

---

---

## M I N U T E S

---

---

**BOARD:** HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS, ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER, KENNETH LOUSH, MICHAEL SIMONSON

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** CHAZ PATRICK, ANTHONY SILVOY

**STAFF PRESENT:** DARLENE HELLER, JEFFREY LONG

**PRESS PRESENT:** JEFF WARD (WFMZ TV)

**VISITORS PRESENT:** JOHN CALLAHAN, JAIME DECK, MICHAEL HANDZO, CARLOS TOVAR, JOHN TRAPANI

**MEETING DATE:** AUGUST 30, 2021

---

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on August 30, 2021, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA as well as via GoToMeeting virtual meeting platform. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

### **Agenda Item #1**

**Property Location:** 9 East Third Street (Canna Calm)

**Property Owner:** Arch Beth Third LLC

**Applicant:** Donald Deck

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a semi-detached 1-story commercial building with a flat roof and multiple storefronts. Architecturally defining features include a highly decorative glazed terra cotta parapet, a stucco sign band and classical pilasters separating each storefront. The building dates from ca. 1920 and is Classical Revival in style. The storefronts were renovated in the 1990s in the Classical style by incorporating large-scale pre-cast masonry units at the sidewalk level, bronze framed glass storefronts and an Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) with stucco applied to upper portions of the façade.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to install a new wall sign and a window sign.

#### **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 signage at existing sign band to reflect new commercial tenant. Applicant subsequently clarified that new window signs in transom above entrance doors and on storefront (at left of entrance) are not part of current Application; however, inspection of property confirms various signage already installed in storefront windows, entrance doors and hanging from existing scroll bracket ... all of which are inappropriate and never received HCC assessments.

Proposed signage includes company name "CANNA CALM" in serif lettering composed of 5-inch-deep aluminum channel letters with sides in black color and polycarbonate fronts with translucent vinyl coating in "lime green" color; two details indicate all upper-case lettering while one detail indicates upper- and lower-case lettering so clarification is warranted. Individual letters are to be flush-mounted into façade with through-bolts. Dimensions of sign band are 32-inches tall x 217-inches wide; proposed letters measure 18-inches tall x 132.4-inches wide on one detail while another detail indicates 168-inches wide, so clarification is warranted. Similarly, one detail indicates new signage is "non-illuminated" while another detail includes "front lit with power supply and LED lights" so clarification is warranted ... noting that internally illuminated signage is inappropriate within Historic Conservation District. If illumination is desired, HCC has considered gooseneck fixtures and halo-effect back-lighting as appropriate if no conduits, raceways, transformers and/or junction boxes associated with new lighting are visible on exterior façade.

New signage is appropriate as proposed, with following modifications:

- Property Owner should repair visible holes in sign band caused by removal of former tenant's signage prior to installation of new signage
- Applicant encouraged to install letters onto rigid backer board to avoid multiple through-bolt locations into existing stucco finish created by individual lettering that require later repair by Property Owner; backer should be ivory or warm white in color and also include offset pin stripe detail in complementary color
- proposed lettering is too large for existing sign band; width of suggested sign backer should align with dimensions of arched opening below, with recommended pinstripe detail and smaller lettering arranged accordingly
- 5-inch depth of proposed lettering is too deep; reduce letter thickness to maximum 1-inch, which might also encourage solid cut-outs rather than channel letters
- Applicant encouraged to amend lime green color scheme of lettering to darker green in deference to more typical historical colors found throughout Historic Conservation District

As previously described, signage already installed in storefront windows, entrance doors and hanging from existing scroll bracket are all inappropriate and never received HCC assessments.

**Discussion:** Jaime Deck represented proposal to install new wall sign. Mr. Lader inquired about intention to illuminate new sign; Applicant confirmed there are no plans to illuminate new signage. Applicant continued with appreciation of suggestion for rigid backer board to limit resulting holes in building façade. Applicant continued by agreeing with suggestion for more "natural" green (rather than neon green) for color of lettering, noting connection with natural-based products for sale; also confirmed new signage includes all upper-case lettering and not combination of upper- and lower-case letters, as depicted within one supplemental COA Application item. Applicant reported that inappropriate signage in storefront window was removed and also confirmed that new blade sign did not receive HCC review. Mr. Lader requested Applicant to remove inappropriate blade sign and stressed need for Applicant to follow relevant design guidelines for new blade signage before seeking subsequent HCC review.

**Public Commentary:** none

**Motion:** HCC upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Mr. Lader adopted proposal that City Council issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to install new wall sign was presented by Jaime Deck.
2. New signage includes following details:
  - a. company name "CANNA CALM" in all upper-case serif lettering composed of maximum 1-inch-thick letters in natural (not neon) green color

- b. lettering to be applied directly onto rigid backer board in warm white or ivory color, with 3/8-inch thick off-set pinstripe detail around sign perimeter in green color to match color of lettering; width of backer board should align with inside dimensions of arched opening below
  - c. new signage includes no illumination
3. Property Owner is encouraged to repair visible holes in existing sign band caused by removal of former tenant's signage prior to installation of new sign.
  4. Applicant agreed to submit revised to-scale design of new wall sign proposal prior to fabrication and installation via City of Bethlehem for final consideration by HCC Chair and Historic Officer.

**Note:** Subsequent COA Application for new blade sign to be installed using existing metal scroll bracket should be submitted for future HCC consideration.

Motion for proposed work was unanimously approved.

**Agenda Item #2**

**Property Location:** 510 East Fourth Street

**Property Owner:** Cathiarn Kelly

**Applicant:** John Lee

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** The COA Application was not represented so no assessment was conducted.

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

**Agenda Item #3**

**Property Location:** 215 Broadway (not 217 Broadway, as indicated on meeting agenda)

**Property Owner:** Greg Salomoni

**Applicant:** John Lee and Greg Salomoni

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** The COA Application was not represented so no assessment was conducted.

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

**Agenda Item #4**

**Property Location:** 301 East Fourth Street

**Property Owner:** Carmen Rosado

**Applicant:** CADCB and CACLV

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a 2 1/2 story, 3-bay, semi-detached, wood-frame residential building. The gable roof is sheathed in dark gray asphalt shingles and includes a central dormer with gambrel roof and two 1-over-1 double-hung windows. The building dates from ca. 1890 and is clad with wood lap siding painted white. The front porch extends across the entire front façade and dates from ca. 1910. It has Classical Revival details, including two round Doric posts atop square pedestals that also support the porch railing, which was boxed in or replaced over time and sheathed in horizontal siding. An open balustrade separates this porch from the adjacent residential structure and may include original porch details. The roof dormer also includes Classical Revival detailing and was probably installed at the same time as the front porch. A single-story, masonry-block enclosed rear porch with separate entrance dates from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) and side (West) façades; paint gutters, downspouts and storm door; replace 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; install surface-mounted porch light fixture and numeric address.

**Guideline Citations:**

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. 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

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** COA Application indicates intent to prep, prime and repaint all existing wood clapboard siding and wood trim, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed; sections of siding and trim beyond repair to be replaced in-kind before priming and painting to match adjacent. Existing metal gutters and downspouts as well as metal storm door also to be repainted.

Application also indicates intent to remove all existing windows and replace with aluminum-clad wood 'Majesty' 1-over-1 double-hung windows manufactured by Harvey; fabrication-applied exterior finish to be "tan" or "bronze".

Needed repairs to existing wood front door to be addressed before prepping, priming and repainting, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed. Should condition of existing wood door be determined beyond repair, proposed replacement door is engineered hardwood ("Masonite" or comparable) to match style of existing door but to be painted, with lockset and deadbolt in satin nickel finish. Transom above door to receive gold leaf street numbers.

New flush-mount light fixture in black color to be installed at ceiling of front porch; submitted model is 12-inch 8-sided fixture manufactured by Secure Home.

Various exterior improvements are appropriate as proposed, with following clarifications and modifications:

- provided 'Proposed Scope' cover sheet indicates various improvements are intended for wood siding and windows at "front and side" façades of building; Applicant should also clarify intentions for enclosed rear porch, entire rear façade and as well exposed masonry foundation beneath water table (currently painted dark green) on front, side and rear façades
- Applicant should clarify poor condition of all existing windows necessitates full removal and replacement, noting HCC encourages repairs to original windows and installation of exterior storm windows as preferred alternative to full replacement
  - o if replacement of existing windows is warranted, proposed 'Majesty' aluminum-clad double-hung wood windows by Harvey are appropriate, taking advantage of opportunity to configure all windows as 1-over-1 (**note:** select upper-level windows at side façade are currently 2-over-2) and ensuring that new windows are custom-sized to fit existing historical window openings rather than contemporary window sizes with additional trim applied to compensate for dimension differences
  - o consider window model that also includes supplemental fly screen sash so Property Owner can operate windows, as weather allows
- aside from Classical columns and boxed pedestals, existing front porch elements are inappropriate; while HCC approves in-kind repairs, Applicant is encouraged to conduct selective demolition to determine if original elements still exist beneath current cladding and repair as needed before painting or reference existing balustrade separating this porch from adjacent residence as inspiration for appropriate wood replacement porch elements
- if door replacement is warranted, new engineered wood door is appropriate if original configuration is retained; difficult to discern because of existing storm door but seems to have one full lite in upper half (not 9 divided lites, as indicated on provided product literature) and perhaps divided panels in lower half
- existence of transom above entrance door cannot be determined from provided images or during on-site inspection; however, gold leaf street numbers within transoms above entrance doors are appropriate

- proposed flush-mount porch ceiling light is appropriate but four-sided model (also depicted on provided product sheet) is more typical for Classical Revival structures; **note:** if LED bulb is used in new fixture, color temperature should be limited to max. 3000 Kelvin

**Discussion:** Michael Handzo, Housing Business Manager at Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley, represented proposal to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) and side (West) façades; paint gutters, downspouts, and storm door; replace 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; install surface-mounted porch light fixture and numeric address within transom above entrance door. Applicant clarified that relevant block grant has funding cap so proposed renovations are intentionally limited to front and side façades, noting block grants typically do not fund improvements to rear façades. Applicant continued that grant requirements also dictate specific lead abatement procedures associated with improvements to existing windows (can be cost prohibitive) so most contractors prefer full window replacements rather than window repairs; admitted new windows are not comparable in material to original windows but proposed windows should satisfy HCC design guidelines. Applicant appreciated suggestion to include fly screen option to encourage property owner to open windows as source of fresh air and natural ventilation. Applicant was also amenable to suggested 4-sided porch ceiling lamp as appropriate alternative to more decorative proposed fixture.

Mr. Lader expressed appreciation for Applicant's justification to replace existing windows to avoid lead paint abatement procedures; continued by recommending metal fly screens as more durable alternative to typical fiberglass webbing. Mr. Lader also agreed 4-sided lamp is more appropriate fixture for porch ceiling. Mr. Simonson requested clarification about lite divisions of proposed replacement windows, considering existing conditions include 1-over-1 double-hung sash at front façade and 2-over-2 double-hung sash at side façade; Applicant confirmed 1-over-1 double-hung sash will be installed at both façades to be consistent and noted that divided lite options with Harvey 'Majesty' windows would be simulated divided lites, which is less appropriate. Mr. Simonson continued by inquiring about intended color scheme for renovated surfaces ... also in relation to adjacent twin property; Applicant noted that color scheme has yet to be finalized with contractors, but new paint scheme would be consistent for both properties but not include rear façades, one-story rear porch addition and stucco finish at water table. Mr. Evans inquired about intentions with porch railings; Applicant explained current budget does not allow exploratory demolition to determine if original details remain so current proposal involves painting existing railing system sheathed in horizontal siding. Mr. Loush inquired if Applicant could reveal grant funding sum; Applicant responded that block grant funding is limited to \$25,000 for each project site ... and assumes budget allows for 10% contingency factor. Mr. Lader inquired about requested option to replace existing entrance door. Applicant confirmed desire to retain original door if possible; however, needed rehabilitation might involve cost-prohibitive lead abatement procedures so decision will be made to retain or replace entrance door based upon associated expenses. Mr. Lader noted that existing door is significant defining feature and encouraged Applicant to retain, if possible. Applicant concluded by confirming that transom above door does not exist so proposed gold-leaf street numbers are irrelevant to rehabilitation project.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) and side (West) façades; paint gutters, downspouts, and storm door; replace 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; and install surface-mounted porch light fixture was presented by Michael Handzo.
2. Appropriate renovations and repairs include following details:
  - a. prep, prime and repaint existing wood clapboard siding and all wood details, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed; sections of siding and trim beyond repair to be replaced in-kind before priming and painting to match adjacent
  - b. paint existing metal gutters and downspouts as well as metal storm door

- c. replace existing windows with aluminum-clad wood 'Majesty' 1-over-1 double-hung windows manufactured by Harvey with fabrication-applied exterior finish to be "tan" or "bronze"; each new window must be custom-sized to fit existing historical window openings with no additional trim applied to compensate for dimensional differences and include supplemental operable fly screen exterior sash
- d. address needed repairs to existing wood front door before prepping, priming, and repainting, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed; should condition of existing wood door be determined beyond repair, replacement door is engineered hardwood ("Masonite" or comparable) to match style of existing door but to be painted, with lockset and deadbolt in satin nickel finish
- e. install new four-sided flush-mount light fixture in black color at ceiling of front porch; if LED bulb is used in new fixture, color temperature is limited to max. 3000 Kelvin

**Notes:** Final paint colors and finishes must be consistent with new paint colors and finishes at adjacent property located at 303 East Fourth Street. If elements of original wood porch handrail assembly are uncovered during renovations at existing or adjacent property, Applicant must cooperate with HCC Chair and Historic Officer via City of Bethlehem to repair and/or replace in-kind.

Motion for proposed work was unanimously approved.

#### **Agenda Item #5**

**Property Location:** 303 East Fourth Street

**Property Owner:** Deny Zea-Silva

**Applicant:** CADCB and CACLV

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This 2 1/2 story, 3-bay, semi-detached, wood-frame residential structure is the mirrored twin of the adjacent building at 301 East Fourth Street and shares many of its defining features. The gable roof is sheathed in medium gray asphalt shingles and includes a central dormer with gambrel roof and two 1-over-1 double-hung windows. The building dates from ca. 1890 but metal siding was installed sometime during the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. The front porch extends across the front façade and dates from ca. 1910. Classical Revival details at the porch and roof dormer (still visible on the adjacent building) have been obscured or removed over time while the porch railing was boxed in or replaced with modified board-and-batten vertical siding.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) façade; paint gutters, downspouts and storm door; remove aluminum siding on front (South) façade and repair or replace in-kind with wood clapboard siding; install wood porch column to match existing; remove aluminum porch soffit and replace with wood; replace windows on front (South) façade with 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; install surface-mounted porch light fixture and numeric address.

#### **Guideline Citations:**

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- see Agenda Item #4
- **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 metal siding at front façade to reveal original wood clapboard siding and wood trim beneath; thereafter, prep, prime and repaint all existing wood siding and trim, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed. Sections of siding and trim beyond repair to be replaced in-kind before priming and painting to match adjacent. Existing metal gutters and metal storm door are also to be repainted.

Application proposes to replace existing square porch post at far-right with wood post to match Doric columns at adjacent porch; continues by proposing to remove existing board-and-batten vertical siding and

replace with new wood clapboard siding to match siding at adjacent porch. Application also proposes removal of existing aluminum soffit on upper (porch) roof and replace with wood eaves to match existing. Like previous agenda item, Application also indicates intent to remove all existing double-hung windows “at front and side” and replace with aluminum-clad wood ‘Majesty’ 1-over-1 double-hung windows manufactured by Harvey; fabrication-applied exterior finish to be “tan” or “bronze”.

Needed repairs to existing wood front door to be addressed before prepping, priming and repainting, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed. Should condition of existing wood door be determined beyond repair, proposed replacement door is engineered hardwood (“Masonite” or comparable) to match style of existing door but to be painted, with lockset and deadbolt in satin nickel finish. Transom above door to receive gold leaf street numbers.

New flush-mount light in black color to be installed at ceiling of front porch; submitted model is 12-inch 8-sided fixture manufactured by Secure Home.

Various exterior improvements are appropriate as proposed, with following clarifications and modifications:

- provided ‘Proposed Scope’ cover sheet indicates various improvements are intended for “front” of building; clarify intentions for side and rear façades as well
- clarify what is meant by “aluminum soffit on upper (porch) roof” so appropriateness of proposed “wood eaves to match existing area” can be determined
- clarify poor condition of all existing windows necessitates full removal and replacement, noting HCC encourages repairs to original windows and installation of exterior storm windows as preferred alternative to full replacement
  - o if warranted, proposed ‘Majesty’ aluminum-clad double-hung wood windows by Harvey are appropriate if existing one-over-one configurations are retained and if new windows are custom-sized to fit existing historical window openings rather than contemporary window sizes with additional trim applied to compensate for dimension differences
  - o consider window model that also includes supplemental fly screen sash so Property Owner can operate windows, as weather allows
- existing front porch elements are inappropriate, as are existing details at adjacent porch; reference existing balustrade separating this porch from adjacent residence as inspiration for appropriate wood replacement
- if door replacement is warranted, new engineered wood door is appropriate if original configuration is retained; difficult to discern because of existing storm door but seems to have one full lite in upper half (not 9 divided lites, as indicated on provided product literature) and perhaps panels in lower half
- existence of transom above entrance door cannot be determined from provided images or during on-site inspection; however, gold leaf street numbers within transoms above entrance doors are appropriate
- proposed flush-mount porch ceiling light is appropriate but four-sided model (also depicted on provided product sheet) is more typical for Classical Revival structures; **note:** if LED bulb is used in new fixture, color temperature should be limited to max. 3000 Kelvin

**Discussion:** Michael Handzo, Housing Business Manager at Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley, represented proposal to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) façade; paint gutters, downspouts, and storm door; remove aluminum siding on front (South) façade and repair or replace in-kind with wood clapboard siding; install wood porch column to match existing; remove aluminum porch soffit and replace with wood; replace windows on front (South) façade with 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; install surface-mounted porch light fixture and numeric address. Applicant explained preference to remove existing board-and-batten siding at front porch railing and replace with boxed railing clad with horizontal lap siding to ensure visual consistency with adjacent structure. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to investigate potential for original balustrade elements beneath current siding to serve as example for both porch railings. Applicant inquired if replacement railing must be composed of wood components or if new railing can be constructed of composite materials; Mr. Lader noted HCC preference for in-kind replacement but also noted HCC acceptance of composite porch railing systems if details are simplified with no decorative components. Applicant continued by clarifying proposal to replace existing metal porch soffit (ceiling) with wood or composite material to emulate porch ceilings of similar nearby residential structures. Mr. Evans inquired if current proposal also includes

removal of metal siding at roof dormer; Applicant responded that proposed siding removal is limited to front (main) façade up to roof line so roof dormer is not included. Mr. Lader followed up to inquire if proposed work (painting, repairs, window replacement, etc.) also includes roof dormer; Applicant clarified that no work is intended for existing roof dormer. Mr. Simonson inquired if investigations were already conducted to confirm original/early wood siding exists beneath metal siding; Mr. Lader continued by noting decorative trim elements might be hidden beneath aluminum siding that match various trim at adjacent structure. Applicant responded that no selective investigations were conducted to confirm existence of wooden clapboards beneath aluminum siding, so COA Application includes language to “repair or replace in-kind” wood siding in response to both potential scenarios. Mr. Simonson inquired if intended paint colors are consistent with new paint colors at adjacent structure; Applicant confirmed that paint color scheme of all renovated elements is uniform for both structures.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to repair and paint all woodwork on front (South) façade; paint gutters, downspouts, and storm door; remove aluminum siding on front (South) façade and repair or replace in-kind with wood clapboard siding; install wood porch column to match existing; remove aluminum soffit and replace with wood; replace windows on front (South) façade with 1-over-1 double-hung windows with aluminum-clad wood windows of same configuration; and install surface-mounted porch light fixture was presented by Michael Handzo.
2. Appropriate renovations and repairs include following details:
  - a. prep, prime and repaint all existing wood details, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed; sections of trim and other details beyond repair to be replaced in-kind before priming and painting to match adjacent
  - b. paint existing metal gutters and downspouts as well as metal storm door
  - c. remove existing aluminum siding and repair wood clapboard siding beneath and/or replace in-kind with wood clapboard siding to match existing before painting
  - d. remove existing square porch post and replace with new wood porch column to match existing Doric posts at adjacent (twin) structure
  - e. remove existing board-and-batten vertical siding at front porch and replace with new wood clapboard siding to match siding at porch of adjacent twin structure at 301 East Fourth Street; see also relevant commentary below
  - f. remove existing aluminum soffit panels at porch ceiling and replace with new tongue-and-groove wood ceiling before painting
  - g. replace existing windows with aluminum-clad wood ‘Majesty’ 1-over-1 double-hung windows manufactured by Harvey with fabrication-applied exterior finish to be “tan” or “bronze”; each new window must be custom-sized to fit existing historical window openings with no additional trim applied to compensate for dimensional differences and include supplemental operable fly screen exterior sash
  - h. address needed repairs to existing wood front door before prepping, priming, and repainting, with epoxy wood filler to be used as needed; should condition of existing wood door be determined beyond repair, replacement door is engineered hardwood (“Masonite” or comparable) to match style of existing door but to be painted, with lockset and deadbolt in satin nickel finish
  - i. install new four-sided flush-mount light fixture in black color at ceiling of front porch; if LED bulb is used in new fixture, color temperature is limited to max. 3000 Kelvin

**Notes:** Final paint colors and finishes must be consistent with new paint colors and finishes at adjacent property located at 301 East Fourth Street. If elements of original wood porch handrail assembly are

uncovered during renovations at existing or adjacent property, Applicant must cooperate with HCC Chair and Historic Officer via City of Bethlehem to repair and/or replace in-kind.

Motion for proposed work was unanimously approved.

**Agenda Item #6-- note:** Mr. Lader confirmed conflict of interest with agenda item, abstaining from discussion and resulting resolution.

**Property Location:** 306 South New Street (Zest Bar & Grille)

**Property Owner:** Gateway 1, Inc.

**Applicant:** John Trapani

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** Construction of this semi-detached 6-story commercial building located on the corner of South New Street and West Third Street was initiated in 2016 and is Contemporary in style. The primary façades on both streets are clad in brick on the 2nd through 4th floors, while the other floor levels and the corner are clad in glass and metal panels. The façade of the 6th floor is set back 12-feet to hinder visibility from the street, creating an open-air terrace along the north and east façades. As a reminder, HCC is mandated with preserving structures dating from the designated era of the Historic Conservation District (ca. 1895 - 1950); thus, this building is not considered a contributing structure to the district.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to install new signage.

**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’** -- see Agenda Item #1

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** During meeting on November 19, 2018, HCC assessed COA Application to install similar signage on north façade (around the corner from the current proposed location) within metal panel handrail segment at 6<sup>th</sup> floor level where building cantilevers over corner entrance. Proposed signage included one set of stainless-steel letters spelling out “ZEST” company logo in all upper-case sans serif stylized stencil lettering painted black at 30-inches tall x 83.7-inches wide, with 1-inch deep returns and polycarbonate back, mounted 1.5-inches off rigid sign backer painted to match existing gray metal panels. Individual letter components were back-lit with halo-effect lighting using white LED lighting. Proposed sign backer (no overall dimensions provided) was to be screwed directly into existing metal façade cladding. At that time, HCC determined proposed signage was appropriate for non-contributing structure within Historic Conservation District, conditional that all conduits, raceways and junction boxes servicing illumination of individual letters are not visible from façade.

Current proposal includes signage with rigid backer measuring 38-inches tall x 116-inches wide while proposed lettering measures 30-inches tall x 108-inches wide (lettering of existing sign is only 83.7-inches wide); otherwise, all proposed sign elements match signage already determined by HCC as appropriate.

New signage is appropriate as proposed, with following clarifications and modifications:

- reduce dimensions of proposed lettering (and potentially rigid backer) as needed to match elements of existing signage previously determined by HCC as appropriate
- confirm “internally illuminated” comment on signage detail is only intended for back-lit halo-effect and does not result in visible illumination through front of each letter
- confirm all conduits, raceways and junction boxes servicing illumination of individual letters are not visible from façade

**Discussion:** John Tripani represented proposal to install new signage. Applicant confirmed proposed signage will match existing signage in dimension, fabrication and installation but will face east; continued that illumination is intended for halo-effect (no internal illumination) while associated wiring will not be visible on building façade.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to install new signage was presented by John Trapani.
2. New building signage includes the following details:
  - a. install sign on east façade (facing South New Street) within metal panel handrail segment at 6<sup>th</sup> floor level where building cantilevers over corner entrance; dimensions, materials, fabrication, design, and installation to match existing sign at north façade (facing West Third Street) previously determined by HCC as appropriate for non-contributing structure within Historic Conservation District
  - b. sign includes one set of stainless-steel letters spelling out “ZEST” company logo in all upper-case sans serif stylized stencil lettering painted black in color at 30-inches tall x 83.7-inches wide, with 1-inch-deep returns and polycarbonate back, mounted 1.5-inches off rigid sign backer; individual letter components are back-lit with halo-effect lighting using white LED lighting
  - c. new rigid sign backer painted gray to match existing metal panels and screwed directly into existing metal façade cladding
  - d. all conduits, raceways, and junction boxes servicing illumination of individual letters are not visible from façade

Motion for proposed work was approved 5-0-1, with abstention by Mr. Lader.

#### **Agenda Item #7**

**Property Location:** 307 East Third Street

**Property Owner:** Peron Development

**Applicant:** John Callahan

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** There is no built structure at this project location; rather there are currently ten mature trees and six ornamental lampposts lining East Third Street, Columbia Street and Taylor Street along with 48 parking spaces within the existing surface lot.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to construct a new 5-story building at the current location of a surface parking lot. The building will be mixed-use, including retail space on the first floor and one- and two-bedroom apartments on the entry level and upper floor levels.

#### **Guideline Citations:**

- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **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.

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** COA Application indicates intent to construct new 5-story mixed-use building currently used as surface parking lot with many mature trees and ornamental lampposts lining public sidewalks. South façade (facing East Third Street) of proposed development project is approx. 108-feet wide and west façade (facing Taylor Street) is approx. 128-feet wide while overall building height is 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. According to supplemental architectural narrative, proposed building includes approx. 2,000 square feet of commercial (retail) space at entry floor level as well as 44 one- and two-bedroom apartments at remaining entry floor level and upper floor levels; accompanying architectural drawings do not indicate any below-grade basement/cellar level or on-site parking spaces.

Assessment and recommendations for approval should focus on two main concepts: size, scale and proportions of proposed development project; proposed elements of new construction, with storefronts at street level and traditional façade treatments for upper floors.

**Size, Scale and Proportions:** Relevant design guidelines note “new construction should reflect the dominant cornice and roof heights of adjacent buildings and proportions of building elements to one another and the streetscape ...” and continue “... In South Bethlehem, where two- and three-story buildings are the norm, buildings that digress from these standards ... seriously impact the Historic Conservation District. If large-scale construction is considered, particular attention will be given to ... the effect of the proposed building on the streetscape and the (District) as a whole.”

Current design proposal attempts to address existing dominant cornice heights by incorporating upper-cornice detail above fourth floor level; however, inventory of neighboring buildings confirms existence of only one-, two-, two-and-one-half and three-story structures so current proposal digresses from dominant cornice heights with proposed upper cornice above fourth floor level and continuing to rise another full story. Applicant may choose to reference their own 5-story mixed-use development project nearby; however, that structure is located two blocks east, sits across East Third Street from 6-story (former Bethlehem Steel) office building (now branch of Northampton County Community College) and is located outside boundaries of Historic Conservation District (HCD). HCC meeting minutes describe deliberation about and ultimate approval of Lehigh Valley Charter High School for the Arts, which is located between both project locations and within HCD boundaries. Approved design of school building rises only three stories, with one full story below grade as compromise to accommodate relevant design guidelines. Because of its institutional use, floor-to-ceiling heights of school structure are taller than residential construction, so approved 55-foot building height was also conceived as “mediator” between nearby tall office buildings just beyond HCD and smaller-scale commercial and residential structures within HCD. Building elements at west end of school structure even step down and set back to appropriately respond to adjacent to mixed-use commercial and residential building.

Based upon relevant design guidelines, current proposal for 5-story structure approx. 58-foot tall is inappropriate for immediate streetscape and more generally for overall district. Proposed building height would also interrupt design concept of nearby Charter School that steps down from taller office buildings outside HCD and transitions to smaller-scale mixed-use structures within HCD.

**New Construction:** Relevant design guidelines continue by referencing: Rhythm and Patterns, Window and Door Openings, Materials and Textures, Architectural Details, Shape and Massing as well as Streetscapes. 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. 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, sliding-glass doors, Juliette balconies, cast sills and lintels at remaining facades as well as ornamental cornices above fourth floor level. Façades of lower four floor levels also include cast stone panels in white color along with brick veneer systems in dark red, light red and black colors while proposed sheathing for entire fifth floor level façade is smooth-surface cement-board scallop siding in dark gray color to “read” as Mansard roof. Fifth floor level sets back at southwest corner approx. 6-feet to create private terrace for corner residential unit and again at southeast corner approx. 16-feet to create common rooftop terrace for all tenants; otherwise, façade at fifth floor level simply extends vertically from floor levels below.

Should HCC consider proposed five-story structure appropriate, Applicant is encouraged to reconsider several important design elements. Based upon current floor plans, orientations of both stairwells result in interim landings that interrupt associated windows; consider moving stairs deeper into development project (perhaps facing inner courtyard) to avoid window interruptions at street façades or reconsider window placements and/or window styles within stairwells to reflect use that differs from adjacent residential units. Similarly, spacing between select window bays appears to vary; consider reorganizing window bays so spacing is uniform ... at least within each implied row house section. Sliding glass doors are inappropriate within HCD so other window types should be considered. South Bethlehem includes many two- and three-story mixed-use attached buildings that serve as inspiration for current design proposal. Such row houses are Federal Revival and Italianate in style, with front façades typically terminating in parapets with upper cornices that hide flat roofs behind. Mansard roofs are sparingly found in South Bethlehem and typically limited to Classical Revival and Queen Anne structures; however, at least one example of Mansard roof

(steeply pitched lower roof portion topped with low-pitched upper roof portion) atop 3-story Italianate Revival structure is located at intersection of Wyandotte and West Fourth Streets. Mansard roofs allow greater use of attic level rather than sacrificing floor area to knee walls typical of gable and hip roofs and integrate roof dormers to accommodate natural light and ventilation. Applicant's current design proposal not only adds another (fourth) floor level to typical rowhouse design but includes yet another (fifth) floor above that "reads" as Mansard roof but is simply extension of wall system below and sheathed in different material; thus, upper-most floor level should be reconceived in design and also set back at least 12-feet from remaining façade to limit perception from public right-of-way below. At entry floor level, chamfered condition at southwest corner accommodates required sight triangle. HCD has many examples of clipped corners, which traditionally serve as entrances into commercial locations ... indeed, same design element appears at Applicant's nearby development project; thus, Applicant is encouraged to explore corner condition as entrance into commercial location.

Subsequent reviews with HCC should address in more detail such items as proposed window and door types, cast sills and lintels, cornice profiles and façade materials. For on-going project development, Applicant should note that tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate within HCD while appropriate window lite divisions are never wider in dimension than in height. Walkways leading from public sidewalks to inner courtyard necessitate privacy/security fencing and gates so associated details should be presented during future HCC meeting. Applicant should also reference 'Guidelines for Storefronts' before finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant should reference 'Guidelines for Signage' to conceive overall building signage concept to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals. Envisioned lighting fixtures also necessitate HCC review.

Though outside HCC's purview, Applicant's intentions to replace ten existing mature trees and six ornamental lampposts lining East Third Street, Columbia Street and Taylor Street are appreciated as are clarifications about needed parking spaces for tenants of 44 apartment units along with solutions for loss of 48 existing parking spaces of current surface lot.

**Discussion:** John Callahan and Carlos Tovar (USA Architects) represented proposal to construct new 5-story building at current location of surface parking lot; new building will be mixed-use, including retail space on first floor and one- and two-bedroom apartments on entry level and upper floor levels. Applicant clarified existing parking lot was previously owned/operated by Bethlehem Steel Corporation (earlier structure was previously demolished to accommodate parking); nearby Factory, LLC currently leases "back bay" (24 parking spaces) while Bethlehem Parking Authority currently leases "front bay" (24 additional parking spaces) to use as metered public parking. Applicant justified replacement of existing parking lot with proposed development, noting surface parking is inappropriate within Historic Conservation District (HCD) and project is conceived as urban infill as appropriate density by addressing need for more residents in South Bethlehem to support nearby existing and proposed commercial development. Applicant justified proposed building height (five stories at approx. 58-feet) as comparable to other nearby structures that fill entire blocks within HCD (Factory, C-Town Supermarket) as well as taller structures just beyond HCD (former Bethlehem Steel corporate offices, Five-10 Flats). Applicant continued that parking for new tenants will become available upon completion of nearby 750-space parking garage while pending revisions to allowable building height at project site location is 60-feet so current proposal does not exceed that.

Applicant described architectural approach of design, with desire to make one large structure appear to be four individual row houses while upper-most (fifth) floor level appears to be Mansard roof with differing façade cladding to help mitigate overall building height. Mr. Lader requested clarification about "blue arrows" on Drawing Sheet 3; Applicant responded that supplemental site plan depicts direction of prevalent winds as blue arrows along with sun's path across site as yellow curve ... noting that resulting shadow lines of proposed structure fall mainly on site of Factory property and not on nearby residential structures. Applicant continued that East Third Street and Columbia Street are both quite wide (approx. 50-feet) at project location so "cavern effect" of five-story structure would also be limited. Corner location at East Third Street and Taylor Street is anchored by commercial tenant and façade above storefront is clad in more formal white masonry panels while remaining portions of façades are set back slightly and are clad in smaller-scale brick units in medium red, dark red and black colors to imitate row houses. Upper-most floor level receives cladding that mimics roof shingles to "read" as Mansard roof while two roof terraces along East Third Street allow fifth floor to step back at both corners to limit visibility of top floor from below. Applicant also justified large lobby (850 sq.ft.) along East Third Street intended only for tenants as

alternative to commercial space (as required by Zoning Code) because space will remain active with tenants of 44 proposed units taking advantage of various amenities.

Mr. Lader inquired why fifth floor level cannot be conceived as true Mansard roof; Applicant responded that proposed construction method is wood framing and roof is conceived as series of flat trusses that must extend to outer walls while Mansard roof would require angular roof trusses and/or angled outer walls which are more expensive and would result in taller building. Mr. Evans encouraged Applicant to further explore roof construction so Mansard is not only perceived but is also real; Applicant continued that Mansard roof approach would also eliminate current roof terraces. Mr. Lader continued by noting contradiction of proposed cladding for upper-most floor level, which results in perception of attic/roof while outer walls from below are simply extended rather than terminating in slanted roof surfaces.

Mr. Loush inquired about location of proposed nearby parking garage; Applicant responded that new garage will be constructed at corner of East Third Street and Polk Street (one block east of current development project and just outside HCD). Mr. Loush continued by inquiring about proposed height of new parking garage; Applicant responded that parking garage portion is 6 stories tall but front façade facing East Third Street will be 5-stories and conceived as series of commercial and business tenants. Mr. Simonson informed Applicant that typical setback for rooftop development within HCD is 12-feet; Applicant confirmed that smaller corner terrace sets back 6-feet and is intended as private terrace for one apartment unit while larger corner terrace sets back 15-feet and is accessible by all tenants. Mr. Simonson continued that resulting resolution might recommend overall setback for fifth floor level.

Mr. Evans returned to issue of building height by acknowledging that current and (potential) future zoning regulations would allow proposed height but explained that HCC has struggled with issues of appropriate height and scale within HCD for similar development projects; also noted that nearby buildings mentioned by Applicant have large footprints but are predominantly 1-, 2- and 3-stories tall so current design proposal does indeed impact HCD at pedestrian level (“canyon effect”). Mr. Evans continued by expressing appreciation of segmentation of overall structure into four perceived row houses but personally struggles with proposed building height (anything above 3 floor levels is not typical for HCD) so treatment of upper-most floor level will be critical for future HCC recommendations of appropriateness. Applicant countered that current proposal of five stories relates to scale of nearby buildings (noting Applicant’s own nearby 5-story building that receives compliments as example that appropriately addresses building height at that location) and stressed width of East Third Street at project location should mitigate concerns about canyon effect. Mr. Simonson noted footprints of nearby larger structures are similar to current design proposal and did not perceive proposed 5-story building height as inappropriate; also recalled recent HCC recommendations to approve even taller nearby structures. Mr. Simonson concluded by encouraging Applicant to reconceive proposed fifth floor level to better relate to neighboring structures. Mr. Lader recalled series of recent reviews of taller structures but also noted logic behind each determination of appropriateness due to several factors (related to specific project site) and came about following series of re-designs and subsequent HCC reviews. Mr. Lader continued by expressing concern about proposed white cast stone for corner condition, noting no brilliant white facades are found within HCD and encouraged Applicant to search for smaller-scale units in tan or warm white color; continued with concern about certain proposed window typies and encouraged more detailed dialogue during subsequent HCC meetings about proposed products and finishes. Though not defined within HCC design guidelines, Mr. Lader also inquired about Applicant’s responses to issues of sustainability. Applicant noted that all-wood construction relies on renewable material while most remaining products and finishes are locally/regionally sourced; also explained that specified building insulation and insulated windows will meet or exceed current energy laws. Applicant also noted integration of efficient mechanical systems for each living unit rather than large-scale HVAC system for overall building as well as water-efficient toilets for each unit along with LED lighting in common corridors and stairwells. Applicant concluded by noting physical location along LANTA bus line, which promotes use of public transportation by tenants. Mr. Evans inquired about bicycle storage for tenants; Applicant confirmed bike storage is integrated into overall project while also noting urban location encourages tenants to walk to nearby commercial locations and to utilize nearby (proposed) parking garage.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to construct new 5-story mixed-use building at current location of surface parking lot was presented by John Callahan and Carlos Tovar.
2. New building includes following details:
  - a. 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
  - b. inner courtyard is accessed from walkways leading along east façade and is adjacent to existing 3-story mixed used building
  - c. 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
  - d. structure does not include below-grade basement/cellar level or on-site parking spaces
  - e. 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
  - f. 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

**Notes:** Subsequent COA Applications for HCC consideration should address in more detail such items as proposed window and door types, cast sills and lintels along with cornice profiles and façade materials along with revised design for fifth floor level. Applicant should also reference 'Guidelines for Storefronts' before finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant should 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.

Motion for proposed work was approved: 5-1, with Mr. Lader not supporting motion, noting proposed building height is 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.

**New Business:** Mr. Lader inquired about status of corner property located at 403-405 East Fourth Street; Mr. Simonson noted property is currently going through blight designation process and attorneys are working toward settlement, with goal to find certified developer to reconceive overall property.

Mr. Simonson reminded all attendees about Mayor's decree that beginning September 1, 2021, all City Hall meetings will be held in person (no longer virtual). Ms. Heller continued that technical support will no longer be offered so projections onto screen is not possible and commissioners will no longer be provided with individual laptops at dais; also noted that HCC members can log in virtually (if needed) but virtual format will no longer be available to general public.

Mr. Simonson summarized on-going cooperation with Philip Roeder and other City Hall staff to establish categories of COA Application items for pre-approval based upon set of appropriate materials and concepts (roofs, signage, windows, etc.) with verbiage to be submitted to HCC in advance for review. Mr. Lader

noted such projects would still receive resulting COAs but will be summarized for HCC under “New Business”; Mr. Simonson noted such issues are still being considered.

Mr. Lader inquired about results of recent ‘South Side Task Force’ workshops led by hired consultant to facilitate new building height regulations. Ms. Heller noted that City Hall staff continue to review working drafts of recent studies to comprehend results of those discussions but admitted initial lack of obvious consensus; ultimate recommendations require consideration/approval by HCC/HARB and City Council.

Ms. Heller reminded HCC about upcoming training opportunity for members of Bethlehem’s historic boards together with similar boards in Easton and Allentown: CAMP sessions confirmed for Oct. 5 and 7 @ 4:30 – 8:00 p.m. and conceived as virtual format meetings, to review fundamentals of historic commissions but also based upon on-going/common themes. City of Bethlehem will re-send schedule of sessions to encourage registration and participation, with relevant login information pending.

Ms. Heller introduced potential revision to relevant historic ordinance that will allow City of Bethlehem to charge fees for HCC/HARB reviews and resulting COAs; fee schedule to be presented during future meetings (similar to building permits) that would justify various reviews and also help fund new position of ‘Historic Inspector.’

**General Business:** Minutes from HCC meeting on June 21, 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 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

---

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