solar panels is appropriate, pending clarification about visibility of new combiner panel, AC disconnect and/or electric meter at east façade, near northeast corner of main house as seen from Graham Place.

Discussion: William and Marylou Seixas represented proposal to install 22 solar panels on roof. Applicant confirmed that locations of all proposed panels face rear of property and will not be visible from public right-of-way. Applicant explained that new combiner panel and new disconnect will be mounted adjacent to existing electric meter at northeast corner of main house, affording fire department quick access to disconnect in case of emergency. Mr. Chambers inquired if existing fence at left (east) of front porch facing Graham Place would block new combiner panel and disconnect from public view. Applicant confirmed that existing fence would block view of proposed items; however, intention is to replace solid fence with open metal fence and posts for new gate to allow for driveway access onto property. Mr. Evans inquired about dimensions of proposed boxes; Applicant responded that disconnect is approximately 15-inches square and 7-inches deep while combiner panel measures 20-inches x 16-inches and is also 7-inches deep.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to install 22 solar panels on the roof was presented by William and Marylou Seixas as submitted.
2. Appropriate details for new solar panels include:
 - a. install four (4) new photovoltaic (PV) modules, commonly referred to as solar panels, on rear (south-facing) roof of main structure; install ten (10) new PV modules on roof of low-sloping roof of 2-story rear (south) addition; install eight (8) new PV modules on roof of detached garage along Rink Street
 - b. each panel measures 67.8-inches x 44.64 inches and is flush-mount installed
 - c. panels provided by Fusion Solar Energy include aluminum frames with stainless steel hardware and have lifespan of 15 years
 - d. associated combiner panel and new AC disconnect will be installed adjacent to existing electric meter at east façade of main house, near northeast corner

Note: Due to no specific mention of solar panels within Secretary of Interior's Standards or within HCC's relevant Design Guidelines, motion is based upon understanding that panels on rear roof of main house and on roof of rear addition are not visible from public right-of-way along Graham Place; similarly, panels on roof of detached garage are not visible from public right-of-way along Rink Street.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 418 Martel Street

Property Owner: William and Byung Pottenger

Applicant: William and Byung Pottenger

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure located at the corner of Martel Street and West Morton Street, is a 2 ½-story, 2-bay, semi-detached, brick masonry dwelling with a gable roof, a front wall dormer and a wood framed front porch with a shed roof. The house dates from ca. 1895, has double-hung windows with segmental arched window and door openings and is Queen Anne in style. The structure includes a 2-story, brick masonry rear addition that was completed during the early 20th century along with a single-story wood frame enclosed back porch that was constructed during the mid-20th century. The structure is the first in a series of three contiguous row houses along Martel Street that share common architectural features as well as a contiguous roof line and front porch. Some exposed façades were treated with a stucco veneer and given an etched pattern (often referred to as "Brickote") in imitation red brick sometime during the mid-20th century; other exposed façades were clad in insulating siding with an etched brick pattern (often referred to as "Insulbrick") during the mid-20th century as well.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to convert an existing enclosed porch into an open porch with railing matching the front porch.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item 1
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 10.** -- New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item 1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: The COA Application was not represented, so no assessment was conducted.

Motion: No motion was made due to lack of Applicant representation.

Agenda Item #4

Property Location: 125 East Third Street

Property Owner: Chad Jarrah

Applicant: Marc Kubushefski

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is an attached, 3-story, mixed-use, masonry building with a flat roof and dates from ca. 1910. Brick pilasters support a decorative upper cornice with ornamental end brackets. The structure is Classical Revival in style, with primary façade materials of light brown brick and cast stone. The original storefront was altered during the mid- to late 20th century but was recently renovated after collaborating with HCC and now includes historically appropriate details, including a reconfigured storefront with new cornice, angled and beaded brackets along with a paneled sign band above and tiled apron beneath.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to install a perforated vinyl widow decal to the glass storefront window; decal size is 3'-9" x 4'-4".

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 Commission 'Design Guidelines for Signage'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to install signage for new commercial tenant within existing storefront window; sign is perforated window vinyl applied to inside glass surface. Proposed sign measures 52-inches tall x 45-inches wide; installation is centered vertically and horizontally within existing storefront. Sign includes ghost figure with eye and mouth cutouts rising from pizza pan; figure is bright white in color and outlined in black color, with various details in red, yellow and black colors. Arcing above ghost figure is word "PARANORMAL" in large, bold, all uppercase stylized lettering in black color; arcing beneath ghost figure is word "PIZZA" in same large, bold, all uppercase stylized lettering also in black color.

Proposed window signage represents departure from appropriate details identified within relevant design guidelines ... such as warm white color (rather than bright white), serif lettering and pinstripe surround as signage frame; however, HCC typically defers to signage proposals when design is confirmed by Applicant to be corporate logo, so discussion is warranted. Should HCC consider proposed signage appropriate, Applicant should clarify that portions of signage without lettering or ghost figure logo are transparent and not opaque to allow for views inside.

Discussion: Joey Kubushefski and Marc Kubushefski represented proposal to install perforated vinyl widow decal to glass storefront window. Mr. Evans inquired if proposed signage represents corporate logo of commercial tenant. Applicant confirmed that graphics reflect logo of pizza restaurant, noting design is same window signage previously approved by HARB for previous business location at 554 North New Street. Applicant explained that perforations within vinyl allow views out from inside but limit views in from outside; continued that white details of logo are not bright white but rather warm white while lettering is also white in color rather than black, as indicated on provided details. Mr. Evans agreed with Mr. Long's suggestion that HCC typically defers to signage proposals when design is corporate logo but expressed concern about size of proposed sign. Ms. Heller noted that COA Applications are typically reviewed by city's Zoning Officer before placing on HCC meeting agenda, so size of proposed sign should satisfy relevant zoning ordinance.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to install a perforated vinyl widow decal to the glass storefront window was presented by Joey Kubushefski and Marc Kubushefski.

2. Appropriate details for new signage include:
 - a. sign measures 52-inches tall x 45-inches wide; installation is centered vertically and horizontally within existing storefront
 - b. design includes ghost figure with eye and mouth cutouts rising from pizza pan; figure is warm white in color and outlined in black color, with various details in red, yellow and black colors
 - c. arcing above ghost figure is word "PARANORMAL" in large, bold, all uppercase stylized lettering in warm white color; arcing beneath ghost figure is word "PIZZA" in same large, bold, all uppercase stylized lettering also in warm white color
 - d. vinyl signage is applied to inside glass surface

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #5

Property Location: 312 East Fourth Street

Property Owner: Holy Infancy Roman Catholic Church

Applicant: Joseph B. McCarthy

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This church structure is a detached, 3-bay, stone masonry institutional building with a steep gable roof and cross-gable transept. Each bay includes an entrance portal with pointed Gothic arch and upper-level windows, also with pointed Gothic arches. The larger central bay with north-facing rose window extends up to become the church bell tower. Originally called St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, it was constructed ca. 1865 but was later expanded and modified ca. 1886 to become Holy Infancy Roman Catholic Church. The church is Gothic Revival in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to replace the existing metal door and frame at the northwest corner entrance.

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 Commission 'Design Guidelines'** -- see Agenda Item 1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to replace existing metal door and associated doorframe installed at northwest corner entrance (facing Taylor Street) with new steel door and doorframe to address poor condition and compromised functionality of existing door due to heavy use. Replacement door will have integrated sidelite similar to existing; new door and doorframe will be painted to match existing. There is no record of HCC assessment of existing metal door that replaced original Gothic Revival wooden doors, so such work most likely took place prior to city ordinance that created Historic Conservation District. No supplemental scale drawing is included with COA Application, implying that Applicant does not intend to alter existing opening or associated wall during installation of proposed frame and door. Accompanying image depicts flush interior face of proposed door with panic hardware and kick door stop but offers no indication of exterior face of proposed door. Relevant Design Guidelines note "HCC will not recommend approval of ... flush exterior doors" (p. 12). Recent walk-by site inspection confirmed that frame of existing metal door appropriately aligns vertically with mouldings of upper transom. Based upon information within provided COA Application, proposed work is appropriate, pending clarification of following details:

- confirm size of replacement door and doorframe match size of existing door and doorframe so that new frame appropriately aligns vertically with mouldings of upper transom
- confirm exterior face of new metal door has panel configuration ... preferably inspired by existing panel entrance door along same façade at southwest corner (also facing Taylor Street)
- provide details for hardware visible on exterior face of replacement door for HCC consideration

Discussion: Andrew Gehringer and Joseph McCarthy represented proposal to replace existing metal door and frame on northwest corner entrance. Applicant explained that transom elements above proposed replacement door will not change while components within door opening are intended for replacement. Applicant noted that existing door has flush exterior face and prefers not to change that aesthetic; however, existing three-hinge detail will be revised to continuous hinge due to heavy use. Applicant explained this entrance will become ADA-compliant entrance (with lift inside) while continuing to serve as main access to fellowship hall on lower level. Applicant noted that three main entrance doors along East Fourth Street are aluminum and glass storefronts that replaced original heavy wooden doors. Applicant acknowledged existing paneled door at other end of Taylor Street, noting it is rarely used. Mr. Evans noted that existing metal door has flush exterior face; continued that HCC traditionally recommends motions to approve proposals for in-kind replacement.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to replace the existing metal door and frame on the northwest corner entrance was presented by Andrew Gehringer and Joseph McCarthy.
2. Appropriate details for the replacement door include:
 - a. remove existing metal door and associated doorframe installed at northwest corner entrance (facing Taylor Street) and replace in-kind with new steel door and doorframe of same dimensions
 - b. replacement door has integrated sidelite similar to existing and continuous side hinge
 - c. new door and doorframe are painted to match existing

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #6

Property Location: 1006 Prospect Avenue

Property Owner: Victor and Joan Stabin

Applicant: Mark Wagner

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a 2-1/2 story, detached, stucco on masonry residence with a hipped roof, a gambrel roofed dormer on the front, overhanging eaves with paired wood brackets and full-width one-story front porch with large square posts and side parapets. The east and west façades both have similar one-story porches at secondary entries. The front entry has a paneled wood door with decorative sidelights and transom above; windows throughout have Colonial Revival muntin patterns over single light lower sashes. The house has a high level of integrity and demonstrates Colonial Revival and Arts and Crafts stylistic details. The building first appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1912 and was built and/or inhabited by Samuel L. Caum, prominent engineer and friend of the inventor, Thomas Edison. Former property owners received a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2017 to install a bronze plaque on the column to the right of the front entrance that reads: "Samuel L. Caum House 1006 Prospect Ave. This property has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places by the United States Department of the Interior. Built ca. 1915"

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to remove rotten portions of both side porticos and rebuild to match existing. The Applicant also seeks permission to remove four small pent roofs on the sides of both side porticos.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item 1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines'** -- relevant sections concerning repair, replace, reconstruct, etc. (pp. 6-7)

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to remove deteriorated roof components of both side (east and west) porticos and reconstruct to match existing. Based upon provided supplemental 'Typical Side Elevation' and 'Typical Section of Portico' scale drawings, all roof components of both side porticos will be demolished and replaced with new structural framing, including rafters, joists and beams; new beadboard ceiling will hide most details from view below. Applicant does not propose any new work to existing columns, upper parapets, low walls, concrete floors or portico foundations; existing gutters are to be removed, salvaged and reinstalled upon completion of proposed work. New roof cladding is asphalt roll roofing over ½-inch sheathing. Based upon Applicant's comments that both side porticos will be rebuilt to match existing, proposed work is appropriate, pending clarification of following details:

- side elevation drawing notes "save and reuse show rafters" while section drawing indicates "new 2x10 rafters"; Applicant should ensure that existing rafter tails are salvaged and reinstalled or that new rafters will include same decorative detail to match historic rafter tails
- section drawing proposes new aluminum flashing; HCC typically considers copper flashing as appropriate for all visible roof flashing
- photographs of existing conditions depict profiled wood trim between rafter tails where they meet outer porch beam while section drawing of replacement roof does not propose similar trim; existing wood trim should be salvaged and reinstalled or replacement trim should match historic trim in design and material
- confirm all exposed wood surfaces will be primed and painted

Applicant also seeks permission to remove pent roofs on sides of both side (east and west) porticos. Though not visible from provided photos, same pent roof detail also exists on both sides of main front portico; however, Applicant does not propose removing those pent roofs with current COA Application. Based upon Secretary of Interior's Standards and relevant HCC design guidelines, removal of pent roofs on sides of both side (east and west) porticos is inappropriate due to resulting "loss of distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques that characterize a property". Existing details of side pent roofs should be retained and preserved; where severity of deterioration requires replacement, appropriate new features should match old in design, color, textures and materials.

Discussion: Joan Morykin and Mark Wagner represented proposal to remove rotten portions of both side porticos and rebuild to match existing while also seeking permission to remove four small pent roofs on the sides of both side porticos. Applicant described existing roof conditions of both side porticos as severely deteriorated, with select details actually missing; in response, proposed approach will repair and replace in-kind to avoid total loss, with resulting aesthetic to match details at existing front porch. Applicant clarified that new show rafters will be attached to ends of replacement rafters to ensure historical dimensions. Applicant expressed concern about retaining and repairing pent roofs on each side of both side porticos, noting they have no real function while detailing (specifically proper flashing) proves difficult.

Mr. Evans inquired about reasons for extreme deterioration at roofs of both side porticos. Applicant described evidence that porticos were previously repaired but not concurrently because of differing details, resulting in portico roofs that are no longer uniform; continued that flashing is problematic and repairs were not properly detailed, resulting in slow but steady deterioration. Mr. Evans continued by inquiring about envisioned approach to address previous mistakes that led to current deterioration. Applicant responded that previous repairs were improperly flashed, allowing water penetration and resulting in deterioration; continued that treated lumber will be used for all (non-visible) framing, visible wood elements will be primed

and painted while flashing details will follow current standards and subject to city inspection. Mr. Chambers inquired if masonry portico elements sit atop original wood framing. Applicant noted absence of original timber structure because previous repairs replaced them with simple 2x12 framing that supports masonry above; continued that proposed repairs include treated framing members that are also wrapped with waterproofing tape (not metal flashing) wherever they touch masonry.

Mr. Chambers questioned proposal to remove side pent roofs from both side porticos, noting this detail seems original to construction of dwelling. Applicant responded by questioning functionality of side pent roofs and noting that shallow pitch of roofs prove problematic with rainwater and snow. Mr. Lader noted that side pent roofs seem to be lacking any flashing and select details are partially or completely missing; continued by noting importance of repairing or replacing various details visible from fronts of each side portico. Mr. Chambers inquired about situation at front portico. Applicant explained that front portico (visible from Prospect Avenue) has similar side pent roofs; continued by explaining if HCC is amendable to removal of pent roofs at both side porticos, future COA Application will include request to remove side pent roofs at front portico.

Mr. Lader inquired about proposed roofing material. Applicant confirmed that rolled asphalt is preferred roofing material due to longevity. Mr. Lader explained that HCC typically requires copper flashing when details are visible; Applicant noted that flashing will not be visible and suggested aluminum might also be acceptable and more affordable alternative. Mr. Evans inquired if current flashing detail is original or perhaps added during subsequent repairs; Mr. Lader responded that existing flashing seems to be original while select details were already missing when current property owner purchased house. Applicant explained that side pent roofs were mounted onto frieze board (ledger) with thin metal roofing attached to framing members. Mr. Evans noted that side pent roofs are not critical design elements and could be carefully removed so that details can be recreated by subsequent property owner, if desired; continued that such process should be documented by drawings and photographs, with removed details stored onsite for future reference. Mr. Chambers countered that side pent roofs do indeed contribute to historical integrity of structure and called attention to historical plaque that noted importance of this dwelling to historic district. Applicant suggested potentially removing all side pent roofs to determine if enough original material can be salvaged to recreate one or more pent roofs. Mr. Lader observed that at least one pent roof is completely missing and questioned ability to salvage and reuse remaining elements of other pent roofs; continued by noting that both side porticos are set back and barely visible from public right-of-way along Prospect Avenue while main front portico is indeed visible and still retains pent roof elements at left and right sides. Mr. Chambers inquired if side pent roofs at front portico still exist; Applicant confirmed both side pent roofs at main front portico indeed still exist.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Lader 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 herein:

1. The proposal to remove rotten portions of both side (east and west) porticos and rebuild to match existing while also seeking permission to remove four small pent roofs on the sides of both side porticos was presented by Joan Morykin and Mark Wagner.
2. Appropriate details for reconstructed portions of both side porticos include:
 - a. removal of all roof components of both side porticos and replace with new structural framing, including rafters, joists and beams, as indicated on supplemental 'Typical Side Elevation' and 'Typical Section of Portico' scale drawings; all visible elements to be primed and painted to match existing
 - b. new beadboard ceiling will hide framing details from view below
 - c. new roof cladding is asphalt roll roofing over ½-inch sheathing, with new aluminum flashing
 - d. existing gutters will be removed, salvaged and reinstalled upon completion of work

Note: Applicant may remove side pent roofs of both side porticos due to deteriorated condition and limited visibility from public right-of-way; process should be documented with drawings and photographs, with removed details stored onsite for future reference.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

General Business:

Minutes from HCC meeting on September 16, 2024, were approved by those attending that meeting, and with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

Mr. Chambers encouraged City of Bethlehem to identify and confirm additional HCC members, noting critical numbers reflected with tonight's attendance. Mr. Lader and Mr. Evans agreed, noting City's need to satisfy qualifications and total number of members, as defined within relevant ordinance. Ms. Heller encouraged receipt of suggestions for potential new HCC members for vetting by mayor's office.

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