
M I N U T E S

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: CRAIG EVANS, ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER (ARRIVED 5:15 PM), CHAZ PATRICK, MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER

MEMBERS ABSENT: SETH CORNISH, KENNETH LOUSH

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: NONE

VISITORS PRESENT: SCOTT BARTKUS, JOHN CALLAHAN, JORDAN CLARK, CHRIS EGGING, ALI KISHAR, JOSEPH SHADID, RANDY SMITH, PAUL SWARTZ, CARLOS TOVAR

MEETING DATE: JANUARY 5, 2022

The re-scheduled December 20, 2021, meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on January 5, 2022, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Vice Chair Craig Evans called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 305 East Third Street (previous COA indicated 307 East Third Street)

Property Owner: Peron Development

Applicant: John Callahan

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: A COA was previously issued for constructing a new five-story building at the current location of a surface parking lot with ten mature trees. The structure will be mixed-use, including commercial space on the first floor and one- and two-bedroom apartments on the entry level and upper floor levels.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant is returning from the August 30, 2021, HCC meeting with revisions and responses to HCC comments.

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 concerning New Construction** -- including but not limited to following: Size, Scale, Proportion; Rhythm and Patterns; Window and Door Openings; Materials and Textures; Architectural Details; Shape and Massing; Streetscapes.
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Storefronts'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on August 30, 2021, Applicant presented proposal to replace existing surface parking lot and ten mature trees with new, detached, five-story, mix-use masonry structure with flat roof. Following extensive discussion and against recommendation of Historic Officer (mainly due to inappropriate height of design proposal), HCC

upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Evans adopted proposal that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed new building with following details:

- south façade (facing East Third Street) measures approx. 108-feet wide; west façade (facing Taylor Street) measures approx. 128-feet wide; overall building height measures approx. 58-feet, excluding potential mechanical penthouse
- inner courtyard is accessed from walkways leading along east façade and is adjacent to existing 3-story mixed-used building
- structure includes approx. 2,000 square feet of commercial space at entry level (corner location at East Third Street and Taylor Street) as well as 44 one- and two-bedroom apartments at remaining entry level and upper floor levels; at entry level, chamfered condition at southwest corner façade accommodates required sight triangle
- structure does not include below-grade basement/cellar level or on-site parking spaces
- though conceived as one structure, overall building mass shifts in materiality at lowest four floor levels with differing materials and colors to appear as series of row houses; fourth floor level terminates in upper ornamental cornice while fifth floor level is delineated differently from lower floors and requires further development
- defining architectural features include traditionally inspired storefronts at street level along East Third Street and around corner along Taylor Street as well as double-hung windows, casement windows, Juliette balconies as well as cast sills and lintels at remaining facades along with ornamental cornices at lower sign band and above fourth floor level before rising another story

Motion for proposed work was approved: 5-1, with Mr. Lader not supporting motion, noting proposed building height was inappropriate due to negative impact of 5-story building on existing streetscape of one-, two-, two-and-one-half and three-story buildings based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect integrity of property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

Current COA Application responds to HCC request integrated into COA motion for more details about proposed window and door types, cast sills and lintels along with cornice profiles and façade materials as well as revised design for fifth floor level. Applicant was encouraged to reference 'Guidelines for Storefronts' before finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant was encouraged to reference 'Guidelines for Signage' to conceive overall building signage concept to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals. Envisioned exterior lighting fixtures as well as privacy/security fencing and gates leading from public sidewalks to inner courtyard also necessitate subsequent HCC review.

Current supplemental drawings, Architectural Narrative as well as Project Architect's cover letter begin to address such details. Applicant notes south façade (facing East Third Street) "reads as four separate structures" due to use of differing materials and colors at second through fourth floor levels; entry level has storefront systems, with recessed entries, display windows with cast stone and brick masonry skirts along with transoms while floor levels above feature double-hung windows along with multi-lite French doors and Juliette balconies. Applicant appropriately confirms no glazing will be reflective, colored or tinted. Proposed entry-level storefronts are appropriate, pending clarifications about materials, finishes and basic dimensions. Applicant is encouraged to follow architectural tradition within Historic Conservation District (HCD) of integrating commercial entrance within chamfered corner situation. Sign band with integrated gooseneck lighting fixtures by Spectrum Lighting, Inc. with angled reflectors in gloss black color and with 3000K LED color temperature is appropriate, pending clarification of sign band dimensions and associated materials ... also noting no conduits, raceways or junction boxes that service illumination can be visible from building façade. Façade treatments of second through fourth floor levels include cast stone veneer (Applicant confirms color rendition is not bright white and will submit product sample), brick veneer in dark red color and brick veneer in medium red-orange color; masonry façade materials are appropriate, pending HCC approval of submitted samples. Windows have expressed sills and lintels which are appropriate, pending clarification of intended materials, profiles and dimensions. Divided lite windows are appropriate pending confirmation they are true divided or simulated divided lites (no divisions sandwiched between inner and outer glazing) but require further clarification about intended materials, dimension, etc. Juliette

balconies are indicated with aluminum railings, which are inappropriate; painted iron railings are recommended. Window configurations in building sections with dark red brick have been revised from previous design proposal ... noting gangs of double windows without heavy separating mullions between as well as differing widths of windows at same floor levels are inappropriate; Applicant is encouraged to return to original design of three uniform windows evenly spaced at each floor level within each building section. Fourth floor level is capped with profiled cornice, with end units also receiving decorative support brackets; cornice details are appropriate, pending clarification of intended materials, profiles, dimensions, etc. and HCC assessment of product samples. West façade (facing Taylor Street) shares similar details with south façade as does north façade (facing Columbia Street), which also includes far-left façade component clad in fiber-cement siding. Pending successful review of various details at south façade, remaining façades are also appropriate, noting horizontal lap siding should have smooth surface (no wood graining or other textures) with 7-inch exposure and should not be bright white in color. Provided drawings also indicate aluminum gutters and downspouts; copper is HCC's recommended material while gutters should have half-round profiles and downspouts should have round profiles.

Previous COA required Applicant to further develop upper-most fifth floor level ... potentially as true Mansard roof (which would include lower steeper roof segment and upper shallower roof segment) or consider setting back entire floor level at least 12 feet from outer walls below. Current submittals indicate no revisions to upper floor level from previous design proposal, aside from rendering with different cladding material. Aside from private terrace for unit at southwest corner and terrace for common use at southeast corner, remaining fifth floor level does not set back from walls below and true Mansard roof construction (with two roof planes of differing pitches) is not currently proposed. To help "read" as Mansard roof, Applicant proposes fiber-cement sheathing in scallop pattern in dark gray color. Supplemental computer-generated rendering also depicts "alternate" façade treatment for upper-most floor level; however, envisioned cladding of proposed alternative is not identified. Appropriateness of fifth floor level warrants discussion before appropriateness can be determined.

Privacy/security fencing and gates leading from public sidewalks to inner courtyard are currently not detailed and necessitate subsequent HCC review.

Applicant also offers very different design approach for south façade (see Drawing Sheet 4 of 19), with fiber-cement panels and brick veneer cladding along with non-traditional window openings and individual balconies with metal-panel railings at upper floor levels with no differing delineation of fifth floor level to help diminish visual perception of overall building height while entry level includes full-height glazed storefronts. New façade approach represents significant departure from design previously determined by HCC as appropriate. If Applicant is seeking assessment of alternative façade, current discussion should cease and previous COA voided so Applicant can further develop before returning with complete set of façade studies for subsequent HCC consideration.

Discussion: John Callahan, Paul Swartz and Carlos Tovar represented proposal to return from August 30, 2021, HCC meeting with revisions and responses to HCC comments. Applicant noted project has not dramatically changed but current design responds to previous HCC comments and clarifies open issues. Applicant explained alternative façade study (Drawing Sheet 15 of 19) depicts cement-board siding to delineate stair at center of block in response to previous concern about stairs "reading" different from residential units; continued by expressing preference for original design with all-brick façade. Mr. Evans noted exterior cladding at 5th floor level is also rendered differently on alternative design; Applicant explained alternative design envisions cement-board siding as option instead of original scalloped siding at upper floor level but expressed preference for original concept. Mr. Lader clarified that HCC's request to further develop upper-most (fifth) floor level was not limited to cladding options but rather to explore setting back entire floor level and/or to construct as true Mansard roof to help mitigate height of new five-story structure within block of two- and three-story buildings.

Applicant repeated previous contention that true Mansard roof would significantly reduce overall square footage and complicate stair/elevator configurations for current design. Applicant noted Zoning ordinance currently allows 150-feet for building height and on-going considerations are to reduce allowable building height to 60-feet while Applicant's design is 58-feet high; also noted that upper floor at main façade (facing East Third Street) steps back at select locations to avoid perception from public right-of-way, as depicted on provided street views. Mr. Evans noted zoning limitations (current or perhaps revised height limits) are not considered by HCC, which is charged with subjective view that new construction appropriately fits within

Historic Conservation District ... which does not have specific/defined height measurements so individual projects must be assessed within existing historical context.

Mr. Lader inquired about proposed construction type; Applicant confirmed TYPE III-B (**note:** also known as "ordinary" construction, with brick or block walls and with wooden roof or floor assembly). In response, Mr. Lader suggested that upper-most floor level could easily be configured as Mansard construction, as depicted on Alternate Elevation, with proposed windows as true dormers; Applicant agreed that framing for true Mansard roof is possible, but construction becomes more complicated and expressed desire to maximize usable square footage. Mr. Lader continued that good design is challenging and encouraged Applicant to continue exploring alternatives for fifth floor level; Applicant noted if "trying to read as Mansard" is unsuccessful then willing to design as traditional vertical wall construction with no "implied" roofing material but with cement-board horizontal lap siding. Mr. Lader inquired about potential for five-foot setback at entire fifth floor level, rather than limiting to one select corner unit; Applicant countered that would result in significant reduction of square footage for various units while causing difficulties with framing of internal stairs. Mr. Lader noted potential benefit of providing terraces for all units at upper floor level rather than limiting only to corner unit, noting obvious need to reconfigure floor plan layouts to accommodate; continued by suggesting setback could be limited to façade segment facing East Third Street.

Applicant submitted cast stone veneer sample (buff white, not bright white); also referenced various materials identified within legends on provided drawing sheets. Mr. Evans inquired if Applicant would consider other color options for scallop siding at upper-most floor level; Applicant noted fabricator offers various color options but expressed preference for proposed dark gray that recalls roofs of other nearby structures. Mr. Simonson inquired if color rendition of proposed roofing is uniform or variegated; Applicant confirmed fabricator-applied finish is uniform in color and finish. Mr. Lader noted differences in window sizes from previous submittal (specifically in dark red sections); Applicant confirmed pairs of larger windows will have true separating mullions and agreed to make window sizes uniform, as initially proposed.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Evans 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. Proposal to construct new, detached, five-story, mixed-use structure was presented by John Callahan, Paul Swartz and Carlos Tovar. Applicant returned from August 30, 2021, HCC meeting with revisions and responses to HCC comments.
2. Appropriate new structure includes following details:
 - a. south façade (facing Third Street):
 - i. reads as four separate structures due to use of differing materials (cast stone veneer in buff white color and brick veneer in dark red and medium red-orange colors) at second through fourth floor levels
 - ii. entry level has anodized aluminum as well as composite fiberglass storefront systems with recessed entries, display windows with cast stone and brick masonry skirts along with transoms and sign bands; **note:** no project glazing will be reflective, colored or tinted
 - iii. second through fourth floor levels feature composite fiberglass double-hung windows along with multi-lite French doors and Juliette balconies with painted iron railings; 1-over-1 double-hung windows are uniform in size while pairs of double-hung windows have true dividing mullions (i.e. are not ganged); 6-over-6 double-hung windows have true divided lites or simulated divided lites (i.e. muntins applied to exterior glass surface, not sandwiched between glazing); all windows have cast sills and lintels
 - iv. sign band in SPF (spruce-pine-fir) kiln-dried wood includes integrated gooseneck light fixtures by Spectrum Lighting, Inc. (or comparable) with angled reflectors in gloss black color and with 3000K LED color temperature; **note:** no conduits, raceways or junction boxes that service illumination can be visible from building façade
 - v. fourth floor level is capped with SPF profiled cornice, with end units also receiving decorative support brackets; **note:** HCC recommends half-round copper gutters and copper downspouts with round profiles

- b. west façade (facing Taylor Street) shares similar details with south façade but with storefront limited to southwest end segment, as does north façade (facing Columbia Street) but with no storefront and includes northeast façade component clad in fiber-cement siding with smooth surface (i.e. no wood graining or other textures), 7-inch exposure and not bright white in color
- c. upper-most (fifth) floor level includes following details:
 - i. private terrace set back approx. 3-feet for unit at southwest corner and common terrace set back approx. 16-feet for use by tenants at southeast corner; otherwise, remaining fifth floor level does not set back from walls below
 - ii. all façades clad in fiber cement scallop siding in dark gray color to help “read” as Mansard roof
 - iii. composite fiberglass 1-over-1 double-hung windows are uniform in size while pairs of double-hung windows have true dividing mullions (i.e. are not ganged); windows are capped with SPF profiled trim to imply roof dormers
 - iv. terraces have painted iron railings
- 3. Applicant agreed to submit relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) and material samples of all proposed windows, doors, cast stone details and brick veneers via City of Bethlehem for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair prior to fabrication and installation.
- 4. Privacy/security fencing and gate(s) leading from public sidewalks to inner courtyard as well as overall signage concepts necessitate subsequent HCC reviews.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 317-327 South New Street

Property Owner: 325 South New Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant is returning from the November 15, 2021, HCC meeting with revisions and responses to HCC comments.

Guideline Citations:

- **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. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- **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 #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission ‘Guidelines for Signage and Awnings’**
- **Historic Conservation Commission ‘Guidelines for Storefronts’** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on November 15, 2021, Applicant presented responses to requirement of initial COA that future project development unifies upper-level façades with façades at street level for more cohesive design and addresses such details as window and door types, cast sills and lintels, cornice profiles and façade materials along with street-level storefronts with awnings. Accompanying drawings indicated design proposal still envisions demolition of all existing structures while integrating salvaged front façade at 321-323 South New Street; Applicant clarified intended approach to protect historical façade during pending demolition as well as resulting rehabilitation efforts. After lengthy discussion, HCC passed motion to table

decision to determine appropriateness of proposed work: 6-0-1, with abstention by Mr. Loush. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to approve current proposal and encouraged Applicant to address such issues as: cornice lines; create more unified front façade; address design of highly-visible side and rear façades, especially in relation to nearby Greenway; center service doors at rear façade with window bays above; incorporate more storefront glazing at side (and potentially at rear) façade; consider appropriate alternatives to proposed (inappropriate) EIFS stucco system; present actual products (not just written specifications) for proposed windows and doors, cast stone details, etc.

Current COA Application represents Applicant's responses to previous commentary. Proposed design remains nine-story, mixed-use building that measures approx. 110-feet wide, approx. 75-feet deep, approx. 88-feet high at shortest (southwest) corner and approx. 92-feet at tallest (northwest) corner but also includes mechanical penthouse obscured from view by louvered equipment screening. Upper-level façades now appropriately align with street level façades resulting in more cohesive design while storefronts appropriately respond to pitch of South New Street by stepping down to meet adjacent public sidewalk. Aside from rehabilitated historical façade, initial three floor levels are clad in large-format limestone panels, which is appropriate. Proposed storefronts are appropriate, pending clarification about frame materials; Applicant previously confirmed that all glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective. Awnings above storefronts with open ends are also appropriate, with Applicant's previous confirmation that fabric is canvas or canvas-like woven vinyl, pending color rendition that avoids bright white or neon colors. Paneled sign bands above storefronts and similar paneled cladding at structural posts and second-level façade above passageway to East Graham Place are now confirmed as stucco paneling, which is appropriate, pending color rendition that avoids bright white.

Exterior cladding at fourth through seventh floor levels is smaller-format limestone panels for vertical window groupings at West (front), North (side) and East (rear) façades, with dark red or brown brick elsewhere; both materials are appropriate, pending acceptance of submittals associated specifications and product samples. Applicant previously proposed metal-panel siding at two upper-most floor levels while current design indicates limestone veneer in same format at remaining upper floor levels. Limestone cladding is potentially appropriate; however, Applicant may wish to consider smaller formats and differing (darker) color renditions to help mitigate visual impact of overall building height. Applicant was previously requested by HCC to consider setting back two upper-most floor levels to help mitigate visual impact of overall building height; however, current design does not respond to that request. Without setback of upper-most floor levels, Applicant might consider more appropriate solution by cladding all upper floor levels with same combination of brick and limestone panels. Profiled cast stone cornice mouldings delineate changes in façade cladding; cast stone cornices are appropriate, and Applicant provides various profiles so submittal of actual materials for final review is appreciated. Per HCC recommendation, Applicant included substantial cast stone cornice moulding above upper-most floor level, which is also appropriate. Provided Drawing Sheets indicate brick façades at fourth through seventh floor levels currently extend out slightly beyond walls below, which is inappropriate and should be corrected. Two intermediate structural posts at North (side) façade are now centered between window bays, which is appropriate.

Window placements have improved from initial submittal. 1-over-1, double-hung sash with expressed sills and lintels are appropriate, pending final approval of window specifications and noting HCC preference for cast stone details. Most windows are depicted with Packaged Terminal Air Conditioner (PTAC) vents beneath sills; such vents are not described within relevant design guidelines so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined, with preference for product sample submittals for final review. Applicant responded to HCC suggestion to integrate additional storefront assemblies at side (north) façade under portico for improved visual connection with adjacent Greenway, which are appropriate.

Relevant design guidelines indicate "plain, modern flush doors are inappropriate"; however, solid doors depicted at East (rear) façade serve utilitarian purposes so exception can be made, pending clarification about proposed material. Per recommendation, Applicant appropriately adjusted placements of utilitarian doors so that centerline of each door aligns with centerline of associated window bay above. Per HCC suggestion, Applicant integrated appropriate awnings above rear entrances. Applicant also incorporated select window openings at rear service level that appropriately align with window bays above; however, heights of proposed windows should be reconsidered ... currently appear too high within rear façade. Mr. Long reminded HCC this COA Application was previously tabled and cannot be tabled again, so HCC must pass motion to approve or deny details within current proposal.

Discussion: Jordan Clark represented proposal to return from November 15, 2021, HCC meeting with revisions and responses to HCC comments. Applicant confirmed all façade materials are true veneers (limestone, brick, etc.) and no longer “faux” finishes, all windows are aluminum-clad wooden window sash and PTAC grilles can be painted to match window color, as needed. Applicant also noted design attempts to set back façades at upper-most floor levels, but floorplan reconfigurations resulted in significant loss of usable square footage, so current design proposal does not include such revisions.

Mr. Lader inquired about vertical lines depicted on façade drawings; Applicant noted minor changes in depth of façades at select locations within areas of brick veneer resulting in subtle shadow lines. Mr. Lader expressed appreciation for detail as appropriate, noting similar examples within Historic Conservation District and encouraged Applicant to further develop. Mr. Lader expressed “mixed emotions” about proposed façade material at upper-most floor levels, noting scale of limestone veneer panels repeats scale of similar panels at lower floor levels and encouraged Applicant to consider brick veneer that matches façades at fourth through seventh floor levels for consistent appearance. Applicant clarified intent for smaller-scale limestone panels at upper-most floor levels, which is mistakenly depicted at larger scale on current drawing sheets; continued by recalling initial design attempts with no delineation of upper floor levels but ultimately appreciated difference in façade materials at upper floors. Mr. Evans inquired if Applicant would consider extending columns/fields of brick veneer at window groupings to full height of structure; Applicant noted early design exploration included such detail but ultimately prefers differing façade treatment at upper-most floor levels to imply penthouse aesthetic. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to study façades of appropriate taller structures within Historic Conservation District (especially so-called Flatiron Building designed by famed Bethlehem architect A.W. Leh) for further inspiration.

Applicant confirmed doors at rear (east) façade are flat, plain, insulated metal doors (due to utilitarian function); also noted potential to lower window heights at rear façade (currently for kitchen) ... depending upon finalized tenant. Mr. Evans explained commercial kitchen vent expressed on building façade (even at rear) will require HCC review; Applicant noted certain tenants would not require commercial kitchen vent but if required, will install directly at window opening to avoid extending full height of exterior wall.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Patrick 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 construct new, nine-story, mixed-use building with integrated salvaged front façade was presented by Jordan Clark.
2. Appropriate new structure includes following details:
 - a. upper-level façades align with street level façades; storefronts at front (west) façade respond to pitch of South New Street by stepping down to meet adjacent public sidewalk while additional storefronts at side (north) façade under portico provide visual connection with adjacent Greenway
 - b. aside from rehabilitated historical façade, initial three floor levels are clad in large-format limestone veneer panels in buff white color while proposed storefronts require subsequent clarification about proposed materials; awnings above storefronts are canvas or canvas-like woven vinyl with open ends and color rendition that avoids bright white and neon colors; **note:** Applicant previously confirmed all project glazing is not tinted, colored or reflective
 - c. paneled sign bands above storefronts and similar paneled cladding at structural posts and second-level façade above passageway to East Graham Place are stucco in buff white color; two intermediate structural posts at North (side) façade are centered between window bays above
 - d. exterior cladding at fourth through seventh floor levels is smaller-format limestone veneer panels for vertical window groupings at west (front), north (side) and east (rear) façades, with dark red or brown brick elsewhere; brick façade segments include pilasters at corners and between sets of windows to create vertical shadow lines

- e. south (side) façade is only visible above fourth floor level due to adjacency with neighboring structure; cladding at fourth through seventh floor levels matches dark red or brown brick elsewhere, with pilasters limited to corners
 - f. exterior cladding at upper-most (eighth and ninth) floor level façades is small-format limestone veneer
 - g. profiled cast stone cornice measuring approx. 1'-6.5" x 1'-3" delineates change in façade cladding above third floor level while profiled cast stone cornice measuring 1'-4" x 1'-6" delineates additional change in façade cladding above seventh floor level; heavy profiled cast stone cornice measuring approx. 2'-0" x 1'-5" caps upper-most floor level
 - h. upper-level windows are 1-over-1, double-hung, aluminum-clad wood sash with cast sills and lintels; most windows also have Packaged Terminal Air Conditioner (PTAC) vents beneath sills, to be painted to match finalized window color
 - i. plain, solid, flush metal doors at east (rear) façade serve utilitarian purposes; centerlines of doors align with centerlines of window bays above while awnings with open ends shelter each entrance
 - j. select window openings at east (rear) service level align with window bays above, with window heights finalized upon clarification of intended commercial tenant; **note:** exterior kitchen exhaust vent (if needed) necessitates subsequent HCC review
3. Applicant agreed to submit relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) and material samples of all proposed windows, doors, cast stone details as well as brick and limestone veneers via City of Bethlehem for final review by Chief Building Inspector, Historic Officer and HCC Chair prior to fabrication and installation.
 4. Exterior light fixtures as well as overall signage concepts necessitate subsequent HCC reviews.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 127 East Fourth Street

Property Owner: 127 East Fourth Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a four-story, detached, stone and brick masonry institutional building with a flat roof. Defining architectural features include a raised, stepped and arched front parapet with a triple-arched entry portal and banks of double-hung windows. The building dates from 1925 and is Italianate Revival in style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to convert the former Holy Infancy School into a mixed-use building, with a commercial tenant and 24 residential units. Proposed exterior work involves opening previously closed window openings and replacing all doors and windows. An exterior ramp will be constructed on the side of the building to accommodate ADA-compliance.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **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: COA Application indicates intent to change out all existing windows with new aluminum replacements for improved energy efficiency. Many window replacements are 1-over-1 double-hung sash while most at third-floor level are triple-hung sash but incorrectly labeled on provided Drawing Sheets at "double-hung" windows. Historical photograph from 1929 confirm building's windows originally had divided lites -- see supplementals. Current window replacements date from mid- to late 20th century, which is later than period of interpretation of Historic

Conservation District, so Applicant is encouraged to return divided sash details with new window replacements because they are considered character-defining elements. Various existing configurations include gangs of windows with masonry mullions between each window; however, mullions seem absent on provided Drawings Sheets that depict window replacements (might be due to manner of depiction), which is inappropriate. Based upon provided floorplans, select windows are interrupted by new interior wall systems, which is also inappropriate. Some floorplans depict select bedrooms at Second Floor Balcony Level and select living spaces at First Floor Level with no windows, which would be unpleasant spaces for tenants and might even violate building code. Upon Applicant's clarifications of those issues, proposed replacements are appropriate ... pending HCC assessment of relevant product information (fabricator, intended materials and finishes, typical dimensions of major window components, etc.) and preferably with product samples ... along with confirmation that window replacements will be custom sized to fit existing historical openings and not contemporary standard sizes with additional trim to compensate for dimensional differences.

Double-height window openings at rear (north) façade as well as at both side (east and west) façades include large-format replacements with contemporary divisions. 1929 historical photograph depicts heavy masonry mullions at all large window openings, which are considered character-defining details; however, openings are currently covered over so Applicant should confirm if original mullions still exist ... noting they are missing from Applicant's current proposal, so discussion is warranted. If new mullion configurations are intended, Applicant should mimic dimensions of original mullions and also clarify proposed materials.

Project description also notes intent to open previously closed window openings, which is appropriate; Applicant should note that missing details (sills, lintels, mullions, etc.) should also be replaced to match existing, as needed. Historical opening at entry level on side (west) façade (near southwest corner) remains closed on provided Drawing Sheets and currently exhibits inappropriate infill (brick units and mortar joints that do not match historical building fabric) along with exposed vent hood and other exterior ductwork, so clarification is warranted about Applicant's intent to address those items during proposed rehabilitation.

Drawing Sheets do not depict existing historical, wooden, double-hung sash with 4-over-4 lite configurations (one at each side of steps within recessed entry portal) so clarification about intentions with those windows is warranted. In all relevant circumstances, Applicant should be aware that reflective, tinted and/or colored glazing is inappropriate.

Supplemental cover letter indicates intent to replace all exterior doors "to match the windows". Although accompanying drawing sheets depict exterior door replacements, no additional details are provided so discussion is warranted ... noting that relevant Design Guidelines state "plain, modern flush doors are inappropriate" so current proposal is inappropriate. At side (east) façade, existing doors are much wider than depicted replacements (actual width matches width of windows above) while door closest to southeast corner is also depicted much higher than existing. Entrance door at side (west) façade leading to new ADA (handicap accessible) ramp interrupts window configuration, which is inappropriate; this design component requires further development that avoids damage to historical details at existing window opening. Details of ADA ramp also require HCC review but are not provided.

COA Application makes no mention of intent to clean various exterior masonry surfaces as part of proposed rehabilitation; however, such efforts would result in immediate visual improvement to existing facades. Applicant is encouraged to reference relevant Preservation Briefs issued by National Park Service to appropriately clean historical masonry surfaces. Applicant is also encouraged to carefully removing various abandoned fasteners, conduits, hanging brackets for former air-conditioning units, etc. at all façades and patch resulting voids to match existing materials, as needed. COA Application makes no mention of rehabilitating existing rainwater collection system; however, downspouts currently transition to white PVC pipes at first floor level. Applicant is encouraged to replace inappropriate PVC to match existing. Current exterior lighting is limited to select utilitarian fixtures, with many no longer properly functioning; replacement fixtures necessitate subsequent HCC review.

Due to adjacency of project location with Greenway, Applicant is also encouraged to reconsider existing scenario at northwest corner (utilitarian metal stairs leading to concrete steps that terminate in metal fence with padlocked gate) to improve access to and visual connection with nearby public Greenway.

Discussion: Jordan Clark represented proposal to convert former Holy Infancy School into mixed-use building, with commercial tenant and 24 residential units. Proposed exterior work involves opening

previously closed window openings and replacing all doors and windows; exterior ramp will be constructed on side of building to facilitate ADA compliance. Applicant confirmed desire to return exterior building façade to aesthetic depicted in 1929 historical photograph provided by Historic Officer (windows with divided lites, heavy mullions between gangs of windows, etc.); continued by clarifying interior walls will not interrupt windows while select spaces depicted without windows in provided floor plan drawings have windows that are higher in exterior walls. Applicant confirmed door replacements will be insulated metal doors but agreed to revise flush doors as paneled doors with divided lites, as depicted in historical photograph. Applicant agreed with Historic Officer's suggestion that exterior façade should be properly cleaned and noted PVC piping at downspouts will be replaced with copper. Applicant explained that new ADA-compliant entrance ramp will be concrete with brick veneer along with metal railings painted black. Applicant also noted initial discussions with developer of adjacent new construction project to consider options for encouraging circulation of new residents to nearby Greenway.

Mr. Lader inquired if original mullions still exist at large window openings. Applicant noted that issue requires further exploration; agreed to retain historical mullions or to replace in-kind if currently missing. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about Applicant's intended window replacements; Applicant responded that current proposal includes aluminum-clad wood windows with applied muntins (currently considering Pella and Andersen replacements). Mr. Evans noted Norwood as another potential fabricator of window replacements previously considered by HCC as appropriate; Mr. Lader recalled preference for Norwood window replacements because of factory-applied finish, which lasts longer than field-painted windows. Applicant apologized for lack of window samples for HCC consideration, noting current difficulties with securing product samples; Mr. Simonson noted that relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) and material samples of proposed window replacements and exterior doors can be submitted to Bethlehem Planning Office when available rather than waiting until subsequent HCC meeting. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to further explore proposed ADA-compliant entrance at west façade to avoid conflict with existing large window opening.

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 as follows:

1. Proposal to convert former Holy Infancy School into mixed-use building, with commercial tenant and 24 residential units was presented by Jordan Clark.
2. Appropriate building renovations include following details:
 - a. existing window openings to receive new aluminum window replacements:
 - i. existing sash configurations (single-hungs, double-hungs, triple-hungs) to be retained but with divided lites (typically 6 lites per sash) to replicate original character-defining details; lites are true divided lites or simulated divided lites (i.e. muntins applied to exterior glass surface, not sandwiched between glazing)
 - ii. existing mullions between gangs of windows to be retained; window replacements must be custom sized to fit existing historical openings
 - iii. new interior wall systems cannot interrupt individual window sash
 - iv. reflective, tinted and/or colored glazing is inappropriate
 - b. double-height window openings at rear (north) façade as well as at both side (east and west) façades are currently closed over; Applicant to investigate potential for existence of original character-defining mullions between gangs of windows before returning to HCC with modified design approach for those windows for subsequent assessment
 - c. Applicant to modify design of new ADA-compliant exterior ramp with new entrance at side (west) façade that avoids interruption of historical window configuration before returning to HCC with modified design approach for subsequent assessment
 - d. closed historical window openings to be re-opened, with missing details (sills, lintels, mullions, etc.) to match existing; historical opening at entry level on side (west) façade (near southwest corner) to remain closed while existing inappropriate infill to be replaced so brick units and mortar joints match historical building fabric

- e. existing plain, modern, flush entrance doors to be replaced with commercial aluminum entrance doors with lower panels and upper divided lites to match character-defining original doors
 - f. project scope to include cleaning of exterior masonry surfaces as well as careful removal of abandoned fasteners, conduits, hanging brackets for former air-conditioning units, etc. at all façades and patch resulting voids to match existing materials, as needed; **note:** Applicant is encouraged to reference relevant Preservation Briefs issued by National Park Service for appropriately cleaning historical masonry surfaces
 - g. existing PVC piping downspout segments to be replaced with appropriate copper downspouts to match existing, as needed
 - h. Applicant encouraged to reconsider existing scenario at northwest corner (utilitarian metal stairs leading to concrete steps that terminate in metal fence with padlocked gate) to improve access to and visual connection with nearby public Greenway
3. Applicant agreed to submit relevant product information (cut sheets, specifications, etc.) and material samples of all proposed windows and doors via City of Bethlehem for final review by the Chief Building Inspector, the Historic Officer and the HCC Chair prior to fabrication and installation.
 4. Exterior light fixtures as well as signage necessitate subsequent HCC reviews.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #4

Property Location: 321 East Fourth Street

Property Owner: Touchstone Theatre

Applicant: Chris Egging

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a two and one-half story, semi-detached, brick masonry building with a gable roof. There is a steel balcony at the second-floor level, a projecting upper cornice with decorative wooden brackets, two roof dormers with paired windows with pointed arches and quatrefoil detailing, casement windows and door with transoms at the second-floor level along with an altered storefront. The main building was constructed in ca. 1890 and is stylistically mixed, with Gothic Revival as well as Italianate details. The two-story brick masonry rear addition with flat roof and double story framed rear porch was constructed during the early 20th century.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to install a new EPDM roof system on top of the existing roof surface, including removal of existing terracotta coping tiles and replacing one-half-inch CDX plywood on the inner face and solid 2x10 lumber on top of the revealed brick surface topped by sheet aluminum coping.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #1 (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 ...)
- **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: COA Application indicates intent to repair existing flat roof at rear extension by installing new EPDM rubber roof membrane over existing roof, including removal of existing terracotta tiles that serve as coping atop upper parapet and replacing with 2x10 lumber covered with .032 aluminum coping. Surface of proposed rubber roof is not visible from public right-of-way, so HCC review is not required; however, replacing terracotta tiles with aluminum-covered lumber is visible from public right-of-way and triggers HCC review. Applicable SIS note deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced but if deterioration requires replacement, new features should match original. Application and supplemental photographs provide no evidence that existing terracotta tiles require full replacement; indeed, supplemental photographs indicate most tiles are well above installation height of existing rubber roof membrane, so discussion is warranted.

Such tiles are considered character-defining details so their loss should be avoided, if possible. If proposal to replace existing terracotta coping tiles is deemed appropriate by HCC, aluminum coping should include proper drip edge detail and should not be bright white in color but rather painted warm white/beige to match adjacent trim or brick red to match parapet wall.

Discussion: Chris Egging represented proposal to install new EPDM roof system on top of existing roof surface, including removal of existing terracotta coping tiles and replacing with one-half-inch CDX plywood on inner face and solid 2x10 lumber on top of revealed brick surface topped by sheet aluminum coping. Applicant agreed with preference to retain existing terracotta tiles as coping atop parapet of rear flat roof; however, recent inspection by roofing contractor revealed existing tiles are significantly deteriorated ... not just at critical junction with gable roof of main structure; continued that most tiles would not survive temporary removal to complete proposed job. Applicant explained that current roof is only 5-7 years old but water penetration at critical locations between flat roof and parapet wall resulted in significant water damage to rooms below. Current proposal extends new roof membrane up onto vertical parapet, with aluminum coping as replacement for lost terracotta tiles; new roof would have 25-year guarantee. Mr. Lader expressed disappointment about inability to salvage existing terracotta tiles, which are considered character-defining element and should be retained, if possible. Applicant expressed willingness to return to roofing contractor to inquire about comparable replacement tiles; however, also expressed concern about ramifications on project budget and schedule. Mr. Lader explained that metal coping in bright white color is inappropriate and suggested dark bronze finish as potential appropriate alternative; Applicant agreed to cooperate with roofing contractor to source metal coping in dark bronze finish. Mr. Lader noted that provided construction sketch of coping (as submitted by roofing contractor) indicates incorrect drip edge detail; encouraged Applicant to cooperate with contractor to amend detail accordingly.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Lader 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. Proposal to install new EPDM roof system at rear extension flat roof, including removal of existing terracotta coping tiles and replace with sheet aluminum, was presented by Chris Egging.
2. Appropriate new roof system includes following details:
 - a. careful removal of existing terracotta tiles that serve as coping atop upper parapet and replace with 2x10 lumber covered with .032 aluminum coping
 - b. new coping to include appropriate drip edge detail and has dark bronze finish
 - c. **note:** new EPDM rubber roof membrane installed on top of existing flat roof is not visible from public right-of-way and requires no assessment by HCC or subsequent approval from Bethlehem City Council

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #5

Property Location: 127-129 East Third Street

Property Owner: P.J. Century, LLC

Applicant: Ali Kishar

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a three-story, three-bay, brick, attached commercial and residential building with a flat roof. It has a projecting pressed metal upper cornice, flat window lintels at the second-floor level and a renovated storefront. The building dates from ca. 1890 and is Federal Revival in style with Italianate details.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to install a new sign and to place vinyl stickers on the storefront window.

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 'Guidelines for Signage and Awnings'** -- see Agenda Item #2

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Submitted COA Application indicates intent to install signage at existing sign band to reflect new commercial tenant. Word "KING" is proposed in stylized, sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in dark red color followed by word "WING" in same stylized, sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in dark green color; centered between both words is chicken head corporate logo in yellow and white colors with crown in dark red color. Application notes intent to individually mount 3-millimeter-thick PVC dimensional letters directly onto existing sign band using glue. Dimensions of proposed signage are 12-inches tall x 117-inches wide; unfortunately, no overall dimensions of existing sign band are provided.

Proposed signage at sign band is appropriate, with following clarifications and modifications:

- confirm new lettering will not interrupt existing dentil molding details above sign band or decorative panels at bottom of sign band
- consider studs for installing individual letters and then painting over to match as alternative to inappropriate glue installation. **Note:** Applicant is encouraged to apply individual letters and logo onto backer board, resulting in significantly fewer mounting locations; if acceptable, logo should be reduced in scale so that backer also includes offset pin stripe detail around entire sign perimeter ... potentially in color to match lettering or logo
- Owner should repair all damage caused during removal of existing signage and repaint sign band before installing new signage

COA Application also indicates intent to install similar signage as vinyl stickers in storefront window, with word "KING" and logo on one text line followed by word "WING" on next text line, with logo serving as dot over letter "I" in "WING". Dimensions of overall signage are 12-inches tall x 36-inches wide; unfortunately, no overall dimensions of storefront window are provided.

Proposed signage at storefront is appropriate, with following clarifications and modifications:

- confirm all lettering is installed on inside surface of storefront glass
- confirm lettering and graphics are not outlined in white color, which is inappropriate
- consider raising height of signage within upper one-third of storefront; proposed signage is currently centered within storefront window, which blocks direct view into commercial location by passersby

Finally, Owner and/or Applicant is required to remove inappropriate LED lighting around entire inside perimeter of storefront window.

Discussion: Ali Kishar represented proposal to install new sign and to place vinyl stickers on storefront window. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant would accept Historic Officer's various recommendations. Applicant noted that signage company representative was unable to attend HCC meeting, but various suggestions seemed reasonable ... including need to remove LED lighting around inside perimeter of storefront window. Applicant requested written description of various items to forward to signage company; Mr. Simonson explained resulting COA would soon be approved by City Council, with resolution detailing various requirements mailed thereafter to Applicant's attention ... with associated permit available from Zoning Officer thereafter.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Simonson and seconded by Mr. Patrick 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 new sign and to place vinyl stickers on storefront to reflect new commercial tenant was presented by Ali Kishar.
2. Appropriate new sign at existing sign band includes following details:
 - a. word "KING" in stylized, sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in dark red color followed by word "WING" in same stylized, sans-serif, all upper-case lettering in dark green color; centered between both words is chicken head corporate logo in yellow and white colors with crown in dark red color

- b. 3-millimeter-thick PVC dimensional letters to be mounted onto new backer (AZEK or comparable material); backer to be painted to match existing sign band or warm white/ivory in color, with off-set pinstripe detail around entire sign perimeter in dark red or dark green color to match lettering
 - c. dimensions of new signage are approx. 12-inches tall x 117-inches wide to avoid existing dentil molding details above sign band and decorative panels at bottom of sign; sign backer to be carefully studded into existing sign band
 - d. Owner to repair all damage caused during removal of existing signage and repaint sign band before installing new sign
3. Appropriate new window signage includes following details:
 - a. word “KING” and logo on one text line followed by word “WING” on next text line, with logo serving as dot over letter “I” in “WING”; lettering and graphics are not outlined in another color
 - b. dimensions of overall signage are 12-inches tall x 36-inches wide
 - c. all lettering to be installed on inside surface of storefront glass
 4. Owner and/or Applicant is required to remove the existing inappropriate LED lighting around the entire inside perimeter of the storefront window.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #6

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 addition.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed 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.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #1 (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 ...)
- **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: COA Application indicates intent to remove existing slate roof and replace with “any applicable shingle-type roof” as well as to replace existing gutters with half-round copper gutters. Applicable SIS note deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced but if deterioration requires replacement, new features should match original. Application and supplemental photographs provide no evidence that existing slate roof (which is considered a character-defining detail) cannot be repaired and requires full replacement, so discussion is warranted. If proposal to replace existing slate roof with shingles is determined by HCC as appropriate, new roof 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

Proposal to install new half-round copper gutters is appropriate, pending confirmation that associated new copper downspouts are round.

Discussion: Joseph Shadid and Randy Smith represented proposal to replace existing slate roof and damaged gutters; new roof will be any applicable shingle-type roof and gutter replacements are half-round copper. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant could retain and repair existing slate roof, considering slates are character-defining features. Applicant expressed preference for replacing slate roof with asphalt shingles, noting initial cost estimate as supplement to COA Application. Mr. Lader noted that regular maintenance of existing slate roofs ultimately result in overall roof replacement, with life span of new slates far exceeding life of asphalt shingles while retaining appropriate historical character. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring how often Applicant repairs existing slate roof; Applicant noted roofer annually repairs roof to replace missing slate but select areas of slates are brittle and certain locations have resulted in roof leaks to rooms below. Mr. Lader explained that proper annual maintenance by qualified roofer should allow Applicant to retain slate roof and extend associated expenses out over time rather than upfront cost for full replacement roof in asphalt shingles with maximum lifespan of 30 years. Applicant recalled current roofing contractor identified one major leak and several other areas of concern where slate roof is irreparable during previous annual inspection and informed Applicant that full replacement is imminent. Mr. Evans noted similar previous HCC reviews included potential for “simulated slate” as appropriate replacement, noting lifespan of such products is longer than asphalt shingles ... admitting still more expensive than asphalt shingles but not as expensive as all new slates ... and encouraged Applicant to consider such options. Applicant submitted product sample of asphalt shingle currently proposed; Mr. Lader noted that submitted product is inappropriate and recalled Historic Officer’s summary of acceptable asphalt shingle alternatives (GAF Slateline non-architectural shingles in slate gray color, etc.) previously determined by HCC at other similar project sites as appropriate. Mr. Simonson noted potential for “composite slate” (fabricated from fiberglass, recycled slate, cement, etc.) with slate-like aesthetic but uncertain if HCC would consider appropriate without more details; Mr. Evans recalled similar roofing product used on rehabilitated firehouse within Historic Conservation District assessed by HCC more than ten years ago. Mr. Lader expressed concern about synthetic slate, noting potential conflict with relevant Secretary of Interior’s Standards to avoid simulated details using non-historical materials. Ms. Strasser noted she lives very near project location and her own home has original slate roof that receives proper annual maintenance; continued that qualified roofing contractor should be able to replace damaged/brittle shingles without inconveniencing Applicant with full roof replacement. Applicant expressed desire for HCC motion to initiate proposed work; Mr. Lader expressed concern about initiating work at beginning of winter season and recommended Applicant to explore various options before submitting new COA Application with alternatives ... (best to speak with several qualified roofing contractors to understand all options) including scenario that retains existing slates but with select repairs. Mr. Hudak noted that many slate roofs throughout South Bethlehem are still maintained by qualified slate roofers, typically involving selective slate replacement and resulting in repairs that outlive full replacement with new asphalt shingles. Applicant expressed willingness to explore various options before returning to HCC for further consideration.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Lader and seconded by Mr. Hudak adopted the proposal to table the decision to determine appropriateness of the proposed work. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to approve current proposal and 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, but with various appropriate details; new composite slate in imitation slate aesthetic.

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

Agenda Item #7

Property Location: 210-212 East Third Street

Property Owner: 210 E. 3rd Street, LLC

Applicant: Scott Bartkus

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a two-story, three-bay, detached brick masonry building with a flat roof. The building portion facing East Third Street was originally constructed ca. 1900 as an appliance and hardware store but later served as a tavern under various ownership. The upper floor level has 1-over-1 double-hung windows while the original entry-level storefront has been altered to include a central recessed entrance flanked on either side by modified windows openings ... each with side-by-side sliding windows. During the mid- 20th century, the storefront received a cladding of Formstone (regionally referred to by the brand name 'Permastone'), a type of pigmented stucco shaped to imitate the appearance of stone masonry. The east façade was clad in vinyl siding sometime during the mid- to late 20th century. Masonry and wood frame rear additions connect this structure to the two-story brick masonry residential building facing Mechanic Street. Many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be identified by a defining style.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to remove siding on the east façade and replace with thin-brick veneer and to remove Permastone on the north façade or cover over with thin-brick veneer; brick veneer to closely match color and pattern of existing brick wall at west façade. It is also proposed to restore the glass storefronts on the north façade, to replace three double-hung windows and add faux shutters. It is also proposed to replace downspout at the northwest corner with a square aluminum downspout. The Applicant intends to bring along material samples to the meeting.

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 'Guidelines for Storefronts'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During presentation to HCC on October 18, 2021, Applicant proposed to paint existing Formstone cladding at front (north) façade as well as vinyl siding at side (east) façade in dark red color, to modify existing windows at entry-level front façade and to infill recessed entry flush with front façade before installing new storefront entrance door. At that time, HCC noted various concerns about Applicant's proposal and unanimously tabled decision to determine appropriateness of proposed work ... encouraging Applicant to cooperate with licensed design professional experienced with historic structures before returning for subsequent review of rehabilitation proposal that responds to expressed concerns.

Current COA Application represents request for subsequent HCC review and indicates intent to replace inappropriate vinyl siding at side (east) façade with brick veneer to closely match color and pattern of existing brick at side (west) façade. Proposal is appropriate ... pending HCC acceptance of brick sample submittals, with veneer system to match not only color and brick bond pattern but also brick texture along with mortar color and joint dimensions at existing brick wall. Similarly, proposal to remove inappropriate Formstone siding at front (north) façade and replace with brick veneer is appropriate ... pending acceptance of mortar and brick sample submittals.

COA Application also indicates intent to replace recessed entrance with new, full-glazed storefront entrance door with glazed transom. Replacement door measures 84-inches tall x 36-inches wide while transom measures 33-inches tall x 36-inches wide; material of door and transom is anodized aluminum in dark bronze color. Proposed replacement entrance is appropriate, as presented ... pending acceptance of product submittals (need fabricator, product line, etc.) as well as clarification if existing recessed entrance condition remains or if recessed entry is infilled flush with front façade.

Accompanying project narrative describes intent to replace existing downspout at northwest corner with new square aluminum downspout. HCC is not commissioned with assessing downspouts but typically

recommends half-round gutters and round downspouts, so discussion is warranted. Project narrative also mentions Applicant's intent to restore glass storefront on front (north) façade. Existing entry-level windows at front façade are also inappropriate so Applicant's intent to modify openings is encouraged; however, required scale elevation drawing depicting modified storefront is not provided and no product information about envisioned storefront system is included so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. Similarly, narrative also mentions intent to replace three double-hung windows and add faux shutters at upper floor level; however, standard product information (including name of window fabricator, envisioned window system, associated specifications of proposed window type, etc.) is not provided so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. Applicant should note that shutters are not typical for upper-level windows of mixed-use structures within Historical Conservation District so proposal for faux shutters at upper-level windows is inappropriate. Applicant should also be aware that reflective, tinted and colored glazing for windows and doors is inappropriate within Historic Conservation District. COA Application also notes intent to install storm windows and storm doors; however, provided supplementals include no indication of intended locations for storm windows and/or storm doors or any indication of materials of storm windows and doors so clarification is warranted before appropriateness can be determined.

Remaining COA Application includes several pages dedicated to white PVC trim pieces; however, intended locations of trim are not provided so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined.

Notations on COA Application indicate proposed signage, exterior lighting and brick retaining wall connected to west façade with front gate will be considered during subsequent HCC meeting. Applicant is strongly encouraged to cooperate with licensed design professional experienced with historic structures to consider appropriate options for rehabilitating not only front and side façades of main structure but also for remaining building components, which are all visible from public right-of-way. Applicant should also note COA Application requires scale drawings if walls or openings are altered so future proposals should include measured drawings (not computer-generated montages with no scale) that depict all façades with proposed window and door replacements.

Discussion: Scott Bartkus represented proposal to remove siding on east façade and replace with thin-brick veneer and to remove Permastone on north façade or cover over with thin-brick veneer; brick veneer to closely match color and pattern of existing brick wall at west façade. It was also proposed to restore glass storefronts on north façade, to replace three double-hung windows, to add faux shutters and to replace downspout at northwest corner with square aluminum downspout.

Applicant noted desire for HCC approval of brick veneer so product can be ordered, with potential to further clarify windows and doors at later date, as needed. Applicant submitted product sample of proposed brick veneer, noting potential for on-site final clarification by HCC, as needed; also expressed understanding that associated mortar joints must match existing. Mr. Simonson requested clarification about intended façade(s) for new brick veneer; Applicant clarified that front (north) and side (east) façades will receive new brick veneer to match existing at side (west) façade. Mr. Lader noted need for HCC to consider various factors and cannot assess one element (brick veneer) without understanding remaining project details; also noted that submitted brick sample seems very contemporary (size, scale, uniform color and finish, etc.) while existing historical bricks at side façade are not uniform in size, color or finish. Applicant explained brick samples closely match "interior bricks" visible at recessed entrance protected from weather and seem more uniform in appearance. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to consider other brick examples before re-submitting to HCC for consideration and encouraged Applicant to work with qualified mason to submit appropriate mortar samples that match existing historical mortar joints so items can be assessed in conjunction rather than separately. Applicant clarified that HCC approval of proposed brick veneer will allow demolition of inappropriate vinyl siding at side façade and Permastone at front façade.

Applicant continued that approval of proposed entry-level door and windows would also be helpful. Mr. Lader expressed appreciation for Applicant's vision but stressed need for Applicant to cooperate with licensed design professional before submitting more cohesive project proposal rather than current disjointed approach. Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant's intent with front shop windows; Applicant noted desire to replace existing windows with full glazing with new frames. Mr. Lader noted qualified door fabricator should also be able to assist Applicant with storefront windows; continued that new storefront windows in conjunction with new door as overall storefront system might result in different and more appropriate solution rather than current piecemeal approach. Mr. Simonson provided Applicant with

relevant HCC Design Guidelines for Storefronts for reference. Applicant agreed to cooperate with qualified design professional; Mr. Evans admitted such cooperation requires initial expense but noted in long run, entire process (design, review, construction, etc.) will ultimately cost less. Mr. Lader also noted piecemeal approach within COA Application (specifically various PVC trim pieces, etc.) are not focus of HCC so design professional could also streamline subsequent COA Application. Applicant clarified upper-floor windows are not to be replaced but only surrounding trim; also agreed with Historic Officer's suggestion to omit faux shutters for upper-level windows from project scope.

Mr. Patrick inquired about 'Aging Moon' logo depicted on proposed signage; Applicant noted sign is associated with emerging catering business as potential tenant for rehabilitated property. Mr. Lader noted design professional will also be needed for various requirements associated with food services tenant. Mr. Simonson inquired if second floor level would remain residential; Applicant confirmed upper level will remain residential while intended tenant at entry level will not require commercial kitchen but rather areas for food preparation.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: The Commission upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Mr. Patrick adopted the proposal to table a decision to determine appropriateness of proposed work. HCC felt it provided sufficient feedback concerning inability to approve current proposal and encouraged Applicant to cooperate with licensed design professional (architect, engineer, etc.) experienced with historic structures before returning for subsequent review of proposals that respond to expressed concerns.

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

New Business: Mr. Lader welcomed Ms. Strasser as new HCC member; also reminded HCC that next meeting is considered initial organizational meeting of 2022, including election of new officers.

Mr. Long reminded HCC that next meeting date is postponed one week (Monday, January 24) in observance of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day federal holiday.

General Business: Minutes from HCC meeting on November 15, 2021, were unanimously approved by those attending that meeting, with abstention by those not previously in attendance.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY: _____

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