BOARD:<br>HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM<br>MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH (VIA GOTOMEETING), CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), ROGER HUDAK, MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER<br>MEMBERS ABSENT: GARY LADER (CHAIR), KENNETH LOUSH<br>STAFF PRESENT:<br>LAURA CLIFTON, JEFFREY LONG<br>PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)<br>VISITORS PRESENT: ANDREW GEHRINGER, LOUIS INTILE, JOSEPH B. MCCARTHY, CHRISTINE USSLER<br>MEETING DATE: AUGUST 15, 2022

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on August 15, 2022, at the City of Bethlehem Town Hall Rotunda, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Vice Chair Craig Evans called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

## Agenda Item \#1

Property Location: 312 East Fourth Street
Property Owner: Holy Infancy Church and Rectory
Applicant: Andrew Gehringer, Pastor

## 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.
The adjacent rectory structure is a 3 -story, detached brick masonry residential building with a low-pitched roof and shed-roof dormers. Defining features include an upper projecting ornamental cornice, full-height bays on either side of the central bay and 1 -over- 1 double-hung windows. Supported by double pairs of wooden columns, the entrance porch leads down to a stone masonry retaining wall with stone piers that delineate access onto the property. Constructed ca. 1910, this structure is Colonial Revival in style.
Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to replace (agenda misstates "relocate") the current aluminum frame pole mounted exterior illuminated reader board in the front yard of the rectory with a custom designed reader board mounted on the right front wall of the church and a custom designed reader board mounted on the front of the rectory. Both signs would have flexibility to update messages and would be illuminated at night.

## Guideline Citations:

- Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public
through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.
- Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage' -- Care should be taken in mounting signs to minimize damage to historic materials. This includes reusing hardware or brackets from previous signs. If reusing existing hardware or attachment locations is not an option, select mounting locations that can be easily patched if the sign is removed. This includes locating holes in mortar joints rather than directly into bricks or masonry, which will facilitate repair if the sign is removed or relocated in the future.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to install one new wall sign at church structure and another new wall sign at adjacent rectory to replace existing pole-mounted reader board installed at northwest corner of rectory property. Each new sign to be fabricated from 1.5 -inch thick High-Density Urethane (HDU) rigid board in beige color with v-carved graphics in black color and v-carved off-set border surround in gold leaf. Lower half of each proposed sign also includes inlaid Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) panel in black color. Proposed church sign measures 78 -inches tall $\times 36$-inches wide while proposed rectory sign measures 78 -inches tall (incorrectly identified on one detail as 31 -inches tall) $\times 31$-inches wide; pointed arch design of new signage recalls Gothic arches of portals and windows of church structure. In upper portion of each new sign is cross graphic followed by text line "HOLY" followed by text line "INFANCY" in large, serif, all upper-case lettering followed by text line "ROMAN CATHOLIC" and thereafter by text line "CHURCH" in smaller, serif, all uppercase lettering. Lower half of each sign includes panel insert with various text information (contact information, operational hours, etc.) in small, sanserif lettering in white color. COA Application notes information within text panels can be easily modified, as needed.
Proposed church signage to be installed at right of western (far-right) entrance portal, centered within adjacent wall surface and mounted 30 -inches above grade ( 108 -inches minus 78 -inches); however, dimension above grade are incorrect based upon provided photomontage ... with bottom of new sign much higher above grade than 78 -inch height of sign. Supplemental detail depicts five stainless steel brackets intended for installing new sign into existing stone wall using masonry screws. Proposed church signage is appropriate, pending clarification about height above grade and confirmation that installation points for hanging brackets are within existing mortar joints rather than directly into stone masonry in satisfaction of relevant design guidelines.
Those same guidelines describe appropriate signage within Historical Conservation District as rigid panels attached to building walls or suspended from brackets as well as individual letters pin-mounted to building facades. Proposed rectory signage to be installed onto front of left pair of wooden porch columns does not satisfy guidelines and is inappropriate. During recent on-site inspection, more appropriate location for new wall signage could not be determined; however, Applicant might consider double-sided blade sign suspended from decorative metal scroll bracket installed above porch columns as more appropriate solution.
COA Application concludes with proposal to illuminate new signage with metal gooseneck light fixtures with angled shades. Such fixtures are appropriate within Historic Conservation District, pending clarifications about intended color, size, quantity, and locations of proposed fixtures along with confirmation that no conduits, raceways, or junction boxes for illumination will be visible on building exteriors. Relevant design guidelines also recommend use of low-wattage incandescent bulbs for signage illumination; fixtures with max. 3000K LED bulbs are also considered appropriate.
Discussion: Andrew Gehringer and Joseph B. McCarthy represented proposal to replace current aluminum frame pole mounted exterior illuminated reader board in front yard of rectory with custom designed reader board mounted on right front wall of church and custom designed reader board mounted on front of rectory. Both signs would have flexibility to update messages and would be illuminated. Applicant admitted incorrect measurements for new signs on provided supplementals to COA Application and offered corrections: proposed church sign is 36 inches wide $\times 78$ inches high, with underside of sign at 100 inches above sidewalk; proposed rectory sign is 31 inches wide $\times 61$ inches high, with underside of sign at 16.5 inches above porch deck. Applicant also confirmed that sign sizes are not equal but proportional in height and width. Applicant continued that intended exterior lighting includes two fixtures per
sign; each fixture is 10 -inches in black color with LED lamps at 3000K. Mr. Evans recommended Applicant to submit cutsheet (specifications) of proposed light fixture that identifies all relevant details; Applicant was amendable to recommendation. Mr. Evans continued by inquiring if Applicant would consider blade sign (double-sided sign that would hang perpendicular to rectory and street) to avoid direct sign installation to existing porch posts, which would also provide better visibility for pedestrian traffic. Applicant explained no viable flat wall surface at front façade of rectory is available for new signage while porch columns (not posts) are substantial enough to accommodate weight of new sign; continued that blade sign with decorative scroll bracket would result in more expense and also challenge to illuminate. Mr. Evans explained unusual situation of mounting signage to porch columns (no examples within relevant design guidelines or found in Historic Conservation District) and noted that select hanging bracket models have integrated lighting for both sides of blade signs. Mr. Simonson inquired if new signage (specifically lower message board portion) includes Plexiglas or glass covers; Applicant understands new signage to include white vinyl lettering applied directly to lower black panels with no protective cover but agreed to clarify with sign fabricator. Mr. Evans inquired about intended electrical service to proposed lighting at both locations. Applicant explained nature of church structure (thick stone masonry walls) do not allow for hidden or internal conduits and explained recent exterior illumination improvements included visible conduits painted to match adjacent stone walls; continued that rectory has existing ceiling light so conduit to service new illumination could tie into that fixture through existing boxed porch columns.

## Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to replace the current aluminum frame pole mounted exterior illuminated reader board in the front yard of the rectory with a custom designed reader board mounted on the right front wall of the church and a custom designed reader board mounted on the front of the rectory along with new exterior illumination was presented by Andrew Gehringer and Joseph B. McCarthy.
2. New signage for the front wall of the church includes the following details:
a. sign to be fabricated from 1.5 -inch thick High-Density Urethane (HDU) rigid board in beige color with $v$-carved graphics in black color and v -carved off-set border surround in gold leaf; lower half of sign also includes inlaid Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) panel in black color
b. sign measures 78 -inches tall $\times 36$-inches wide, with underside of sign at 100 -inches above public right-of-way; pointed arch design of signage recalls Gothic arches of portals and windows of church structure
c. upper portion of sign includes cross graphic followed by text line "HOLY" followed by text line "INFANCY" in large, serif, all upper-case lettering followed by text line "ROMAN CATHOLIC" and thereafter by text line "CHURCH" in smaller, serif, all upper-case lettering; lower half of sign includes panel insert with various text (contact information, operational hours, etc.) in small, sanserif lettering in white color
d. sign to be installed at right of western (far-right) entrance portal, centered horizontally within adjacent wall surface; locations of stainless-steel hanging brackets for installing sign onto stone wall will coordinate with masonry screws inserted into existing mortar joints
3. New signage for the front of the rectory includes the following details:
a. sign to be fabricated from 1.5 -inch thick High-Density Urethane (HDU) rigid board in beige color with v-carved graphics in black color and v-carved off-set border surround in gold leaf; lower half of sign also includes inlaid Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) panel in black color
b. sign measures 61 -inches tall $\times 31$-inches wide, with underside of sign at 16.5 -inches above porch deck; pointed arch design of signage recalls Gothic arches of portals and windows of church structure
c. upper portion of sign includes cross graphic followed by text line "HOLY" followed by text line "INFANCY" in large, serif, all upper-case lettering followed by text line "ROMAN CATHOLIC"
and thereafter by text line "CHURCH" in smaller, serif, all upper-case lettering; lower half of sign includes panel insert with various text (contact information, operational hours, etc.) in small, sanserif lettering in white color
d. sign to be installed onto front of left pair of wooden porch columns; stainless-steel mechanical fasteners for installing sign into columns are within off-set border surround and painted to match color of border
4. New illumination for signage includes the following details:
a. metal gooseneck light fixtures with angled shades in black color with maximum 3000K LED bulbs
b. HCC recommends no conduits, raceways, or junction boxes for new illumination are visible on building exteriors; however, that is not possible at this location, so new church illumination includes surface-mounted conduit painted to match existing stone masonry façade while new rectory illumination ties into existing porch ceiling light fixture and down through existing boxed columns
5. The Applicant agreed to submit updated details (to-scale elevation drawings indicating corrected dimensions, etc.) for each new sign along with product specifications for new illumination (cut sheets confirming fixture count, size, style, locations, etc.) via City of Bethlehem for review and approval by HCC Vice Chair, Historic Officer and Chief Building Inspector prior to fabrication and installation.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

## Agenda Item \#2

Property Location: 114 West Fourth Street (rear)
Property Owner: 114 W. 4th Street, LLC
Applicant: Christine Ussler, Artefact, Inc.
Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a $21 / 2$ story, brick masonry and wood, detached residence with cross-gabled roof, projecting bays, wraparound porch with corner entry, Doric columns and a stone base. The house also has a variety of multi-lite double-hung windows. The rear of the house has a 2-story porch, part of which was original to the house. The house is late Queen Anne in style and dates from ca. 1885. The west side of the house has a 1 -story brick addition that dates ca. 1950. At the southwest rear corner of the lot is a 1 -story brick detached garage with segmental arched window and door openings and a slate roof. Although the doors and some windows have been altered over time, the garage retains its original integrity and was built sometime between 1904 and 1912 according to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. The house was the home of Eugene Grace during the period 1902-1906. Mr. Grace was President of Bethlehem Steel (1913-1945) and then served as its Chairman (1946-1957). The importance of this property has been recognized by Pennsylvania's State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with a historic marker.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to relocate the existing garage and construct a new, 3story, 6-unit residential building.

## Guideline Citations:

- Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 1. -- A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
- 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.
- Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District -- see Agenda Item 1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on May 16, 2022, Applicant requested informal review of proposal for new in-fill construction at rear of Grace Mansion site; proposed project involved 3-story twin residential building as well as demolition of detached rear garage and addition to rear of main structure. At that time, Applicant described new structure that uses traditional building materials (brick façade, aluminum-clad wood windows, etc.); admitted 3-level front porch with steel details is non-traditional (size, scale, materials, etc.) but noted several 2-story porches in South Bethlehem ... admittedly not within Historic Conservation District. Applicant described area of property between new construction and existing Grace Mansion (approx. 15-feet wide) for common use by tenants of both structures; continued that proposed project is intended for general housing market ... not specifically targeting university students but could serve as student housing. In response, HCC expressed various concerns, including:

- lack of any progress with rehabilitation of existing Grace Mansion structure
- intentions with existing historic stone masonry wall along Martel Street
- proposed 3-story front porch with steel cladding on new in-fill project; perhaps re-locate to rear façade
- concept of shed roof proposed for main roof of new project
- need for parapet at rear flat roof of new project
- 15-feet width of common courtyard seems insufficient
- reconsider proposed demolition of existing rear garage due to importance as contributing structure within Historic Conservation District
Current COA Application addresses HCC concern with previous proposal to demolish existing rear garage by relocating it elsewhere on property and using it as visual connector between existing Grace Mansion and proposed new residential structure. Though violating Secretary of Interior's Standard 2 ["removal of distinctive ... spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided"], such action would at least salvage what HCC previously determined as contributing structure from demolition. Indeed, Bethlehem has tradition of historic structures being moved as means of rescuing them from loss, including but not limited to: Moravian Apothecary -- constructed in 1873 near Central Moravian Church on Main Street, moved one lot north ca. 1930 to fill void left by demolition of adjacent structure; Nain-Schober House -- log structure originally located in Native American Moravian settlement in West Bethlehem, dismantled in 1765 and reassembled along Market Street in downtown Bethlehem, dismantled yet again in 1905 and reassembled along Heckewelder Place. Proposed use for relocated garage as studio apartment would satisfy Secretary of Interior's Standard 1 ["a property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials (and) features"] and is considered appropriate.
Discussion: Christine Ussler represented proposal to relocate existing garage. Applicant noted intent of current discussion is limited to potential move of existing garage structure elsewhere on current property, with Client not wanting to move forward with design of new residential development project until HCC support and City Council approval for garage relocation is secured. Applicant referenced similar on-going project (client in Allentown) to relocate existing garage structure; continued by noting if garage remains in place, proposed development project (if approved) would ultimately block garage from public view, so current proposal would ensure visual connection between street and contributing garage. Applicant also noted that linking new structure with existing mansion with garage as connector improves project from city zoning perspective; admitted that more work is needed to finalize details for properly connecting garage to existing mansion. Applicant also noted garage would physically connect to mansion's one-story western addition, with potential of returning to HCC with future proposal for new second story to that addition. Applicant concluded by noting respect of previous HCC comments about proposed new development project and desire to further develop but requests HCC response to relocating garage before additional studies are commissioned.
Mr. Evans expressed concern about limiting discussion to topic of relocating garage without understanding resulting ramifications for remainder of project site ... at connection with existing mansion as well as proposed new residential development project; continued by warning against scenario that garage is relocated but no other work at project site is ultimately completed. Applicant suggested that resulting HCC motion could be formulated to avoid approval of garage relocation without various contingencies associated with remainder of proposed development project. Mr. Simonson compared scenario with similar approach
typically taken with demolition requests, noting such COAs include commentary about successful review and approval of all planning applications before demolition permit is issued. Mr. Evans agreed that relocating historic garage structure elsewhere on project site allows more visibility if proposed residential development project moves forward; also appreciated comments from Historic Officer about Bethlehem's tradition of relocating historic structures as means of preservation. Mr. Simonson requested clarification if relocated garage would only serve as pass-through space between existing mansion and proposed new structure; Applicant clarified that relocated garage would be used as "self-contained living unit". Mr. Cornish expressed personal appreciation for proposal to relocate garage elsewhere on project site as appropriate measure that avoids demolition of contributing historic structure.


## Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Evans 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. The proposal to relocate the existing garage was presented by Christine Ussler.
2. Appropriate rehabilitation of the existing rear garage structure includes relocating the garage to serve as a connector between the Grace Mansion and proposed new construction; select modifications of non-original features are necessary to connect the garage to both structures while distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques that characterize the garage will be preserved.
Note: The City of Bethlehem will not issue a permit to relocate the existing garage until all planning applications have been successfully reviewed and approved and the Applicant has also secured a COA confirming appropriateness of the new development project.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

## Agenda Item \#3:

Property Location: 512 East Fourth Street
Property Owner: NMC Holdings, LLC
Applicant: Louis Intile
Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a semi-detached, 3 -story, 3 -bay, mixed-use, brick masonry building with a stepped parapet with corbel details and a flat roof. The original storefront has been manipulated over time and now includes a large shop window and recessed entry, with separate entrance for residential units above. The sign band is covered over with vertical metal siding, as are portions of the lower cornice. Brick pilasters at each end delineate the upper façade, which includes three 1 -over-1 double-hung windows at each floor level. This structure was constructed ca. 1900 and is Italianate in style.
The rear garage structure facing East Morton Street is a semi-detached, 2-story, wood-frame building with a stone foundation and a gable roof. Original exterior features are covered with inappropriate aluminum siding in light gray color that also hides original window openings and defining architectural features. The singlebay opening is closed over with inappropriate plywood sheathing. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of South Bethlehem, this garage was constructed ca. 1900 in conjunction with the main building that faces East Fourth Street.
Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to demolish a dilapidated and deteriorated garage which is located on East Morton Street. The structure is unstable and no longer safe.

## Guideline Citations:

- Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District -- see Agenda Item 1
- Historic Conservation District 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless:
- proposed demolition involves a non-significant building, a non-significant addition or a (nonsignificant) portion of the building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant
- Applicant has demonstrated that they have exhausted all other options and they will suffer undue economic hardship
Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates request to demolish existing rear garage due to deteriorated condition, with concern that building is no longer structurally sound and therefore unsafe. Recent site visit indicated this structure was potentially used as residential unit (with entrance porch and windows facing rear yard of main structure); however, garage now seems abandoned while roof is caving in due to structural failure of attic framing and previous paneled garage door is replaced with sheets of plywood that are quickly deteriorating.
As stated above, existing garage was constructed ca. 1900 (during period of interpretation of Historic Conservation District: ca. 1885-1950) and is therefore considered contributing structure. Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation do not offer guidance on demolition because they assume all contributing historic structures will be rehabilitated rather than demolished; however, District Design Guidelines allow HCC to recommend approval for demolition if "Applicant has demonstrated that they have exhausted all other options and they will suffer undue economic hardship." Provided supplemental information does not offer details confirming Applicant has exhausted all options and will suffer undue economic hardship if garage structure must be rehabilitated. In addition, poor condition of garage structure is due to property owner's lack of proper maintenance; thus, request for demolition is inappropriate. Should HCC grant permission to demolish existing garage, Applicant should clarify what is intended with resulting void ... noting adjacent garage structure was recently demolished without HCC review; resulting void with exposed block masonry foundations at neighboring location is inappropriate and should not serve as example for current Applicant to emulate.
Discussion: Louis Intile represented proposal to demolish dilapidated and deteriorated garage, which is located on East Morton Street. Mr. Evans confirmed HCC never approved demolition of adjacent garage structure or any other structures within current city block. Applicant noted his organization often presented to HCC, with proven success record for various rehabilitation projects; continued by agreeing with Historic Officer's assessment about construction dates for main structure and rear garage. Applicant explained property was recently purchased, so deferred maintenance issues resulted from previous owner while garage was previously used for storage. Applicant noted that main structure facing East Fourth Street is currently being rehabilitated in anticipation of prospective tenants; continued that attempts to stabilize compromised rear garage (installing plywood to replace damaged garage door, etc.) are temporary measures to avoid further vandalism while recent demolition of adjacent garage by neighboring property owner further compromised existing structure.
Mr. Simonson confirmed City of Bethlehem recently issued raze-or-repair order to new property owner, leading to Applicant's presentation to HCC. Mr. Evans inquired about vision upon demolition of existing garage; Applicant agreed that adjacent neighbor's approach (leaving foundation walls and crumbling parking pad) are inappropriate and will avoid similar approach ... most likely new parking pad for prospective tenants. Mr. Evans suggested that HCC should table current application, allowing Applicant to study options before returning with detailed plan for replacement. Applicant confirmed desire is not to construct new structure at garage location but rather to remove and allow for on-site parking. Mr. Evans explained HCC's hesitation in approving demolition without clear understanding of what would replace it: walls/fencing, materials, dimensions of replacement pad, etc.; encouraged Applicant to confer with other City departments to ensure all planning and zoning regulations are properly addressed. Applicant requested permission to demolish in order to approach other city officials to finalize various details. Mr. Simonson suggested resulting COA should include statement that demolition permit will not be issued until all planning applications are reviewed and approved.
Public Commentary: None.
Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. The proposal to demolish a dilapidated and deteriorated garage was presented by Louis Intile.
2. Appropriate demolition of the existing rear garage structure includes removal of all garage building elements (including masonry foundation walls) and replaced with a code-compliant concrete parking pad.

Note: The City of Bethlehem will not issue an approved permit to demolish the existing garage until all planning applications have been successfully reviewed and approved.
The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

## General Business:

Mr. Long introduced Laura Clifton as Historic Officer's new associate, replacing former associate who recently moved away upon retirement. Ms. Clifton will occasionally assist with researching relevant properties and will also serve as alternate Historic Officer during HCC meetings should Mr. Long be incapacitated.

## Mr. Simonson reported that Mr. Charles Patrick formally resigned from HCC.

Mr. Evans inquired about status of proposed project at location of former firehouse adjacent to Speedway gas station (215 Broadway: Greg Salomoni, Owner; John Lee, Applicant). Mr. Simonson confirmed no permits were pulled to-date and no visible demolition activity at that location; Mr. Evans expressed concern that HCC approved select demolition conditional upon subsequent submittals of project details, but Applicant has yet to return to HCC for further assessments.

Mr. Simonson reported on status of property located at 409-411 Wyandotte Street (Palace Row, LLC, Owner; Jackson Eighmy, Applicant). Rear addition to main structure recently experienced structural failure due to deterioration and is now fenced off for safety; Owner is currently cooperating with City's planning office to complete emergency demolition application. Mr. Simonson noted that previous COA allows for demolition of rear addition, contingent upon subsequent review of select architectural details; current request is to authorize demolition of rear addition while not authorizing construction of exterior façade until Applicant returns to HCC with results of demolition and potential ramifications on remaining project scope. HCC supported Mr. Simonson's suggestion to authorize emergency demolition of rear addition.

Minutes from HCC meeting on July 18, 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 $7: 15$ p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


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

D: \Correspondence\Historic Conservation Commission\2022\08.2022\2022.08.15 -- Minutes - HCC Meeting.docx

