
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: TODD CHAMBERS, CRAIG EVANS (VICE CHAIR), GARY LADER (CHAIR), MICHAEL SIMONSON, DESIREE STRASSER

MEMBERS ABSENT: NONE

STAFF PRESENT: MATTHEW DESCHLER (CITY SOLICITOR), JEFFREY LONG (HISTORIC OFFICER)

PRESS PRESENT: NONE

VISITORS PRESENT: LAFONTE KING, LIZ KING, JOSEPH SHADID, RANDY SMITH, SALVATORE VERRASTRO, CHRISTOPHER WORTON

MEETING DATE: JANUARY 27, 2025

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on January 27, 2025, at the City of Bethlehem Town Hall Rotunda, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Election of Officers:

HCC upon motion by Mr. Chambers and seconded by Mr. Simonson unanimously approved Mr. Lader to serve as HCC Chair.

HCC upon motion by Mr. Chambers and seconded by Mr. Lader unanimously approved Mr. Evans to serve as HCC Vice Chair.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 708 East Fourth Street

Property Owner: Jario Santiago/FPS Developments

Applicant: Liz F. King

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a 2-bay, 2-1/2 story, semi-detached, brick commercial and residential building with a shared, steeply pitched front gable, original slate roof and a large shop window with applied upper divisions. The building dates from ca. 1920 and is Queen Anne in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to install window graphics, all white, one measuring 18-inches in diameter, one measuring 12-inches x 40-inches; each sign to be centered within the window frame.

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 - Article 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’**
- **Historic Conservation Commission ‘Guidelines for Storefronts’**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application indicates intent to install signage for new commercial tenant within existing shop window; project description and supplemental details offer no indication of intended materials. Scale drawing of proposed signage with elevation view of façade (as required on COA Application) is not included, so Application is incomplete.

Provided graphics indicate one proposed sign that measures 18-inches in diameter in white color; supplemental hand sketch indicates that round sign is centered vertically and horizontally within central division of upper window. Sign includes letters “KE” in large, bold, sans serif, upper-case lettering encircled within lettering that spells out “KING’S EXPRESSIONS” in small, sans serif, all upper-case lettering and completed with intertwining thorns. Dimensions of central window division are 23-inches tall x 40-inches wide, so proposed graphic fits.

Provided graphics indicate another proposed sign that measures 12-inches tall x 40-inches wide, also in white color; supplemental hand sketch indicates this sign is centered vertically and horizontally within main shop window. Sign includes word “King’s” in large, bold, stylized cursive, serif lettering followed on next line by “EXPRESSIONS” in large, all upper-case serif lettering. Dimensions of shop window are 43-inches tall x 93-inches wide, so proposed graphic fits.

Clarification of proposed material for both signs is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. Applicant should also confirm that signage is installed on inside glass surfaces. HCC traditionally encourages signage proposals to incorporate pinstripe detail around graphics to serve as frame, so Applicant might also consider this detail, especially for lettering in main shop window.

Discussion: Liz King and Lafonte King represented proposal to install window graphics, all white, one measuring 18-inches in diameter, one measuring 12-inches x 40-inches; each sign to be centered within the window frame.

Applicant confirmed that proposed signage is fabricated from vinyl in bright white color, with installation on exterior glass surfaces. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant might consider installing new signage on interior glass surfaces; Applicant responded in agreement, noting existing signage is on exterior glass surfaces but preference is for interior installation for ease of maintenance. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant might consider integrating typical pin stripe detail around lettering for main shop window. Mr. Simonson suggested that current window divisions could be considered inherent frames for proposed signage, so typical frame detail might not be needed in this situation. Mr. Evans inquired about nature of proposed commercial use; Applicant responded that new business is clothing store. Mr. Evans continued that HCC typically recommends off white or ivory rather than bright white color for signage within Historic Conservation District but also understands such colors are not as visible when installed on interior glass surfaces. Applicant inquired if HCC might be amendable to “goldish” color instead of bright white. Mr. Lader cautioned that darker or deeper colors might not “read” well from public right-of-way if installed on inside glass surfaces. Ms. Strasser noted that “bright white” is not preferred by HCC and suggested “warm white” color with brown rather than blue undertones as more appropriate; Applicant was amenable to that suggestion.

Public Commentary: none

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

1. The proposal to install window graphics, all white, one measuring 18-inches in diameter, one measuring 12-inches x 40-inches was presented by Lafonte King and Liz King.
2. Appropriate details for new signage in upper shop window include:
 - a. one sign fabricated from vinyl that measures 18-inches in diameter in warm white or ivory color

- b. round sign is centered vertically and horizontally within central division of upper window; installation is on inside glass surface
 - c. sign includes letters “KE” in large, bold, sans serif, upper-case lettering encircled within lettering that spells out “KING’S EXPRESSIONS” in small, sans serif, all upper-case lettering and completed with intertwining thorns
3. Appropriate details for new signage in the main shop window include:
- a. one sign fabricated from vinyl that measures 12-inches tall x 40-inches wide in warm white or ivory color
 - b. sign is centered vertically and horizontally within main shop window; installation is on inside glass surface
 - c. sign includes word “King’s” in large, bold, stylized cursive, serif lettering followed on next line by “EXPRESSIONS” in large, all upper-case serif lettering; **note:** incorporation of typical pinstripe detail around graphics to serve as frame is left to Applicant’s discretion.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 1304 Spring Street

Property Owner: Diocese of Allentown

Applicant: Salvatore Verrastro

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This residential structure is a detached 2 ½-story, 2-bay, wood-frame, single-family dwelling with a front facing gable with original slate roof shingles, projecting planar barge boards supported on wood brackets, wood shingle gable details, wood clapboard siding and a full front porch with hipped roof. Dating from ca. 1885, the house is Queen Anne in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing single-family dwelling. This review is a continuation of the July 15, 2024, HCC meeting.

Guideline Citations:

- **Bethlehem Ordinance - Article 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item 2.
- **Historic Conservation Commission ‘Design Guidelines’** -- Relevant sections concerning ‘Demolition’ (p. 19): HCC encourages “an evaluation of the significance of the building in the historic district ... and all attempts to reuse a historic building be exhausted prior to considering demolition”; HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless “proposed demolition involves a non-significant building” or “the applicant has demonstrated that they have exhausted all other options and they will suffer undue economic hardship”.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: COA Application to demolish existing historic structure and replace with open lawn was presented to HCC during series of meetings in late 2012 through early 2013. Citing high level of historical integrity of this contributing structure as well as concerns of “demolition by neglect” and also supported by public comments about Applicant’s lack of proper maintenance of this and other historic structures located on Grace Manor property, HCC ultimately recommended that Bethlehem City Council deny Applicant’s proposal. In February of 2013, consistent with HCC’s recommendation, Council denied COA Application to demolish existing structure. In late 2019, Applicant returned to HCC with COA Application to replace existing slate roof sheathing with GAF Slateline asphalt shingles. HCC unanimously supported Applicant’s proposal to maintain existing historic structure by recommending that Bethlehem City Council approve Applicant’s proposal. Council issued resulting COA to replace existing slate with asphalt roof shingles in early December of 2019. Recent walk by inspection of property confirms existing slate roof was never replaced. COA Application dated May 30, 2024, repeated earlier proposal to demolish existing historic structure with intent to replace with much larger new structure. However, May 30, 2024, COA Application only sought approval for demolition; Application did not seek COA approval for particular replacement structure.

Because this dwelling was constructed ca. 1885, it is considered “contributing” to Mount Airy Neighborhood District (MAND) and is therefore significant. This structure also exhibits high level of historical integrity and is part of partial neighborhood block of similar 2 ½-story, single-family residential structures dating from roughly same period, so its loss to demolition would be significant to existing streetscape and also to overall District.

During HCC meeting on July 15, 2024, Applicant acknowledged that existing dwelling was not inhabited for last few years; attempts to “button up” structure included recent COA Application to replace existing slate roof but claimed that effects of COVID pandemic prevented initiation of work due to lack of available contractors. Applicant called attention to supplemental Conditions Assessment and Property Appraisal reports to confirm that needed rehabilitation is well beyond appraised value; Applicant continued that rehabilitation of existing structure affords no real use because of small-scale rooms and needed compromises to make ADA-compliant. Applicant continued that existing structure has no significance to neighborhood because it is located far from most other historic buildings within boundaries of MAND and does not satisfy definition of traditional Queen Anne style. Applicant concluded by explaining that attempts to rehabilitate existing structure will cause undue financial hardship.

In response, HCC questioned Applicant’s contention that existing dwelling is not contributing structure within MAND. HCC also questioned Applicant’s argument that rehabilitation of existing historic structure is considered undue economic hardship while proposed new construction (with initial cost estimate of \$2MM) is not. During public commentary portion of meeting, existing dwelling was confirmed as originally intended for Mr. Grace’s gardener and once included nearby greenhouses. Recollections about Applicant’s previous proposal to demolish existing structure were also shared, noting Applicant was already criticized then for attempting to “demolish by neglect”. Another member of public questioned Applicant’s claim that existing structure is insignificant, noting MAND includes not only mansions of former wealthy executives but also homes of former common workers. Public comments concluded with observation that this structure also has intrinsic historical significance for former Grace Manor property.

As follow up to various comments, HCC inquired if Applicant would be willing to explore design options that rehabilitate existing historic structure while also including appropriate new addition to address proposed housing. Applicant was amenable to HCC’s suggestion and agreed to return with revised design proposals based upon various comments. In response, HCC unanimously tabled decision to deny or support proposed demolition until requested design options are presented for subsequent review.

Rather than submitting new COA Application with requested design options to rehabilitate existing structure in combination with appropriate new addition, Applicant now stands by previous COA Application and requests HCC to comment on subsequent research into structure’s significance. Referencing National Register of Historic Places nomination form received by National Park Service on March 25, 1988, that led to successful designation of Mount Airy National Register Historic District, Applicant calls attention to accompanying map that delineates proposed district. Within district boundaries, 27 dwellings are indicated as “contributing” while two are indicated as “noncontributing”. Though physically located within proposed district boundaries, Applicant’s property along with several other similar historic structures facing Spring Street are not depicted. Accompanying narrative describes 27 contributing structures within proposed historic district while both noncontributing structures are identified as 1970s ranch-style houses. Similar to supplemental map, Applicant’s property along with several other similar historic structures facing Spring Street are not included within narrative. Applicant concludes these omissions support claim that existing structure is noncontributing, so discussion is warranted.

Almost 20 years after designation of Mount Airy National Register Historic District by National Park Service, City of Bethlehem collaborated with Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in 2007 to establish Mount Airy Neighborhood District (MAND) as its newest Historic Conservation District. In response, existing Ordinance, i.e., Article 1714, was amended to assign responsibility of assessing COA Applications for proposed alterations within newly created District to HCC. Amended Ordinance includes boundary description of new District that mirrors boundary description within National Register nomination from 20 years earlier; however, individual structures are not indicated as “contributing” or “noncontributing”. Article 1714 does not exempt structures within MAND from COA review on grounds they are noncontributing. Discussion of whether structures are noncontributing or contributing may be relevant to whether HCC does or does not recommend COA for action proposed, but it has no bearing on whether action is subject to COA

review. Under Article 1714 and Historic Districts Law, while demolition or construction work on particular structures within MAND may be exempt from HCC review on other grounds (i.e., where structures are less than 100 square feet or not visible from public street or way) contributing/noncontributing dichotomy is not one of those grounds. Secretary of Interior's Standards, City Ordinance and accompanying Design Guidelines dating from 2007 in collaboration with Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission rather than nomination form submitted to National Park Service in 1988 serve as basis for HCC's assessments of all COA Applications. Based upon that understanding, Applicant's existing historic structure is considered significant, so its loss to demolition would be significant to existing streetscape and also to overall District. Secretary of Interior's Standards do not address topic of demolition. According to relevant Ordinance and associated Design Guidelines, HCC does not recommend approval for demolition of contributing structures; rather, evaluation of building's significance within MAND is encouraged and confirmation is needed that all attempts to reuse historic building are exhausted prior to considering demolition. If HCC determines Applicant has satisfied issue of building's significance and all attempts to reuse historic structure are exhausted, HCC may recommend demolition if it concludes that Applicant will suffer resulting undue economic hardship.

Discussion: Joseph Shadid, Randy Smith, Salvatore Verrastro and Christopher Worton represented proposal to demolish existing single-family dwelling; review is continuation of July 15, 2024, HCC meeting.

Mr. Lader initiated dialogue by noting two discussion items: HCC's definition of significant structures vs. Applicant's claim this dwelling is non-contributing structure and Applicant's claim of undue economic hardship. Applicant admitted that original proposal in 2012 to replace existing structure with open lot would negatively impact immediate streetscape and overall district; however, subsequent proposal in 2024 to demolish existing structure and intent to replace with new design that satisfies relevant design guidelines remains Applicant's position. Applicant continued by recalling public comments during previous meeting that confirmed this structure was originally constructed as residence for Mr. Grace's gardener, making it "historical" from personal perspective; however, relevant guidelines do not assess historic structures based on residents but rather on architectural features. Applicant also recalled that original COA Application did not result in unanimous HCC consensus to deny demolition and acting Historic Officer (George Donovan) did not voice opposition to demolition within his assessment submitted for consideration by City Council. At that time, Holy Family approached City Council with news that acting Historic Officer did not consider this structure historically significant; however, Council ultimately supported HCC's recommendation to deny demolition. Applicant concluded by standing behind previous Historic Officer's assessment that existing structure is not historically significant and does not contribute to MAND.

Mr. Deschler explained that, regardless of 1988 nomination form to National Register of Historic Places leading to successful designation of Mount Airy National Register Historic District, City of Bethlehem assesses all proposals for exterior changes within MAND (including demolition) in accordance with Article 1714. Mr. Deschler noted this structure is located within boundaries of MAND defined by City's amended Ordinance, is visible from public right-of-way and is not otherwise exempt from HCC review under Article 1714 and is therefore subject to HCC assessment. Applicant agreed relevant Ordinance includes language that differs from nomination form and confirmed understanding that all structures within boundaries of MAND are under auspices of HCC, as recommending board to City Council.

Applicant noted that existing dwelling is structurally stable but not habitable in current condition; continued that required restoration measures are expensive and would still not address all issues to meet building code requirements for intended use. Applicant admitted that architects have responsibility to be good stewards of existing historic structures, so proposed demolition is not easy request; however, Holy Family exhausted all options to retain and rehabilitate existing structure before discerning that resulting cost burden would satisfy city's definition of undue economic hardship. Applicant concluded by recounting recent conversation with Mary Toulouse, community resident who previously spoke against proposed demolition. That conversation confirmed Ms. Toulouse's main reason for denying demolition is based on history of dwelling's past residents; Ms. Toulouse also suggested that Applicant could integrate select details of existing historic structure into proposed new construction. Applicant could not immediately discern what materials or details can be salvaged for future use but might consider installing marker that identifies historical nature of existing structure and its former residents.

Mr. Lader recalled that Applicant previously focused on style of existing structure as atypical of Queen Anne structures and therefore not significant; however, HCC considers historic structures not based on specific style but rather how buildings relate to existing streetscape and contribute to overall district while also considering size, scale and other defining architectural features. Mr. Lader noted that several dwellings along that section of Spring Street reflect differing architectural styles but present themselves in similar scale and with similar setbacks to street; continued that HCC is more concerned about these details rather than focusing on individual buildings or who once lived there. Mr. Lader recalled previous HCC comments that Applicant should consider proposed new construction within greater context to ensure it respects defining features of district; continued by noting Applicant's admirable and worthwhile goal of providing affordable senior housing and requested to learn more about how proposed replacement would respect context of overall district.

As HCC's sole resident of MAND, Ms. Strasser recalled that several other single-family dwellings along this block as well as other similar structures just outside district's boundaries share similar styles, scales, materials, details, etc. and contribute to overall district, so loss of existing structure would be negative not only for immediate streetscape but also for entire district; continued by wondering if Applicant might consider selling existing structure to someone interested in restoring it as single-family dwelling. Ms. Strasser concluded by noting difficulty in assessing if proposed replacement justifies loss of existing significant structure without Applicant's ability to offer more details. Applicant explained that process of preparing proposed new construction was based on assessment of existing streetscape and surrounding neighborhood; confirmed that height of proposed replacement relates to heights of existing structures but admitted that footprint of proposed structure is much larger than typical single-family dwelling.

Mr. Lader noted that HCC must justify demolition of significant structures based on proven economic hardship; however, Applicant did not respond to HCC request for design options that rehabilitate existing historic structure while including appropriate new addition to address proposed housing. Mr. Simonson expressed preference to wait until Applicant offers more details about proposed replacement structure before approving or denying demolition request. Mr. Long noted relevant Ordinance requires action by HCC to either recommend approval or denial of Applicant's request for demolition because of previous HCC action to table current COA Application; continued that any motion to recommend approval of demolition should include caveat that resulting demolition permit will not be issued until all relevant planning reviews (including HCC assessment of proposed replacement structure) are successfully conducted.

Mr. Chambers expressed frustration that Applicant returned to HCC with no further project development, as previously requested by HCC and agreed upon by Applicant; continued that studies should have been provided that confirm all options to rehabilitate existing structure were exhausted to support claim of undue economic hardship. Mr. Chambers also expressed frustration that COA Application results from obvious need for demolition due to neglect; Applicant responded that poor condition of structure was inherited from previous director. Mr. Evans noted this specific structure contributes not only to immediate streetscape but also to overall Grace Manor property; continued that workers' houses are just as significant as mansions of wealthy landowners. Mr. Evans concluded by expressing concern that proposed new construction does not fit within existing streetscape and overall district. Mr. Chambers noted that HCC should have future opportunities to assess proposed new construction.

Ms. Strasser inquired about potential for locating proposed new construction elsewhere on overall property. Applicant deferred that question and requested HCC to focus on issue of fate of this specific structure. Ms. Strasser continued by requesting clarification if previous COA Application (in early 2013) to demolish was approved or denied. Applicant responded that acting Historic Officer considered structure as non-contributing while City Council ultimately denied Applicant's request to demolish based upon HCC's recommendation. Ms. Strasser inquired why slate roof was not replaced, as previously approved by City Council upon recommendation by HCC in late 2019; Applicant described difficulty in hiring qualified roofer during initial months of COVID-related shutdown. Ms. Strasser questioned Applicant's response, noting that several other approved roof replacements within MAND were completed during that same time period. Applicant continued by noting once they were about to begin full roof replacement, undue economic hardship became reality and decision was made to patch with similar roof slates as affordable alternative.

Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant might consider option to "gut" existing structure with potential to rehabilitate as two-family unit, which would not require ADA-compliance. Applicant responded that scenarios was

indeed explored but resulting cost per square foot was almost double that of new construction. Applicant continued by noting existing structure has no insulation, requires new electrical wiring and needs abatement of exterior lead paint, which all factor into issue of undue economic hardship.

Public Commentary: Marsha Fritz: as resident of Mount Airy neighborhood and recent chair of HARB, reminded everyone that focus should remain on structure in question, noting this building is record of its time and place when Bethlehem Steel managers moved to North and West Bethlehem; continued by recounting recent walk past property, noting it is nicely proportioned vernacular Victorian Queen Anne dwelling with lovely detailing. Ms. Fritz also wondered why it was placed there and who previously lived there, noting its farmhouse nature implies it most likely predates Grace Manor development and regular lot layout of West Bethlehem. Simply detailed wood-frame structures are not that common in Bethlehem, so its demolition would result in real loss to Bethlehem's history, which contradicts what HCC's commission. Applicant's comments about needed insulation, electrical repairs and lead paint abatement as reasons for demolition contradict what preservation architects (like herself) take on; also recounted personal story of purchasing historic structure in much worse condition before rehabilitating it, resulting in significant economic improvement when it was later sold. Ms. Fritz noted that HCC is commissioned by relevant Ordinance to assess proposed exterior changes of buildings and structures within defined historic district and are subject to City Council approval, with HCC serving as recommending board; concluded by urging HCC to deny Applicant's request for demolition.

Mr. Deschler noted if all parties are in agreement, term of COA Application can be extended beyond current meeting, with understanding that Applicant will return with more details along with intent to secure approval of proposed replacement structure. Applicant responded with concern that more time and money will be expended for continued project development with no guarantee of HCC approval. Mr. Deschler explained there is no real difference between securing conditional demolition approval now and returning later for HCC assessment of proposed replacement structure or securing concurrent recommendations to approve demolition of existing structure and approval for replacement structure during future HCC meeting; also reminded all parties that City Council has ultimate authority to support HCC's recommendation or to overrule that recommendation. Mr. Lader suggested HCC could offer feedback for unified demolition and new construction proposal during subsequent meeting; in response, Mr. Deschler suggested that Applicant could withdraw current COA Application without prejudice and resubmit request for demolition in conjunction with new COA Application that includes more details about proposed replacement structure. In response, Applicant requested better understanding of HCC's willingness to assess proposed new construction as appropriate replacement. Mr. Lader agreed to accommodate Applicant's request by conducting informal poll: Mr. Evans expressed inability to support proposed demolition based upon current COA Application; Mr. Lader agreed with Mr. Evans, noting existing structure is significant and contributes to MAND while COA Application fails to address required undue economic hardship; Mr. Chambers admitted he is "currently torn", noting evidence of existing conditions, associated cost estimate, etc. begin to support claim of economic hardship and might consider allowing Applicant to move forward, pending new structure respects appropriate design considerations; Ms. Strasser is inclined to deny Applicant's request for demolition, noting she lives in nearby historic house and appreciates need to invest in community rather than allow older structures to fall into disrepair while also noting personal reactions to proposed replacement structure are not positive; Mr. Simonson felt "conflicted" noting personal aversion to vacant properties ... especially significant structures within Bethlehem's historic district ... left to fall into disrepair but also sympathizes with Applicant's desire to replace existing structure with appropriate new design and would have appreciated studies that illustrate new addition to existing structure as well as full replacement option before making final decision. In closing, Mr. Lader reminded Applicant about HCC's previous request that all future design proposals depict surrounding context of existing streetscape, which is currently missing; also suggested that Applicant might qualify for façade grant in support of needed rehabilitation of existing historic structure. In response to informal poll, Applicant requested HCC to vote on request to demolish existing structure rather than return for future unified demolition and new construction proposal.

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

1. The proposal to demolish an existing single-family dwelling was presented by Joseph Shadid, Randy Smith, Salvatore Verrastro and Christopher Worton.
2. The motion to DENY a recommendation to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work was unanimously approved; therefore, the proposal to secure approval to demolish an existing single-family dwelling was DENIED based upon its failure to comply with Bethlehem Ordinance Article 1714.03 Purposes of the Historic Conservation District as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition. Select HCC members voting in support of denying a recommendation to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal considered the existing dwelling as significant to the immediate streetscape and also to the overall Mount Airy Neighborhood District. Other HCC members voting in support of denying a recommendation to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal noted the Applicant could investigate design solutions that rehabilitate the existing historic structure while including a sympathetic new addition that also satisfies relevant design guidelines for new construction.

General Business:

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

Mr. Evans reminded everyone that HCC's next meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2025, to avoid conflict with Presidents' Day federal holiday.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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