

---

---

## 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, CHAZ PATRICK

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** ANTHONY SILVOY, MICHAEL SIMONSON

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

**PRESS PRESENT:** ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)

**VISITORS PRESENT:** KAREN GREENLEE, JOHN LEE, MICHAEL METZGER, MICAH MUTSCHLER, RICHARD SAUSE, HARLEY SHUPP

**MEETING DATE:** SEPTEMBER 20, 2021

---

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on September 20, 2021, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

### **Agenda Item #1**

**Property Location:** 510 East Fourth Street  
**Property Owner:** Cathiarn Kelly  
**Applicant:** John Lee

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a semi-detached, 2 1/2 story, 3-bay residential building with vinyl siding that covers wood frame construction. Built in the late 19th century, the steeply pitched cross gable and original slate roof are characteristic of the Victorian Gothic style. The existing concrete front porch is a mid-20<sup>th</sup> century addition while the porch's open-web posts and shed roof fell into disrepair and were recently removed.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to remove the existing rotted porch structure (rusted rails and posts) and replace with new shingled porch roof and vinyl-covered posts.

### **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.

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** COA Application indicates intent to replace already-demolished front porch elements (including inappropriate open-web iron posts, wrought iron handrail assembly, etc.) with appropriate porch details. Based upon provided drawings, porch roof is approximately 9-feet deep x 18-feet wide (one foot wider than concrete porch below) to shelter steps at side. Underside of replacement porch ceiling is 8-feet 5-inches above finished floor of existing concrete porch to match previous; existing wrought iron handrail at steps leading down to sidewalk are to remain. Proposed structural elements include 4x4 pressure-treated wooden posts; Porch Section drawing notes that

posts are to be covered with vinyl. Floor Plan drawing indicates three new posts while Front Elevation drawing indicates four new posts. Replacement handrail assembly is described as “vinyl railing system ... with 2x2 vinyl balusters” on Porch Section drawing while Front Elevation drawing describes new handrail as “AZEK top and bottom rails with 1 ½”x1 ½” balusters”.

Additional structural elements include gang of two 2x8 pressure-treated wooden beams across front of new porch roof and resting on new posts; Front Elevation drawing indicates beams to be covered with aluminum. Proposed porch ceiling is AZEK beaded soffit panels. Replacement shed roof with 4/12 pitch matches previous porch roof while proposed sheathing is GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in ‘Antique Gray’ color. Aluminum drip edge across front of porch roof allows rainwater to run into new half-round aluminum gutter that leads to two round downspouts ... one at each end of new porch. Side gable of new porch roof to be sheathed with cement board lap siding with smooth surface and 8-inch exposure.

Replacement porch details are appropriate as proposed, with following clarifications and modifications:

- HCC will not recommend vinyl building products for approval within Historic Conservation District so proposed vinyl handrail assembly is inappropriate; **note:** according to relevant Design Guidelines, appropriate porch elements for wood-framed structures should be wood; however, HCC has previously determined porch components (including handrail assemblies) of composite material (AZEK, or comparable) as appropriate alternative
- posts covered in vinyl are also inappropriate; consider wooden posts or alternative posts fabricated by firms specializing in structural elements sheathed with composite material (AZEK, or comparable) to be compatible with new composite handrail assembly; **notes:** added benefit includes ability to paint composite surfaces; however, might involve re-calculating sizes of posts and beams to meet structural requirements. See also existing porch at adjacent property (#508 East Fourth Street) as inspiration for decorative post elements (should at least consider simple upper capital and lower base details) rather than plain vertical posts with no detailing, as currently proposed
- install four (not three) structural posts; ensure location of third post from left is centered between both existing windows and then mirror that dimension to locate second post from left on other side of window; **note:** entrance door is off-center so post location between window and door will differ from post location between windows
- clarify detail at junction between existing building façade beneath upper-level windows and top of porch roof, noting need for flashing detail as well as limited repairs to existing sheathing below upper windowsills
- take advantage of existing lowest segment of original downspout (at far right of concrete porch) that already directs rainwater beneath public sidewalk to gutter by connecting one new downspout at that location; requires omitting proposed second downspout at far left, potential recalculating sizes of half-round gutters and/or round downspout (including rainwater from main roof) as well as repair to existing segment to accommodate new round downspout; **note:** though not depicted on drawings, provided photographs indicate that repairs to existing upper gutters and associated downspouts should also be part of current work scope so they properly direct rainwater from main roof down onto new porch roof as well

**Discussion:** John Lee represented proposal to remove existing rotted porch structure (rusted rails and posts) and replace with new shingled porch roof and vinyl-covered posts. Applicant confirmed AZEK composite is intended material for porch handrail components instead of vinyl, as originally conceived. Applicant also confirmed four porch posts are intended instead of three, as originally conceived; continued with preference for posts to be evenly spaced with equal segments between rather than centered between windows, as recommended by Historic Officer. Mr. Evans inquired if new porch roof (including proposed gutter and downspouts) would continue to accept rainwater from main house roof; Applicant confirmed new porch would also collect rainwater from front half of main roof so proposal to reduce number of porch downspouts is concerning during heavy rains. Mr. Evans continued with concern that current proposal to evacuate new leaders directly onto public sidewalk is safety hazard; Applicant responded with willingness to reconceive new porch roof with only one downspout leading to existing boot so rainwater can be directed beneath public sidewalk and into gutter. Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s intentions for various flashing details at new roof; Applicant suggested aluminum step flashings at junction of new porch roof with adjacent brick masonry structure as well as aluminum flashing and counterflashing at junction of new porch roof with existing aluminum siding above. Mr. Lader noted appropriate flashing details for projects within Historic

Conservation District typically involve copper rather than aluminum; Applicant expressed budgetary concerns for his client is copper flashing details are required. Mr. Lader also noted height of proposed railing might need to increase (based upon distance between porch deck and public sidewalk below); Applicant confirmed existing handrail height is 31-inches while proposed handrail height is 32-inches. Mr. Lader encouraged Applicant to investigate relevant building code requirement, with potential to increase height of handrail to 36-inches, as needed. Mr. Lader concluded by inquiring if proposed posts sheathed in AZEK might require resizing; Applicant agreed to investigate options for structural composite posts rather than sheathing pressure-treated posts with composite to avoid overly large elements.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to remove existing rotted porch structure (rusted rails and posts) and replace with new shingled porch roof and vinyl-covered posts was presented by John Lee.
2. Appropriate replacement porch includes following details:
  - a. porch roof is approx. 9-feet deep x 18-feet wide; underside of new porch ceiling matches previous while existing wrought iron handrail at steps leading down to sidewalk remain
  - b. gang of two 2x8 pressure-treated wood beams across front of new porch roof and clad with aluminum on four posts of AZEK (or comparable structural composite) at equal spacing
  - c. handrail at code-compliant height is AZEK (or comparable composite material) top and bottom rails along with 1 ½"x1 ½" balusters
  - d. porch ceiling is AZEK (or comparable composite material) beaded soffit panels; side gable is clad with cement board lap siding with smooth surface and 8-inch exposure
  - e. new shed roof with 4/12 pitch matches previous; sheathing is GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in 'Antique Gray' color
  - f. aluminum flashing and counterflashing seam new porch roof with existing siding above while aluminum step flashing seams new porch with existing brick wall of adjacent structure; existing siding as well as existing upper gutters and leaders require limited repairs
  - g. aluminum drip edge across front of porch roof allows rainwater to run into new half-round aluminum gutter and down one new round downspout at west (right) corner fitted into existing boot beneath public sidewalk

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

## **Agenda Item #2**

**Property Location:** 215 Broadway

**Property Owner:** Greg Salomoni

**Applicant:** John Lee and Greg Salomoni

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a 2 ½ story, brick masonry, semi-detached former residential building with slate roof that was modified in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century with a commercial storefront. The 2-story, 2-bay storefront includes a brick parapet above a cast stone projecting cornice with simple profiling, 2 pairs of 1-over-1 double-hung windows with large cast stone headers separated from the cornice by soldier coursing, a large display window under a profiled cast stone cornice and a door with transom on either side of the display window. The building dates from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the storefront dates from ca. 1920. The storefront is Classical Revival in style typical of residential/commercial conversions elsewhere in the Historic Conservation District.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to demolish and construct a new building.

**Guideline Citations:**

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1

- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless proposed demolition involves a non-significant building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant.
- **Historic Conservation Commission '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:** During HCC meeting on September 18, 2017, Applicant received approval to fully demolish existing building at 215 Broadway with specific conditions, including:

- scaled drawings must be created to document existing cast stone architectural elements in case they cannot be salvaged
- all cast stone or stone architectural elements and as much historical brick as possible will be salvaged and reused in new façades
- new front and side façades will match drawings, as submitted and amended during May 2017 HCC meeting
- new foundation plan for building must be submitted prior to demolition; **note:** HCC determined subsequent foundation plan as appropriate during meeting on April 17, 2021
- Applicant must return to HCC with revised façade drawings for proposed replacement building

HCC records indicate series of earlier reviews that also resulted in HCC motion in support of COA during meeting on May 15, 2017 with additional conditions for front and side façades, including: reuse of salvaged brick and new brick to match existing, entrance door and bi-folding doors at front façade similar to existing at adjacent former fire house, window openings for upper-level terrace with infill to imply double-gang windows ... otherwise, no additional window or door openings ... as well as smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic top coat and integral color for remaining side façade, with samples to be reviewed by HCC at future meeting.

Applicant envisioned reconstruction to serve as addition to adjacent existing structure at 217 Broadway, with interior openings to allow circulation between both buildings. Current COA Application details Applicant's intentions, many of which satisfy select items from previous COAs. Proposed new structure measures 19-feet wide x 109-feet deep x 28-feet high, with three extensions at side (north) façade ... one measuring 14-feet wide x 5.5-feet deep x 14-feet high, adjacent extension measuring 21-feet wide x 5.5-feet deep x 28-feet high and separate extension measuring 46.5-feet x 8.5-feet deep x 28-feet high (all measurements are approximate). Proposed new construction includes following details:

Front (east) façade

- cast stone architectural elements to be salvaged and reused
- as much historical brick as possible to be salvaged and reused in new façade; **note:** added brick should match existing and entire façade pointed with appropriate mortar matching existing in color, texture, joint style and softness
- top of raised façade (parapet) is below decorative detailing of adjacent firehouse
- single entrance on left side of storefront; new door matches existing on adjacent firehouse but transom above is now smaller to align with adjacent bi-folding doors rather than with existing transom at adjacent firehouse
- large bi-folding doors replace former display window and secondary entrance; two panels on each side of vertical divide, with each panel divided into five lites. **note:** tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate
- windows at second floor accommodate outdoor dining terrace, with aluminum frames around window openings that also divide each opening vertically to create two pairs of "windows" and with lower "sash" infilled with 4-inch x 4-inch wire mesh, orthogonally oriented; **note:** previous COA identified infill as 2-inch x 2-inch wire mesh
- front landing and railing to match adjacent firehouse
- proposed 12-inch x 24-inch porcelain tiles in matte-black finish oriented both horizontally and vertically were never reviewed by HCC so discussion is warranted

- **note:** series of new single-story and double-story additions sheathed in metal-panel siding at side façade and visible from front façade that also include additional windows and doors along with metal emergency egress stair and privacy fencing were previously not assessed by HCC and now extend into current adjacent parking lot so discussion about these new items is warranted

#### Side (north) Façade

- most of façade extending 25-feet from corner is no longer brick, as originally determined to be appropriate so discussion is warranted about proposed insulated metal-panel rainscreen system in flat black finish; **note:** HCC has determined metal-panel siding as appropriate exterior sheathing for select Contemporary style new construction of non-contributing structures as well as cladding for recessed roof-top additions on contributing structures but not as exterior sheathing at street level for contributing structures
- two upper-level window openings with aluminum frames that create two pairs of windows similar to windows at front façade are indicated within brick portion, with wire mesh infill at lower “sashes” in both openings; cast stone sills, lintels and cap are also to be installed on brick section
- current drawing depicts four additional windows as “thermally broken aluminum frame with insulated glazing” as well as two emergency egress doors (proposed door material not indicated); however, previous COA indicated that no additional window and door openings are allowed at side façade, so discussion is warranted
- previous HCC reviews offered no indication of materials for visible roof landscapes so current proposals for standing-seam metal roof at one-story addition as well as EPDM rubber roof membrane for remaining roofs warrant discussion; **note:** HCC considers standing-seam metal roofing for secondary roof landscapes appropriate, as long as Applicant clarifies proposed material and color (needed for resulting COA) but does not consider visible EPDM roofs as appropriate ... often requiring raised parapet to screen such roofs from public view; **note:** trees currently screen view of roof landscape but will be removed to construct proposed new side extensions
- remainder of side façade as well as rear façade and visible portion of other side façade to be finished in sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic topcoat and integral color; Applicant is prepared to submit product samples for HCC consideration
- current Side Elevation drawing depicts metal stair at side facade while previous COA approved wood emergency stair at rear façade, so clarification is warranted; **note:** HCC discourages visible emergency stairs within HCD but rather encourages Applicants to enclose emergency stairs

#### Rear (west) and Side (south) Façades

- previous COA Applications did not include drawings or details associated with rear façade and remaining side façade but current submittal indicates both façades are to be finished in sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic topcoat and integral color that matches stucco on other side (north) façade; **note:** floor plan drawing indicates rear emergency egress while rear façade drawing does not depict associated exit door so clarification is warranted ... noting interior floor level is several feet above parking lot so exit platform with steps, hand rails, etc. will also be needed to service new exit
- drawing sheets also indicate privacy fencing (depicted on floorplan and detail but not on façade drawings); proposed fencing includes 4x4 pressure-treated posts at 5-feet on-center and 7-feet tall while fencing elements are 5/4x6 wood slats oriented horizontally ... with all wooden components stained in black color; though detailed similar to existing privacy fence at adjacent former firehouse, discussion is still warranted to determine appropriateness

Supplemental computer-generated view indicates new signage and exterior lighting; however, current COA Application provides no specifics, so these items require assessment during subsequent HCC meeting.

**Discussion:** John Lee represented proposal to demolish and construct new building. Mr. Lader requested clarifications about various building materials; Applicant responded that proposed tiles at front façade mimic existing (failing) tiles but are more durable and should last longer. Applicant continued that proposed front façade includes no revisions from previous proposal already determined by HCC as appropriate (and identified with resulting COA) except for re-sized transom above entrance door so that it aligns with adjacent bi-folding doors. Mr. Lader inquired about Applicant’s intent to submit sample of proposed wall stucco finish with acrylic topcoat and integrated color. Applicant noted inability to attend August HCC

meeting when proposed project was originally intended for review, but samples were submitted in advance; **note:** Ms. Heller left meeting in search of various samples before returning. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about visibility of proposed EPDM roof; Applicant responded that view of proposed EPDM roof landscapes from public right-of-way will be limited due to height (above second floor level) and low pitch. Mr. Lader noted HCC typically requires EPDM roofs to be hidden from public view by raised parapets. Mr. Lader also inquired about visibility of proposed metal emergency stairs; Applicant admitted that previous design allocated emergency stairs to rear of property, but new floorplan layout works best if stair is at side façade between two extensions that include interior stairs and restrooms. Mr. Lader noted site plan indicates ample location for rear emergency stair and inquired if new addition can be expanded to enclose emergency stair. Applicant explained that rear portion of new building now includes performance stage so placement of emergency stair beyond no longer works; continued that design of proposed stair and fencing are similar to existing emergency stair and privacy fence at adjacent building while also noting that property owner is “vehemently opposed” to enclosing emergency stair ... explaining that enclosed stairs encourage unwanted outside parties to cooperate with patrons inside in order to sneak in without proper ID checks and to avoid cover charges. Applicant also confirmed need for rear deck at rear exit, with details of pressure-treated components to match construction at adjacent structure.

Applicant presented exterior stucco sample: sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic topcoat and integral color, Dryvit ‘Sandpebble’ finish in Smoke Signal color. Applicant also presented metal-panel sample for exterior cladding at side façade and extensions: insulated metal-panel rainscreen system, 0.032 gauge aluminum panels by ATAS International in matte black finish. Applicant confirmed that proposed standing-seam metal roof for single-story side extension is same metal-panel system in matte black finish. Mr. Lader inquired about product sample for proposed matte black porcelain tiles at front façade; Applicant confirmed no samples were provided but simple aesthetic repeats existing tiles in better quality product. Mr. Lader also inquired about proposed windows at side elevations, noting personal concern with simple-line muntin divides for lites; Applicant explained proposed windows are source of natural light for new spaces inside and are aluminum frame with “slim-line” muntins that imitate windows in nearby industrial structures. Mr. Evans inquired about provisions for trash corral and method of dealing with resulting refuse; Applicant confirmed proposed new structure is conceived as addition to existing adjacent structure ... with existing kitchen to be renovated and expanded into new addition ... so existing refuse area will service both addresses. Mr. Lader inquired if new addition will also be sprinklered; Applicant confirmed new addition will be sprinklered to comply with building code requirements of adjacent structure.

Mr. Lader inquired about status of ownership of adjacent parking lot to allow for proposed expansion; Applicant confirmed that conversations with Bethlehem Parking Authority about purchase of select portion of existing parking lot are on-going ... with current HCC review of proposed demolition and new construction required in advance of final contract negotiations. Mr. Evans expressed concern that ownership of property needed to construct proposed development is not yet finalized and noted that all HCC decisions are voided if BPA does not approve property purchase because project must be reconceived. Applicant responded that draft agreement is already in place while proposed project is reviewed by various city entities and agreed that design concept must be reconsidered (triggering separate HCC review) if sale of adjacent lot is not successful. Mr. Evans stressed that all previous and current HCC approvals (including permission to demolish existing structure) are voided if purchase of adjacent lot is unsuccessful as assurance that demolition cannot proceed until appropriateness of replacement structure is determined.

**Public Commentary:** none

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

1. Proposal to demolish and construct new building was presented by John Lee.
2. Existing structure will be replaced with new structure that measures approx. 19-feet wide x 109-feet deep x 28-feet high, with three extensions at side (north) façade ... one measuring approx. 14-feet wide x 5.5-feet deep x 14-feet high, adjacent extension measuring approx. 21-feet wide x 5.5-feet deep x 28-feet high and separate extension measuring approx. 46.5-feet x 8.5-feet deep x 28-feet high and includes following appropriate details:

- a. Front (east) Façade:
  - i. existing cast stone architectural elements to be salvaged and reused
  - ii. as much historical brick as possible to be salvaged and reused in new façade; **note:** added brick should match existing and entire façade pointed with appropriate mortar matching existing in color, texture, joint style and softness
  - iii. top of raised façade (parapet) is below decorative detailing of adjacent former firehouse
  - iv. single entrance is on left side of storefront; new door matches existing on adjacent firehouse but transom above is smaller to align with adjacent bi-folding doors
  - v. large bi-folding doors replace former display window and secondary entrance; two panels on each side of vertical divide, with each panel divided into five lites. **note:** tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate
  - vi. window openings at second floor accommodate outdoor dining terrace, with aluminum frames around openings that also divide each opening vertically to create two pairs of “windows” and with lower “sash” infilled with 4-inch x 4-inch wire mesh, orthogonally oriented
  - vii. front landing and railing to match adjacent firehouse
  - viii. Applicant must cooperate via City of Bethlehem with HCC Chair and Historic Officer to finalize appropriateness of proposed cladding of 12-inch x 24-inch porcelain tiles in matte-black finish oriented both horizontally and vertically
- b. Side (north) Façade
  - i. initial portion of façade extending from corner is salvaged brick and includes two upper-level window openings with aluminum frames that create two pairs of windows similar to windows at front façade, with wire mesh infill at lower “sashes” in both openings along with cast stone sills, lintels and parapet cap (salvaged and reused or new cast elements to match original details)
  - ii. brick façade followed by two extensions clad in insulated metal-panel rainscreen system (0.032-gauge aluminum panels by ATAS International, or comparable) in matte black finish; remainder of façade is sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic topcoat and integral color (Dryvit ‘Sandpebble’ finish in Smoke Signal color, or comparable)
  - iii. additional windows are thermally-broken aluminum frame with insulated glazing and slim muntins, including two smaller windows facing front (east) façade and two larger windows facing side (north) façade; **notes:** tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate; Applicant is required to submit window details and samples during subsequent HCC meeting before appropriateness is finalized
  - iv. two emergency egress doors lead out onto metal stair, with details similar to existing at side (south) façade of adjacent former firehouse; appropriateness of metal stair dependent upon construction of new privacy fence that includes 4x4 pressure-treated posts at 5-feet on-center and 7-feet tall along with 5/4x6 wood slats oriented horizontally, with all wooden components stained in black color
  - v. all roof landscapes are clad with standing-seam metal roofing in matte black finish to match metal-panel rainscreen wall system; **note:** Applicant also has option of EPDM rubber roof membranes combined with raised parapets to screen roofs from public view
- c. Rear (west) and Side (south) Façades: both façades are finished in sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic topcoat and integral color that matches stucco on side (north) façade

**Notes:** The City of Bethlehem will not issue a demolition permit until all planning applications have been successfully reviewed and the Applicant has purchased portions of the adjacent property to construct proposed extensions at the side (north) façade. Details of the new exit platform (including decking, steps, handrails, etc.) at the rear façade, envisioned exterior lighting fixtures as well as new signage necessitate subsequent HCC reviews.

The motion for the proposed work was approved: 5-1. Mr. Cornish opposed the motion, recalling his previous decision that the proposed project was inappropriate and noting the current proposal does not include appropriate improvements to the original project.

### **Agenda Item #3**

**Property Location:** 201 Broadway  
**Property Owner:** Hess Realty, LLC  
**Applicant:** Karen Greenlee

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a 1-story commercial building with a flat roof and metal siding. There is also a flat-roofed canopy over the existing gas pumps with the company logo on multiple sides. Dating from ca. 1975, the building is utilitarian in style and is non-contributing to the Historic Conservation District. There is also an existing pylon sign for the gas station with two internally illuminated acrylic pricer faces beneath the station logo.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to replace existing 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'** -- 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 replace existing pricer fields on each face of pylon sign with two new pricer fields along with one new digital toggle field on each sign face; existing company logos on pylon sign, sides of canopy and front façade of commercial building to remain. Two new fields of digital figures for per-gallon pricing on pylon sign measure 14-inches high each while one new field of digital letters that toggles between message "WITH PAY CARD" and "WITHOUT PAY CARD" in all upper-case lettering measures 9-inches high. New digital figures and letters to be internally illuminated with red LED lights.

Relevant design guidelines for signage indicate "HCC will not recommend for approval ... (signage with) internal fluorescent lights and sign faces (as well as) signs that move, flash or are intermittently illuminated". Proposed new signage would toggle between differing per-gallon prices depending upon "with pay card" or "without pay card" toggle messages in new field. Similar HCC reviews in 2011, 2014 and 2015 resulted in COAs allowing internal illumination of pylon signage because existing structure does not contribute to HCD; however, previous signage included digital pricer fields on each sign face that remained static. Current proposal that toggles between messages and associated per-gallon prices is inappropriate based upon relevant design guidelines for signage within HCD.

**Discussion:** Karen Greenlee represented proposal to replace existing signage. Applicant clarified proposal includes replacing existing pricer faces with new style to better reflect current company image, including new toggle bar with field for instantaneous message changes. Mr. Evans inquired about typical timeframe between toggle messages. Applicant explained messages typically toggle every 8 to 12 while clarifying toggle changes are instantaneous and do not blink, flash or have ticker tape trailer; also confirmed proposed revisions to signage are limited to pricer faces while existing logos on remaining portions of sign as well as other sign locations remain unchanged. Mr. Lader requested clarification from Historic Officer concerning applicable signage guidelines; Mr. Long repeated relevant signage design guidelines but reminded HCC that previous resolutions for project site were approved because gas station is non-contributing to Historic Conservation District. Mr. Lousch agreed gas station is not contributing to HCD, recalling HCC previously approving internally illuminated signage at project location. Mr. Lader inquired about appropriate time between toggles; Applicant noted studies from various communities indicate toggle times that range between 8 and 12 seconds are optimal to avoid potential for traffic hazards. Mr. Hudak inquired if Speedway is currently working at other locations to accommodate new toggle pricing concept; Applicant cited several recent reviews in other nearby PA and NJ communities and also noted process remains on-going within other municipalities.

**Public Commentary:** none

**Motion:** HCC upon motion by Mr. Lousch 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 replace existing signage was presented by Karen Greenlee.
2. Appropriate replacement signage includes following details:
  - a. two new pricer fields and one new digital toggle field on each face of existing pylon sign replace two existing pricer fields; existing company logo on pylon sign to remain
  - b. two new fields of digital figures for per-gallon pricing on pylon sign measure 14-inches high each and one new field of digital letters that toggles between message "WITH PAY CARD" and "WITHOUT PAY CARD" in all upper-case lettering measures 9-inches high; digital figures and lettering to be internally illuminated with red LED lights
  - c. digital figures and lettering will not move, trail, flash, or blink; toggling between messages is instantaneous and minimum toggle interval is 8 seconds

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

#### **Agenda Item #4**

**Property Location:** 321 Wyandotte Street

**Property Owner:** Cathedral Church of the Nativity

**Applicant:** Architerra, PC

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** This structure is a stone church with a south facing gable with rose window, a steeply pitched slate roof and a gable transept. The current transept was the original church and dates from 1864 while the current nave was constructed in 1887. The church is Gothic Revival in style.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to install a sign at 321 Wyandotte Street (corner of Wyandotte Street and West Third Street). The sign consists of a single-sided aluminum sign with masonry support elements, sign lighting and electrical work for the sign.

#### **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 #3
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines concerning New Construction'** -- see Agenda Item #2

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** COA Application indicates intent to install new sign measuring 3-feet and 10-inches high x 15-feet and 8-inches wide x 6-inches deep integrated within new free-standing masonry wall measuring approx. 9-feet high x 19-feet wide x 2-feet and 10-inches deep at greatest dimensions. Painted aluminum sign in red color includes Episcopal Church shield at left measuring 29-inches high x 23-inches wide with details in white, blue, and red colors and outlined in black color along with two rows of text, each measuring 12-inches high, with "Cathedral Church" followed by "of the Nativity" in combination upper-case and lower-case serif lettering in white color. Top, sides and rear of aluminum sign are also painted red in color with no logo or lettering. Proposed sign to be installed on cast stone wall cap atop masonry wall construction with natural stone veneer "to match Cathedral architectural elements" and flush left with masonry column with cast stone column cap and natural stone veneer "to match Cathedral architectural elements". Front of sign to be illuminated by free-standing linear grazing luminaire approx. 1-foot tall and installed approx. 3-feet in front of new wall construction; proposed lighting accomplished with 4000K LED bulbs.

New signage is appropriate as proposed, with following modifications:

- suggestion to reduce size of proposed sign and free-standing wall construction; although 60 sq.ft. sign area complies with relevant zoning ordinance, supplemental photomontage (Drawing Sheet 3, top right image) confirms that views of defining architectural details of contributing structure will be obstructed by proposed sign and wall construction in violation of SIS #9 that “new work shall be ... compatible with historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect integrity of (historic) property and its environment”
- suggestions to revise bright white painted sign elements to warm white or ivory in color
- integrate off-set pinstripe detail around entire perimeter of sign in complementary color; re-size logo and/or lettering to fit, as needed
- cast stone elements should be tan/warm gray in color rendition (not cold gray) to match existing cast stone elements of contributing structure
- ensure natural stone veneer includes custom elements that properly turn corners; otherwise, corner stone veneer units will appear thin and not match existing stone corners of contributing structure
- relevant design guidelines for signage do not address free-standing linear lighting but rather small-scale, individual or hidden fixtures (gooseneck fixtures, wall-mounted lamps, etc.) so discussion of proposed free-standing linear grazing luminaire is warranted; if HCC determines proposed lighting as appropriate, LED color temperature should be limited to max. 3000K for appropriate warm illumination within HCD

**Discussion:** Richard Sause and Micah Mutschler represented proposal to install sign at corner of Wyandotte Street and West Third Street; sign consists of single-sided aluminum sign with masonry support elements, sign lighting and electrical work for sign. Applicant confirmed that proposed stone veneer is 6-inches thick so “thin veneer effect” at corner conditions is avoided. Mr. Lader inquired if samples of proposed stone veneer are available; Applicant agreed to provide samples via City of Bethlehem for HCC review, as needed. Applicant continued by agreeing with recommendation to lower color temperature of intended LED lighting to 3000K; also agreed to source warm gray cast stone elements to match similar elements at existing church structure. Applicant deemed suggestions for off-set pinstripe detail around sign perimeter and warm white or ivory color as unnecessary, noting desire to match bright white details of Episcopal Church shield logo. Mr. Lader inquired about HCC acceptance of logos. Mr. Long responded that HCC typically accepts corporate logos without manipulation as appropriate so church shield could be considered corporate logo as well; continued that pinstripe detail and warm white color details represent suggestions and not requirements. Applicant explained that proposed sign represents approved design resulting from several iterations reviewed by congregational committee, noting proposed size is well within zoning limitations; also noted interruption to views of church are fleeting as cars and pedestrians pass by. Mr. Lader suggested raising sign on posts so views of church are possible not only above signage but also from below and all sides. Mr. Evans inquired how light bar would respond during snowfall; Applicant noted LED bulbs produce no heat for snow to melt, so proposed fixture needs to be serviced if snow accumulation exceeds 12-inch mounting height ... also clarifying that raised height will illuminate sign and not masonry base while new plantings will hide view of fixture from public right of way.

**Public Commentary:** none

**Motion:** HCC upon motion by Mr. Cornish and seconded by Mr. Patrick 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 sign at 321 Wyandotte Street (corner of Wyandotte Street and West Third Street) was presented by Richard Sause and Micah Mutschler.
2. Appropriate sign includes following details:
  - a. aluminum sign measures 3-feet and 10-inches high x 15-feet and 8-inches wide x 6-inches deep and is integrated within new free-standing masonry wall measuring approx. 9-feet high x 19-feet wide x 2-feet and 10-inches deep at its greatest dimensions
  - b. painted sign in red color includes Episcopal Church shield at left measuring 29-inches high x 23-inches wide with details in white, blue, and red colors and outlined in black color along with two rows of text, each measuring 12-inches high, with “Cathedral Church” followed by “of the Nativity” in combination upper-case and lower-case serif lettering in white color; top, sides and rear of aluminum sign are also painted red in color with no logo or lettering

- c. sign installed on cast stone wall cap atop masonry wall construction with natural stone veneer and flush left with masonry column with cast stone column cap and natural stone veneer; stone details to match existing stone elements of Cathedral Church
- d. front of sign illuminated by free-standing linear grazing luminaire approx. 1-foot tall and installed approx. 3-feet in front of new wall construction; proposed lighting accomplished with 3000K LED bulbs

**Note:** Applicant has option to include spacers between aluminum sign and masonry wall, resulting in smaller sign that improves visibility of Cathedral Church

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

### **Agenda Item #5**

**Property Location:** 30-32 East Third Street

**Property Owner:** Collaboration 3 Development

**Applicant:** Michael Metzger

**Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features:** The existing structure at 30 East Third Street is a semi-detached, three-story, three-bay, masonry building with highly decorative upper cornice and flat roof that dates from ca. 1910. Originally conceived as a department store for C.P. Hoffman & Company, it later served as a commercial location for Sears, Roebuck & Company and then for Goodman Furniture, which is the source of its current name. The structure is Classical Revival in style, with primary façade materials of cast stone at the front (north) upper levels and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century aluminum framed storefront at the entry level. The adjacent structure at 32 East Third Street was destroyed by fire in 1982; resulting demolition work exposed brick masonry along the (east) side wall at 30 East Third Street.

**Proposed Alterations:** It is proposed to install a new roof and metal flashings as well as replace and paint existing trim at 30 East Third Street and also to construct a new addition that includes a 4-story mixed-use masonry-clad building at 32 East Third Street, with massing to complement the existing (adjacent) Goodman Building. The new addition will provide commercial/retail/restaurant space on the first floor with twelve apartment units on the levels above.

#### **Guideline Citations:**

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 1.** -- A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 4.** -- Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines concerning New Construction'** -- see Agenda Item #2

**Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations:** During meeting on Feb. 27, 2017 in consultation with City of Bethlehem representatives, HCC generated list of specific architectural elements and details to be evaluated and considered by developer of 30 East Third Street property;

resulting list included: retention of cornice at roofline; window repairs, including missing transoms; removal of aluminum cladding to reveal concealed architectural details; masonry repairs, as needed; re-design of storefront windows and entrance; possible retention of two-story projecting "Goodman" sign; consider restoring "Goodman Furniture" painted sign on upper portion of rear wall. Applicant returned to HCC on March 19, 2018, and again on Sept. 17, 2018, with proposals to restore and renovate existing Goodman Building at 30 East Third Street and to construct new addition at 32 East Third Street. Addition was originally described as five-story, mixed-use, masonry-clad building but was subsequently reduced one floor level (in response to HCC recommendation that massing of addition should better complement existing Goodman Building), with commercial space at entry level and twelve apartment units on upper floor levels. Resulting COA identified appropriate renovations to Goodman Building, including: structural reinforcing of existing flooring and roofing members, installation of new roof and metal flashings, replacement of existing rotted trim as required (with PVC trim to match existing) and painting of all trim; development at rear entry level as potential depot to service existing bus connections along Mechanic Street; existing masonry wall adjacent to proposed addition could be breached at one or more locations at entry level to allow for common commercial tenant at 30 and 32 East Third Street. COA also defined appropriate new addition as four-story, mixed-use, masonry-clad building, with massing to complement existing Goodman Building along with commercial space at entry level and twelve apartment units on upper floor levels. COA continued with list of appropriate design details, including: recessed corner entrance at intersection of East Third Street and Adams Street leading through vestibule and into commercial space, with secondary egress along east façade at Adams Street; existing south end L-extension of Goodman Building (extending to Adams Street) accommodates rear commercial service area as well as secondary (side) entrance with dedicated stair and elevator for residential tenants; primary entrance for residents accommodated by slight recess along East Third Street facade, acting as transitional element between existing Goodman Building and new addition; entry connector includes smaller double-hung windows at intermediate landings while entrance door is delineated with cast masonry or limestone cladding different from remaining brick masonry façade; cornice lines of new four-story addition approximately align with those of existing Goodman Building at entry-level storefront and upper roofline; new storefront façade with cornice for bus depot at rear entry level of Goodman Building repeats existing details at service entrance of Goodman Building L-extension, as found along Adams Street façade; twelve (12) one-bedroom residential units organized at second, third and fourth floor levels are expressed on exterior façade by aluminum-clad wood double-hung windows with functioning window sash rhythmically organized within red brick masonry construction; composite detailing at window heads and sills recall similar details at adjacent Goodman Building; composite parapet is also similar in dimension and detailing to existing parapet at adjacent Goodman Building (**note:** Applicant agreed to simplify parapet detailing of new addition in deference to existing ornate parapet at adjacent Goodman Building); support brackets for upper cornice are similar in scale but simpler in detail to brackets at adjacent Goodman Building but Applicant should clarify proposed bracket material.

Current COA Application with supplemental information includes various updates that reflect on-going project development. Floor plan drawings of Goodman Building depict revised commercial entrance sequence at street level, with slightly recessed vestibule, new interior doors and landing with ADA-compliant chair lift along with steps leading up into commercial space. Previous development at rear entry level as depot to service bus connections along Mechanic Street is no longer depicted. Aside from additional restroom facilities at second level, no specific development for Goodman Building is indicated. Proposed new addition at 32 East Third Street measures approx. 39.5-feet wide x 108-feet deep x 57-feet high (at greatest dimension) includes recessed corner entrance at intersection of East Third Street and Adams Street leading through vestibule and into proposed commercial space. Existing south end L-extension of Goodman Building (extending to Adams Street) accommodates rear commercial service area as well as secondary (side) entrance with dedicated stair and elevator for residential tenants. Primary entrance for residents is accommodated by slight recess along East Third Street facade, acting as transitional element between existing Goodman Building and new addition. In response to previous HCC commentary, Applicant refined details of entry connector to include smaller double-hung windows at intermediate landings. Proposed entrance door is delineated with cast masonry or limestone cladding different from remaining brick masonry façade, which repeats detail at other structures along East Third Street. It should also be noted that Applicant previously revised floor levels of entry, first and second floors within new addition at 32 East Third Street by aligning them with existing floor levels of Goodman Building at 30 East Third Street. Revised façade drawings illustrate Applicant's ability to approximate cornice lines

of new four-story addition with those of existing Goodman Building at entry-level storefront and upper roofline while support brackets of new addition have been reduced in scale. Proposed renovations for existing Goodman Building indicate revised transom detail at storefront beneath building signage; height of storefront entrance doors should be revised so tops of doors align with underside of new transom. Entry-level storefront façade of new addition with lower cornice along East Third Street and continuing partially along Adams Street respects HCC Guidelines; proposed simplicity avoids competing with more detailed cornice details of existing neighbor. Similar to previous commentary, tops of corner entrance doors leading into new addition should also align with underside of transom detail. Per HCC request, Applicant aligned storefronts at side façade with window bays above while integrating screened gate enclosure at trash bays; HCC previously determined that proposed aluminum-frame storefronts in new addition are appropriate. Applicant reduced number of window bays at side façade of new addition to reflect apartment units behind, included new windows for upper floor levels Goodman Building L-extension to replace current brick in-fill and also simplified composite parapet with aluminum coping detail at portion of side elevation of new addition that steps back. With removal of bus depot use at rear façade, Applicant now proposes new windows for existing masonry openings at entry level. HCC previously determined that proposed aluminum-clad wood 1-over-1 double-hung windows are appropriate as are painted sills and lintels in composite material; Applicant should note that reflective and/or tinted glass for storefronts, entrance doors and windows is inappropriate within HCD. Several notations indicate intent to tooth-in brick infill, as needed within existing façade; appropriate infill should match size, color and finish of existing brick units while historical mortar mix to match existing should also be used.

Applicant previously described investigations into structural integrity of exterior wall systems to determine potential for retaining 2-story projecting “Goodman” sign along front façade; similarly, Applicant previously considered potential for re-painting mural signage on upper portion of rear wall. Considered intrinsic to historical identity of existing structure at 30 East Third Street, neither sign nor mural are depicted within current COA supplementals, so clarification is warranted. In addition, all new signage within proposed sign boards as well as any exterior lighting require assessments during subsequent HCC meetings.

**Discussion:** Michael Metzger represented proposal to install new roof and metal flashings as well as replace and paint existing trim. New addition includes 4-story mixed-use masonry-clad building, with massing to complement existing (adjacent) Goodman Building; new addition will provide commercial/retail/restaurant space on first floor with twelve apartment units on levels above. Applicant recounted series of HCC reviews leading to current submittal, noting previous approvals led to on-going work, including replacement roof, new mechanical systems to remediate moisture, new structural roof system, etc. Applicant continued that provided drawing set depicts current state of project, with desire to move forward by fitting out shell of existing building because of need to attract potential tenants.

Mr. Lader inquired if height of entrance doors can be raised to align with bottoms of transoms; Applicant noted potential to raise door heights somewhat while lowering height of transoms as compromise to avoid overly tall doors. Applicant submitted two brick sample options, noting compatibility of proposal with existing brick at rear of Goodman Building: Alverton Type-1 and Alverton Type-2 (Pennsylvania molded series) manufactured by Watsontown Brick Company. HCC noted Type-2 is preferred brick unit due to more color variation that complements existing brick of Goodman Building. Applicant submitted window sample: Pella ‘Architect’ series aluminum clad wooden 1-over-1 double-hung, as previously determined by HCC as appropriate. Mr. Lader requested confirmation about previous HCC determination that composite windowsills and lintels are appropriate; Mr. Long clarified original assumption about Goodman Building (with front façade of cast masonry units) would have cast sills and lintels but Applicant previously confirmed that sills and lintels are wooden, so HCC previously determined composite elements as appropriate alternative to wooden sills to ensure longevity and lower maintenance. Mr. Evans noted contemporary insulated windows have inherent reflectivity to glazing so HCC should be aware that some mirroring is unavoidable but important to clarify that Applicant cannot enhance reflectivity or make tinted. Applicant clarified proposal for rear “L” of Goodman Building reestablishes previous window openings currently covered over. Mr. Lader inquired if coping/parapet at recessed stairwell can be lowered to be more appropriate for adjacent existing Goodman Building; Applicant noted current design proposal for adjacent expansion allows historical building to take precedence. Mr. Lader continued by inquiring about color rendition of aluminum components of new storefronts; Applicant responded that colors are not finalized but would match windows above ... currently considering green color scheme.

Mr. Evans inquired about status of mold remediation at existing structure. Applicant confirmed existing structure has been mold-free for almost two years, noting structural stabilization occurred and new roof installed before mold remediation was conducted and subsequent dehumidification system was installed. Mr. Loush inquired about issues with historical signage. Applicant confirmed rehabilitation of rear mural signage is possible; however, condition of historical projecting Goodman Furniture sign at front façade will prove financially and physically challenging while also not necessarily attractive for new tenant with differing name. Mr. Lader suggested decision to rehabilitate and reinstall historical projecting sign might remain with owner; Mr. Hudak suggested general public continues to reference structure as Goodman Building and might expect return of historical sign. Mr. Cornish noted existing building has been vacant for so long that current generation does not necessarily connect structure with past tenant and historical sign requires significant rehabilitation while proposed building rehabilitation will result in new tenant so recommendations for signage should not be included within current motion.

**Public Commentary:** none

**Motion:** HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader 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 install new roof and metal flashings as well as replace and paint existing trim at 30 East Third Street and also to construct new addition that includes 4-story mixed-use masonry-clad building at 32 East Third Street, with massing to complement existing (adjacent) Goodman Building, was presented by Michael Metzger. Current proposal builds upon renovations and new construction identified as appropriate within previous COA (Resolution 2018-210, adopted by City Council on October 2, 2018) to reflect ongoing project development.
2. Appropriate rehabilitation of existing Goodman Building at 30 East Third Street includes following details:
  - a. commercial entrance sequence at street level includes slightly recessed vestibule, new interior doors and landing with ADA-compliant chair lift along with steps leading up into commercial space; tops of new entrance doors align with underside of new storefront transom
  - b. previous proposal at rear entry level as depot to service bus connections along Mechanic Street is no longer applicable; new windows to be installed within existing masonry openings that match windows previously determined as appropriate (Pella Architect series aluminum-clad wood 1-over-1 double-hung windows with painted sills and lintels in composite material)
  - c. south end L-extension (extending to Adams Street) accommodates rear commercial service area as well as secondary residential entrance into new addition, with dedicated stair and elevator for tenants; also includes new windows at upper floor levels to replace current inappropriate brick infill
  - d. tooth-in brick infill, as needed within existing façade; appropriate infill to match size, color and finish of existing brick units while historical mortar mix to match existing will also be used
3. Appropriate construction of new adjacent addition at 32 East Third Street includes following details:
  - a. addition measures approx. 39.5-feet wide x 108-feet deep x 57-feet high at greatest dimension
  - b. recessed corner entrance at intersection of East Third Street and Adams Street leads through vestibule and into entry-level commercial space, with tops of new entrance doors aligning with underside of new storefront transom; storefront includes lower cornice along East Third Street and continuing partially along Adams Street
  - c. primary entrance for upper-level residential tenants is accommodated by slight recess along East Third Street façade as transitional element between existing Goodman Building and new addition; details of entry connector include entrance door delineated with cast masonry or limestone cladding different from remaining brick masonry façade as well as smaller double-hung windows at intermediate landings
  - d. cornice lines of new four-story addition approximate those of existing Goodman Building at entry-level storefront and upper roofline while support brackets of new addition are reduced in scale

- e. storefronts at side façade align with window bays above and trash bays include screened gate enclosures; **note:** reflective and/or tinted glass for storefronts, entrance doors and windows is inappropriate
- f. appropriate brick units for new addition are Alverton Type-1 and Alverton Type-2 (Pennsylvania molded series) manufactured by Watsonstown Brick Company; **note:** Type-2 is HCC's preferred brick unit due to more color variation that complements existing brick of Goodman Building

**Notes:** Envisioned exterior lighting fixtures as well as new signage necessitate subsequent HCC reviews.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

**New Business:**

Ms. Heller reminded HCC about upcoming training opportunity for members of Bethlehem's historic boards together with comparable 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. HCC members expressed general preference for sitting together in same space rather than individually logging into virtual meeting but location preference is elsewhere (not at City Hall) to avoid face mask requirement; Ms. Heller agreed to investigate potential locations.

Ms. Heller offered updates to 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 August 30, 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 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY: \_\_\_\_\_

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