
M I N U T E S

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS, ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER (VICE CHAIR), PHILIP ROEDER (CHAIR), BETH STARBUCK

MEMBERS ABSENT: KENNETH LOUSH, TONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS); CHARLES MALINCHAK (MORNING CALL)

VISITORS PRESENT: BRUCE CAMPBELL, MIKE DECROSTA, MISSY HARTNEY, LYNNE HOLDEN, CHARLES PATRICK, MOLLY PATRICK

MEETING DATE: JULY 15, 2019

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on July 15, 2019 at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA. HCC Chair Philip Roeder called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Locations: 8, 12 and 20 East Fourth Street (Molly's Irish Grille & Sports Bar)

Property Owner: WCR Rooney Limited Partnership

Owner's Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant: Community Action Development Corporation of Bethlehem

Applicant's Address: 409 East Fourth Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is part of a single-story brick "mini-mall" commercial building with a flat roof. Completed in late 1979 as part of an urban renewal project initiative, it shares architectural details similar to the detached but immediately adjacent Fred B. Rooney Building, including an exterior façade defined by large-format, medium brown brick units and street level storefronts with bronze metal frames. The building is Modern Commercial in style. As a reminder, HCC is mandated with preserving structures dating from the designated era of the Historic Conservation District (ca. 1895 – 1950); thus, this building is not considered a contributing structure to the District.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to upgrade the façade by installing new awnings.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.
- **Historic Conservation District 'Design Guidelines'**

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Submitted COA Application indicates intent to install new awning above passage opening along north façade at 8 East Fourth Street, to replace existing awning above passage opening along south façade at 8 East Fourth Street, to install new awning above openings between masonry piers along south façade at 12 and 20 East Fourth Street and to install seating enclosure at entry level along south façade at 12 and 20 East Fourth Street.

New and replacement awnings of Sunbrella acrylic fabric are to match existing awning style; however, no longer Kelly green but rather black in color. Application indicates awning was once installed along north façade (awning fasteners still evident) as well as intent to include business logo and random shamrocks on both awnings at 8 East Fourth Street. Awning at 12 and 20 East Fourth Street also proposed as black in color but Application does not include business logos or graphics. Graphic depictions of proposed awnings provide no mention of awning frame (material, size, means of mounting into existing masonry façade, etc.) and do not indicate front flap valence detail; supplemental materials offer no overall dimensions but indicate differing heights, widths and depths for each awning so clarification is warranted before appropriateness can be determined. It should be noted that Design Guidelines for projects within Historic Conservation District indicate awnings were historically installed within framed openings of storefront entrance doors and windows so current proposal to install awnings above framed openings onto building façade is unusual and should perhaps be considered as signage; however, structure is non-contributing so Design Guidelines could be interpreted as not applicable for current situation. Traditionally, HCC requires awnings to have front flap valences and open ends but current proposals imply awnings with closed ends and no front flaps.

Proposed seating enclosure to be fabricated from welded galvanized pipe frames, with 5-foot opening centered on entrance door at 20 East Fourth Street. Sunbrella acrylic fabric panels in black color to match proposed awnings to be secured by rope lashing at top and bottom rails. Application provides no details of proposed galvanized pipe, including pipe diameter, need for intermediate support posts, lengths and mounting heights of top and bottom rails, along with description of intended means to attach pipe frames to existing masonry walls and concrete sidewalks so clarification is warranted before appropriateness can be determined.

Discussion: Lynne Holden and Charles Patrick represented proposal to upgrade façade by installing new awnings and provided supplemental information in support of original COA Application. Proposed awning at north façade at 8 East Fourth Street to include new 1-inch galvanized pipe frame with dimensions, as provided: 328 inches long, 36 inches tall, 16 inches deep (at bottom) from masonry wall; Applicant confirmed existence of abandoned hangers from previous awning. Applicant continued that existing awning at south façade at 8 East Fourth Street to be replaced atop existing pipe frame with dimensions, as provided: 591 inches long, 36 inches tall, 16 inches deep (at bottom) from masonry wall. Applicant also noted proposal for new awning at south façade at 12 and 20 East Fourth Street to be installed on new 1-inch galvanized pipe frame with dimensions, as provided: 606 inches long, 36 inches tall, 16 inches deep (at bottom) from masonry wall. Applicant confirmed all new awnings would include 12-inch front flap. Mr. Roeder inquired about proposed advertising to be printed on awning. Applicant responded with desire to repeat existing logo "Molly's Irish Grille & Sports Bar" (currently on signage near corner at north and south façades) rather than random shamrocks, as described in original COA Application; logo to repeat three times on each awning. Ms. Starbuck expressed concern about total number of logos, especially if existing signs immediately adjacent to new/replacement awnings are also to be retained; Mr. Roeder noted zoning regulations limit coverage by graphics to maximum 40% of overall surface area. Mr. Starbuck expressed concern that provided measurements seem incorrect ... especially inconsistent height and depth depictions on submitted sketches; Applicant acknowledged provided sketches are not to scale and agreed to re-confirm measurements of proposed awnings. Mr. Lader questioned need for two new awnings in addition to replacement awning; Applicant responded that existing awning is in need of replacement and hopes to combine effort with return of missing awning at north façade along with new awning at location of new outdoor seating. Mr. Roeder suggested to-scale drawings of each façade properly depicting three proposed awnings would prove useful for proper assessment

because provided photomontages do not accurately depict current proposal. Ms. Starbuck continued by inquiring about proposed material for new awnings. Applicant noted existing awning is coated canvas; proposed replacement awning is Sunbrella acrylic fabric rated for outdoor installation. Mr. Hudak inquired if new outdoor seating would benefit from proposed new awning. Applicant responded that outdoor seating is limited to existing recessed walkway and will not extend onto sidewalk; however, proposed awning will help identify location of new outdoor seating. Ms. Starbuck repeated commentary provided during initial assessment that appropriate awnings must have front flap valence (not currently depicted in provided photomontages) along with open ends (rather than closed ends of existing awning) and material must be fabric rather than coated canvas.

Applicant described proposed seating area enclosure: 1/2-inch diameter galvanized pipes at 36-inches high, installed between existing brick piers at 12 and 20 East Fourth Street; 5-foot segment would be left open and centered on entry door at 20 East Fourth Street. Mr. Roeder clarified that ends would actually terminate into existing brick walls. Applicant continued that openings between pipe frames would be covered with black acrylic fabric to match fabric of new awnings; rope lashing through eyelets in fabric material will secure fabric to frames, with color of rope yet to be determined. Mr. Evans inquired about potential logo(s) applied to fabric; Applicant confirmed desire to repeat same logo proposed for new awnings, with maximum logo coverage allowed by zoning regulations to ensure visibility due to existing trees along public right-of-way. Ms. Starbuck noted on-street parking would obstruct proposed logos more than existing trees and questioned need for any logos at seating panels. Ms. Starbuck continued by inquiring if defined seating area would be seasonal or permanently installed; Applicant responded that outdoor seating would be seasonal but enclosure would remain year-round. Mr. Cornish questioned 36-inch installation height as well as 1/2-inch pipe diameter and inquired with Mr. Roeder about ADA compliance requirements; Mr. Roeder confirmed handrail height should be minimum 34 inches and maximum 38 inches above walking surface but rail diameter should increase to 1 1/4 inches. Mr. Lader inquired if Applicant already commissioned fabricator and installer for proposed handrail, noting lack of provided installation details and suggested sleeves at mounting locations to limit damage to affected surfaces rather than permanent installation. Applicant responded that installer has not been finalized but expressed preference for permanent installation of seating enclosure. Mr. Lader continued that resulting COA should include commentary about fasteners installed at existing mortar joints to avoid damage to brick masonry so minor adjustments to proposed installation locations might result.

Mr. Roeder summarized HCC desire for to-scale drawings of various proposals but encouraged Applicant to finalize issue of surface area logo coverage with Zoning Officer before submitting subsequent COA Application.

Public Commentary: None

Upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Ms. Starbuck, HCC unanimously decided to table decision to approve proposal to upgrade façade by installing new awnings until Applicant submits more comprehensive COA Application with to-scale drawings and approval already secured from Bethlehem's Zoning Officer for logo coverage at various locations.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 601 East Fourth Street (previously Happy Tap)

Property Owner: 601 East Fourth Street, LLC

Owner's Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant: Bruce Campbell

Applicant's Address: 601 East Fourth Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: The free-standing brick structure is a 4-bay, 2 1/2-story commercial building with a simple gable roof with asphalt shingles; painted aluminum siding was recently removed to reveal the original brick façade with wood trim along with early window and door placements. The front façade has a corner entrance and two

windows of different sizes at the street level. It has a cross gable rear addition with one roof dormer (currently missing window sash) along Pierce Street. Constructed ca. 1895, it replaced an earlier double building known as the Fourth Ward Hotel. It was later modified to create separate entrances to segregate hotel guests above from a wine and liquor retail business at the entry level. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the rear addition received a framed porch around 1940, which was subsequently enclosed to create yet another entrance. The same maps depict a large, detached, single-story, brick masonry garage constructed in the northwest corner of the rear yard about the same time as the back porch. A masonry wall connecting the main house with the detached garage was completed sometime after 1952. The garage with low-slung hip roof, corner entrance and random windows was later converted into an apartment. The original brick masonry façades of the garage and privacy wall were treated with a stucco veneer and given an etched pattern (often referred to as "Brickote") in imitation of stacked stone sometime during the mid-20th century. Over time, primary use of the main structure changed from hotel and liquor store to a tavern and was re-named Linden Tavern, then later known as Korner Bar. It received the name of Happy Tap Grill and Pub in 1992.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish the rear apartment, construct a new rear deck, replace windows, shutters and doors and make various exterior alterations as necessary.

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) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation District 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless proposed demolition involves a non-significant building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Submitted COA Application indicates intent to rehabilitate exterior façades of main structure following recent removal of aluminum siding, replace windows and doors, install new window shutters and demolish rear apartment to construct new patio/deck. COA Application is considered continuation of HCC discussion on June 17, 2019, which resulted in approval to remove aluminum siding, exposing and restoring brick and wood trim in-kind, with cleaning of revealed masonry using mild detergents (no harsh chemicals) and low-pressure wash. At that time, HCC agreed to consider proposal to demolish rear garage apartment, contingent upon Applicant's ability to provide to-scale drawings of design for new rear patio/deck as replacement for demolished structure.

Current COA Application includes photographs of main structure following removal of non-historic aluminum siding as well as detail images of corner entrance door, soffit at corner entrance and one window. Supplemental images include: entrance door with lower raised panels, large glass insert with half-round top; tall but narrow leaded glass sash with clear glass panels; Ultimate Insert Double-Hung replacement window information from Marvin windows, implying six-over-one

double-hung "frame-in-frame" design, with bronze clad exterior; two pages of wood trim moldings, with two profiles specifically indicated. Unfortunately, COA Application does not include clarifications about provided supplementals in connection with overall project proposal and no details about new window shutters were found.

Current COA Application also includes three computer-generated views of proposed rear patio/deck; however, to-scale drawings, as requested during previous HCC meeting (and as required on COA Application), are not provided so clarification is warranted before appropriateness of proposal to replace rear garage apartment with new patio/deck can be determined. As reminder, previous HCC discussion included such concerns as: overall height of proposed stucco retaining wall at rear of property due to differing floor levels of front main house and rear garage apartment; lack of reference to original garage structure in design, considering its ca. 1940 construction was during designated era of Historic Conservation District (ca. 1895 - 1950); as alternative to stone veneer, Applicant was requested to consider brick piers to match material of main house; roof structure extending from rear of main structure out over portion of new patio/deck should include heavier framing members as part of design development. Clarifications are warranted before appropriateness of provided items can be determined.

Discussion: Bruce Campbell represented proposal to demolish rear apartment, construct new rear deck, replace windows, shutters and doors at existing main structure and make various exterior alterations. Mr. Roeder described recent inspection of project site following removal of aluminum siding from main structure; continued by stating assumption that existing soffit detail at corner entrance is not part of original structure but dates from later period ... similar in detail to property across East Fourth Street. Applicant recounted recent removal of non-historic aluminum siding revealed painted brick masonry façade (including painted mortar joints), with intent to repair as needed and ultimately paint entire exterior façade for uniform appearance; continued by describing desire to remove more contemporary covered stoop at corner entrance. Applicant also repeated previous desire to demolish rear apartment and connecting privacy wall, recalling prior HCC discussion about height of resulting foundation wall for proposed patio/deck in order to make ADA compliant by meeting finish floor of main structure rather than stepping down along Pierce Street. Applicant continued that current design proposal also includes new stair leading from patio/deck down to sidewalk along Pierce Street, with landscaping between new sidewalk and retaining wall. Mr. Evans noted current design for new stair and adjacent landing at side door fails to indicate needed handrails and requested such details be defined within future COA Application so HCC can consider appropriateness. Mr. Roeder recalled previous HCC concern about height of patio/deck structural wall at rear approaching 120 inches; however, current not-to-scale renderings imply wall is lower. Applicant confirmed height of resulting wall approximates 62 inches, not including decking. Mr. Roeder continued by inquiring about envisioned decking; Applicant responded desired decking would be true wood decking with wooden trim around perimeter of patio/deck so decking abuts inside edge of trim.

Applicant clarified HCC should ignore door proposal included with original COA Application and offered not-to-scale hand-sketch of covered stoop with fixed transom and solid wood door with diamond-shape glass lite in upper portion. Ms. Starbuck suggested appropriate replacement door should include approximately 50% glass in upper portion. As alternative to historic salvaged doors, Mr. Lader suggested new Caoba Doors (Philadelphia, PA) as useful source for custom, insulated replacement doors that can be properly fitted into openings to withstand robust use. Mr. Roeder inquired if all doors will be uniform in appearance. Applicant noted side door is service entrance and secondary door along front façade is emergency exit so clear glass at those locations is not desired; Ms. Starbuck offered opaque or translucent glass as viable alternative to clear glass. Applicant continued by noting salvaged leaded glass intended for installation in existing transom above large window at entry level; also envisions similar but new leaded glass details at main entrance door but noted potential need for installation of panic hardware. Upon inquiry by Ms. Starbuck, Mr. Long noted leaded glass doors are inappropriate for main structure. Ms. Starbuck agreed and inquired about architectural style of structure; Mr. Long noted previous renovations removed main architectural features, but structure was constructed ca. 1895, which is typically identified as late Victorian/Queen Anne style. Applicant continued that all windows

(except for large window at entry level and upper-level windows in both gables) are inappropriate replacements; COA Application identified Marvin replacement windows but Applicant provided new supplementals indicating Jeld-Wen as preferred option for new replacement windows. Mr. Roeder noted previous HCC approval of Jeld-Wen replacement windows at other project locations because of lean frames and large glass surface areas in comparison to other replacement window manufacturers. Ms. Starbuck inquired about appropriateness of proposed 6-over-1 double-hung windows; Mr. Long agreed 6-over-1 double-hung windows are inappropriate and suggested 1-over-1 windows or 2-over-2 windows as acceptable alternative, considering simplicity of overall structure. Applicant continued that proposed windows would be aluminum clad with bronze exterior finish; surrounding trim to be repaired in-kind and/or to match existing profile and painted in light contrasting color. Mr. Evans inquired about need for upper-level windows to serve as secondary means of egress; Mr. Roeder explained current proposal does not include residential component (only commercial use) so egress windows are irrelevant.

Mr. Roeder requested Applicant to describe soffit detail at covered corner entrance following recent removal of aluminum siding; Applicant explained soffit details date from subsequent renovations and noted evidence of earlier but simpler covered entrance. Mr. Lader noted existing covered entrance might not be original but could still be considered historically significant in its own right, based upon Secretary of Interior's Standard #4 cited by Mr. Long during initial project assessment. Mr. Roeder cited similar detailing of covered corner entrance at nearby project site; Mr. Lader suggested decision to retain and repair existing covered corner entrance details or to recreate details from original construction period should be left to Applicant. Applicant continued by noting proposed molding profiles match existing building fabric; Mr. Roeder responded HCC approval of repairs/replacement in-kind is not required.

Mr. Evans turned to subject of rear patio/deck by inquiring why current application does not take advantage of previous HCC suggestion to integrate brick piers (to match brick of main structure) but rather than indicates piers clad with stone veneer. Applicant explained existing façade is patchwork of various masonry that are painted (including mortar joints) to give uniform appearance so piers at rear patio/deck relate to stone details of proposed outdoor bar rather than to brick façade that will (most likely) be re-painted. Applicant continued by calling attention to low pitch gable roof at covered rear bar area as revision to previous design, noting change was requested during recent discussions with Bethlehem's zoning officer. Applicant confirmed current proposal for covered roof over deck measures 34 feet wide x 16 feet deep. Mr. Roeder noted gable roof with higher pitch would conflict with existing windows at upper level and suggested HCC might consider flat roof (shed roof with slight pitch) as alternative; measured drawings depicting both scenarios would be useful for future HCC discussion. Mr. Evans noted such drawings should also indicate intended gutters and downspouts; Applicant expressed desire to use half-round gutters and round downspouts in dark brown color to imitate copper.

Applicant continued by describing proposed bar area at back of existing building, noting rear façade would be clad in wood siding; HCC members suggested paintable cement board siding as more robust alternative. Applicant continued by describing several options for privacy fence to adjacent neighbor and turned spindles for handrail assembly between piers; HCC members suggested 2x2 pickets as preference rather than spindles. Mr. Roeder continued that depicted handrail seems low, noting need for 42-inch mounting height of handrail due to commercial-use structure and height differential between deck and public right-of-way below. Mr. Evans encouraged Applicant to integrate handrail cap with pitch or profile (not flat) to discourage patrons from placing anything atop handrail. Ms. Starbuck inquired about intended location for refuse; Applicant admitted current design does not address issue of trashcans and Mr. Roeder suggested carving out niche under rear retaining wall as garbage nook, with fence/gate in front as screen. Applicant returned to issue of proposed piers at patio/deck, confirming dimensions of each proposed pier measures 18 inches x 18 inches, with stone veneer and bluestone caps; agreed to bring along product samples to subsequent HCC meeting for consideration. Though not currently depicted, Applicant also identified piers as ideal locations for exterior illumination. Mr. Evans suggested posts installed at piers for elevated lighting rather than fixtures installed at caps of piers; continued by recommending that impact-resistant fixtures should be utilized. Ms.

Starbuck suggested posts could also support series of string lights. Applicant continued that color of trim board around new deck/patio to match color of wood decking while stucco retaining wall below would receive finish in sand color; Ms. Starbuck suggested stucco finish should also extend to base of main structure for unified appearance. Mr. Evans reminded Applicant to return to HCC for future signage approvals; Mr. Long encouraged Applicant to cooperate with qualified sign maker and to reference Guidelines for Signage within Historic Conservation District while designing proposed signage.

Mr. Roeder summarized current HCC discussion to foster Applicant's progress: approval to demolish rear (former garage) apartment, with deck/patio replacement that includes stone piers, wood deck, simple trim detail and stucco foundation in sand color; however, HCC requests to-scale drawings of patio/deck, along with better understanding of proposal for privacy fence with adjacent neighbor. Drawings should also include handrails, gutters and downspouts, understanding of alcove below patio/deck for trash, along with details about replacement doors at main structure. Applicant continued that limited roof repairs are not indicated on COA Application but described intent to salvage existing slate from rear roof to repair front roof landscape, with rear roof to receive replacement slate roofing and need for replacement of missing snow guards. Applicant also confirmed attic windows (including dormer window currently missing from provided drawings) to be repaired in-kind and not replaced. Applicant inquired about suggestions for historically appropriate shutters; Mr. Long inquired if Applicant noticed evidence of shutter hardware during removal of aluminum siding (Applicant noted no such evidence found) and suggested main structure did not originally have shutters. Applicant expressed original impression that new shutters would offer opportunity for additional façade color but also respects historical configuration without shutters.

Public Commentary: None

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

1. Proposal to demolish rear apartment, construct new rear deck, replace windows, shutters and doors and make various exterior alterations as necessary was presented by Bruce Campbell.
2. Approved improvements include: Jeld-Wen replacement windows in 1-over-1 configuration (except for large-format window with fixed transom and upper windows in both gables) with aluminum exterior cladding in bronze color; exterior storm windows to include full screen detail, with meeting rails to match meeting rails of correlating windows; repair/replace in-kind existing window trim, painted in lighter contrasting color.
3. Based upon verbal approval to demolish rear apartment structure and masonry privacy wall, Applicant agreed to return to HCC with measured drawings along with specifics concerning dimensions, materials, colors, etc. of various design elements as part of subsequent COA Application.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Mural Installation Discussion

Property Locations: 13 West Third Street (Lehigh Pizza); 310 Taylor Street (Bonn Place Brewing); 8 East Fourth Street (Molly's Irish Grille & Pub)

Building Descriptions, Period, Style, and Defining Features:

- 13 West Third Street (Lehigh Pizza) -- This free-standing structure is a 2 ½ story, 3-bay masonry former residential, now commercial building with corbelled brick and ornate projecting cornice, Victorian multi-lite sash and altered storefront. The building dates from the late 19th century and is Late Victorian in style.
- 310 Taylor Street (Bonn Place Brewing) -- This free-standing structure is a small, 1-story, brick commercial building with low-sloping roof and simple brick cornice. The front façade

has four bays: the far left bay has an entry with aluminum-framed, full-lite door; the second bay from the left and the far right bay each have former window openings with segmental arched openings currently in-filled; the third bay from the left is the largest, with an overhead door installed and steel header. The entire building is painted in a tan color. It is considered Vernacular Industrial in style and dates from ca. 1920.

- 8 East Fourth Street (Molly's Irish Grille & Pub) -- This structure is part of a single-story brick "mini-mall" commercial building with a flat roof. Completed in late 1979, the exterior façade is defined by large-format, medium brown brick units and street level storefronts with bronze metal frames. The building is Modern Commercial in style.

Proposed Alterations: The Southside Arts District is working with several property owners and businesses to permanently install murals that were previously displayed on the Greenway. Each of the murals is 4 feet tall x 8 feet wide and is constructed of Parachute Cloth adhered to an Alumalite panel that will be installed into existing mortar joints of a brick wall. The properties are listed as follows:

- 13 West Third Street (Lehigh Pizza); proposed mural location: north façade of 4 East Fourth Street(?)
- 310 Taylor Street (Bonn Place Brewing); proposed mural location: north façade of 4 East Fourth Street(?)
- 4(?) East Fourth Street (Molly's Irish Grille & Sports Pub); proposed mural location: north façade

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

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Current review is considered continuation of HCC discussion on April 16, 2018. At that time, Stacie Brennan (Senior Director for Visual Arts, ArtsQuest) and Barbara Fraust (Public Art Committee Chair, Bethlehem Fine Arts Commission) presented information about Mural and Public Art Program as part of 2018 Southside Arts and Music Festival. In addition to HCC review/approval of painted mural on existing exterior façade of brick structure facing New Street at corner of East Third Street, Ms. Brennan explained six additional artists would cooperate with local non-profit agencies to display murals on painted canvases suspended on free-standing frames, to be temporarily exhibited along Greenway during festival weekend ... with potential for future permanent locations. During that discussion, Mr. Traupman reminded Ms. Brennan that HCC approval must be secured if murals will have permanent exterior location(s) within Historic Conservation District; thus, clarification is warranted ... especially concerning proposed mural locations (**note:** applications indicate north façade of 4 East Fourth Street for all three proposals), actual means for attaching mural panels into existing mortar joints and anticipated lifespan of murals before appropriateness of proposed murals can be determined.

Discussion: Missy Hartney and Mike DeCrosta represented Southside Arts District proposal to cooperate with several property owners and businesses to permanently install murals previously displayed on Greenway. Each mural measures 48 inches tall x 96 inches wide and constructed of parachute cloth adhered to aluminate panel, to be installed into mortar joints of existing brick walls. Applicant noted recent receipt of capital improvement grant to install certain salvaged murals and clarified murals were adhered to aluminate panels approximately 1/2" thick and weather-proofed to last minimum 10 years ... with desire to increase number of mural panels in future years. Applicant requested clarification about preferred means to secure panels to existing walls; Mr. Roeder suggested Tapcon (or similar) masonry anchors, which are rust resistant, leave minimal damage upon removal (resulting hole is approximately 1/8 inch diameter) and anchor head can be painted to match mural. Ms. Starbuck stressed need to prepare mural panels in advance so existing mortar joints can be utilized rather than simply drilling holes and then

attempting to match joint patterns. Ms. Starbuck continued by recommending following adjustments to mural placements, as currently depicted: at Lehigh Pizza location, align top of mural panel with top of existing windows at left of proposed mural; at Molly's Irish Grille & Sports Bar, center placement between existing openings at left and right of proposed mural; at Bonn Place Brewing location, hang vertically (currently depicted as horizontal) and center placement between existing window at left of proposed mural and building corner at right of proposed mural.

Public Commentary: None

The Commission upon motion by Ms. Starbuck and seconded by Mr. Cornish approved proposed work as presented (with modifications) described as follows:

1. Proposal to cooperate with several property owners and businesses to permanently install murals previously displayed on Greenway was presented by Missy Hartney and Mike DeCrosta as representatives of Southside Arts District.
2. Each mural measures 48 inches x 96 inches and is constructed of parachute cloth adhered to aluminate panel, to be installed into mortar joints of existing brick walls using Tapcon (or similar) masonry anchors.
3. Approved mural placements are as follows:
 - a. 13 West Third Street (Lehigh Pizza), align top of mural panel with top of existing windows at left of mural
 - b. 8 East Fourth Street (Molly's Irish Grille & Sports Bar), center placement between existing openings at left and right of mural
 - c. 310 Taylor Street (Bonn Place Brewing), hang vertically and center placement between existing window at left of mural and building corner at right of mural

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Old Business: None

General Business: Minutes from HCC meeting on June 17, 2019 were unanimously approved.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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