
MINUTES

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: TONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: JEFFREY LONG

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER (BETHLEHEM PRESS)

VISITORS PRESENT: RICHARD MERCADO, RYAN PEKTOR, LOU PEKTOR, STACI SABETTI, MARYLOU SEIXAS, WILLIAM SEIXAS

MEETING DATE: MAY 20, 2019

The regular meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on May 20, 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 6:05 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

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

Property Owner: Greenway 1, Inc.

Owner's Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant: John Trapani

Applicant's Address: 306 South New Street, Suite 601, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a 6-story mixed use building located on the corner of South New Street and West Third Street. It has retail uses on the 1st floor, offices on the 2nd through 5th floors and a restaurant on the 6th floor. The exterior is metal siding, brick masonry and glass. There is a connecting bridge between the building and an adjacent parking deck. The building steps back at the corner and there is an angled entrance while the building above cantilevers over the corner entrance. The primary facades on both streets are clad in brick on the 2nd through 4th floors, while the other floor levels and the corner are clad in glass and metal panels. The 6th floor is set back approx. 7 feet on South New Street, approx. 12 feet on West Third Street and both originally had thin projecting roofs. The west façade is clad in dark brown masonry with blind window niches accented by cast masonry headers and sills to break up the otherwise blank façade. The building abuts two 3-story buildings along West Third Street with historical facades. Construction of this contemporary building was initiated in 2016. As a reminder, HCC is mandated with preserving structures dating from the designated era of the Historic Conservation District (ca. 1895 – 1950); thus, this building is not considered a contributing structure to the District.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to install signage per elevations and plans.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve

historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.

- **Historic Conservation Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'** -- Care should be taken in mounting signs to minimize damage to historic materials. This includes reusing hardware or brackets from previous signs. If reusing existing hardware or attachment locations is not an option, select mounting locations that can be easily patched if the sign is removed. This includes locating holes in mortar joints rather than directly into bricks or masonry, which will facilitate repair if the sign is removed or relocated in the future.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: per communication received from HCC Chair Philip Roeder on May 17, this item was removed from meeting agenda so no evaluation was completed.

Discussion: Mr. Roeder cited letter from Applicant's Landlord confirming lack of approval by Owner for current signage proposals; therefore, no HCC motion for approval was considered.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 306 Brodhead Avenue (Couchpota.doh!)

Property Owner: Angelina M, LLC

Owner's Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant: William and Marylou Seixas

Applicant's Address: 116 West Graham Place, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: 306 Brodhead Avenue is composed of two very similar adjoining structures. Both are three-story, three-bay, painted brick masonry structures with flat roofs; one has subsequently lost its neighbor and is now an end structure while the other is attached. Both are late Italianate in style and comprise the end portion of an entire block of structures along Brodhead Avenue completed between 1890 and 1900, each with business locations at the entry level and residential units in the upper two levels. Many of these structures were designed by famed Bethlehem architect A.W. Leh; however, the architect of these specific buildings cannot be confirmed without further investigation. Original entry-level storefronts of both structures have been manipulated over time and now include recessed entrances and large storefront windows with painted aluminum frames flanked on either side by brick piers. Both storefronts share a simplified cornice over the entry level while the sign band is defined by a common window sill detail at the second level; however, the sill is not continuous due to differing window placements at each structure. Each upper floor facing Brodhead has three pairs of double-hung windows. Brick pilasters along the end facades of each structure delineate the upper-level facades and lead to an upper brick corbeled cornice. Exterior facades of both structures have been painted, with the entry level storefront and upper parapet in medium beige color while upper floor levels are painted yellow in color.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to remove old signage and replace the signage with new logo, paint lower portion of building, add awnings and exterior light fixtures.

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) 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 Commission 'Guidelines for Signage'** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Submitted COA Application indicates intent to remove existing internally-illuminated box sign at front façade and replace with new signage of company logo. Removal of illuminated box signs is encouraged and appropriate within Historic Conservation District; Applicant should also remove additional box sign around corner along West Third Street façade. Proposed replacement signage is company logo "Couchpota.doh!" composed of individual, stylized, serif, shadow-box lettering and individual bulbs with exposed filaments within each letter; second letter "O" is internally illuminated and in shape of potato in medium brown color. Provided hand drawing implies signage is not centered vertically within sign band above storefront but rather organized along window sills at second floor levels. Sign installation along upper-level window sill is inappropriate because lettering would interrupt lower sash of 2nd floor residential units; illustration also fails to consider sill heights of both structures are not contiguous. Applicant is encouraged to install new signage within existing sign band rather than interrupting window sills above. It should also be noted that HCC typically does not approve internally-illuminated signage so discussion about stylized letter "O" as potato detail is warranted. Guidelines for Signage do not mention shadow-box letters but rather define signage as letters and graphics installed on backer board with off-set pin stripe detail around sign perimeter; however, HCC recently approved few examples of similar shadow-box lettering signage so discussion is warranted. Attached hand drawing also includes word "kitchen" in stylized lower-case letters positioned below main signage and installed justified right; illustration implies this lettering is black in color but no details are provided. COA Application references "light masonry around area for signage" and continues with statement about "added soft orange glow in background of letters" but provides no further details about illumination techniques. Application also lacks scale drawing with dimensions of proposed signage in comparison with existing façade so discussion is warranted about these issues before appropriateness of signage proposal can be determined.

Application references intent to "paint yellow metal trim to satin black". HCC is not commissioned to review paint color proposals; however, changing current neon yellow window frame color to more traditional metal trim color is welcomed and encouraged. Application notes intent to "paint door entrance trim to match window trim"; seems to imply door frames will be painted satin black, which is appropriate. Application also notes intent to "paint front lower portion of building (storefront area) to light stone white". Bright white is not appropriate within HCD so Applicant should consider ivory or warm white for façade color. Application does not indicate where new paint color scheme will terminate (ex.: at bottom or top of lower cornice, within sign board, to underside of window sills at upper level, around corner along West Third Street, etc.) so discussion of this issue is warranted. HCC cautions against dramatic differences in color schemes between street level, upper floor levels and upper parapet.

Application also notes intent to install exterior lighting and awnings at both storefront windows. Exterior-mount gooseneck lighting fixtures as well as awnings at entry level storefronts are appropriate within HCD; however, no dimensions of proposed items are provided and no product information with proposed sizes, materials, colors, bulb types, graphics on awning flaps, etc. are included with Application so discussion is warranted before appropriateness of proposed lighting fixtures and awnings can be determined.

Finally, Application does not indicate secondary signage for such items as hours of operation, company website, telephone number, etc. typically installed on inside glass surface of entrance door; Applicant is encouraged to return to HCC at future date to review such items, if applicable.

Discussion: William and Marylou Seixas represented proposal to remove old signage and replace with new logo, paint lower portion of building, add awnings and exterior light fixtures.

Applicant described business model (current owners of food truck specializing in Ecuadorian cuisine, live in immediate neighborhood of project location, desire stability of dine-in facility as

expansion of food truck business) and presented supplemental information to COA Application: two additional sheets with signage details and paint swatches. Applicant continued by clarifying proposed signage is not shadow box lettering but rather reverse-lit channel letters pin-mounted to existing sign band. Applicant confirmed desire to remove existing box signs on both façades but new signage proposal would only be installed at front (east) façade. Applicant described on-going discussions with building owner about possibilities for façade treatments of side (north) façade, including billboard or mural with storefront and awning to mimic front façade details. Mr. Roeder noted Applicant must return to HCC when relevant proposals are further developed.

Mr. Roeder continued by inquiring about Applicant's proposal to paint exterior façade. Applicant responded to confirm proposed exterior painting in ivory color includes front façade, extending from sidewalk level up to ribbon course just below windows at second floor level; lower cornice molding (at bottom of sign band), ribbon courses (at top of sign band) along with storefront metal trim will be painted in matte black color.

Mr. Roeder requested clarification about proposed awnings. Applicant provided no awning fabric samples but explained new awnings would be installed at both storefront window locations in black color. Ms. Starbuck added that awning fabric must be flame-retardant canvas (not acrylic fabric) in true black color and must be installed to avoid overlap with glass surface areas, as illustrated on COA Application. Mr. Evans continued that provided illustration indicates closed gable ends at each awning but HCC only approves open-end awnings.

Ms. Starbuck requested clarification about proposed signage lettering. Applicant confirmed signage proposal on original COA Application is incorrect and called attention to supplemental information indicating that signage is individual closed-aluminum letters pin-mounted to existing sign band with LED back lighting in amber color. Ms. Starbuck continued by inquiring about distance between proposed lettering and sign board; Applicant responded proposed letters are 3 inches deep and distance from back of letters to front of wall is 2 inches. Ms. Starbuck concluded by requesting size of signage be dictated by additional vertical space above and below largest initial letter "C"; Mr. Evans suggested minimum 2-inch spacing at initial letter "C" to top and bottom of sign band. Mr. Lader continued by suggesting logo lettering not be centered along entire sign band (across both structures) but rather centered above structure at right (to north) due to location of front door location of business. Applicant expressed concern that centering signage above only one storefront would give false impression that different businesses are located behind each storefront. Mr. Lader continued by suggesting additional lettering such as business hours, company website, telephone number, etc. could be integrated on front valence flap of awnings; Applicant expressed preference for information about select menu items for front valence flap and agreed to return to HCC when such issues are further developed.

Public Commentary: None

The Commission upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Ms. Starbuck adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented (with modifications) described as follows:

1. Proposal to remove old signage and replace with new logo, paint lower portion of building, add new awnings and exterior light fixtures was presented by William and Marylou Seixas.
2. Existing internally-illuminated box sign at east (front) façade will be removed and replaced with new signage of company logo. Existing box sign at north (side) façade facing West Third Street will also be removed but not replaced with new signage. Replacement signage includes:
 - a. company logo "Couchpota.doh!" composed of individual, stylized, serif lettering in reverse-lit channel letters; second letter "O" is internally illuminated and in shape of potato in medium brown color
 - b. logo also includes word "kitchen" in stylized lower-case letters positioned below main signage and installed justified right; lettering is black in color
 - c. overall logo to be centered horizontally within existing sign band above lower cornice; size of initial "C" in logo must allow minimum 2 inches above bottom of sign board and minimum 2 inches below top of sign board upon installation

- d. 3-inch deep channel letters will be pin-mounted into existing masonry wall of signboard, with 2-inch space between wall and letters; illumination of reverse-lit letters will be amber in color
3. Approved exterior paint scheme includes:
 - a. metal trim at existing storefront windows and recessed entrance doors to be "satin black"; provided color sample: Behr 'Broadway PPU18-20'
 - b. cornice molding below existing sign band and horizontal ribbon courses at window sills of second floor level to be "satin black"; provided color sample: Behr 'Broadway PPU18-20'
 - c. existing front building façade at entry level (including sign board) to be "light stone white"; provided color sample: Behr 'Delicate Lace PPU5-11'
4. Details of approved new awnings at both entry-level storefront windows at east (front) façade include:
 - a. Sunbrella (or comparable) fire-retardant canvas awnings in black color; color is solid with no applied designs or advertisements
 - b. new awnings must fit within existing storefront openings
 - c. front flap valances are max. 6 inches high; end gables are open with no awning fabric
5. Applicant agreed to return to HCC for subsequent reviews of such items as exterior lighting, secondary signage (hours of operation, company website, telephone number, etc.), additional for storefront windows and/or awnings, renovations to the north (side) façade, etc.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #3

Property Location: 310-322 East Third Street

Property Owner: Ashley Development Corporation

Owner's Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant: Michael Metzger, President, Alloy 5 Architecture

Applicant's Address: 530 West Broad Street, Bethlehem, PA 18018

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: The structure is a 3-story commercial building with an acrylic, hard-coat stucco finish in taupe color applied to all facades, with a flat roof and stylized upper cornices defining flat parapets. A recessed arched entrance and accompanying arch supported by corbeled brackets at the upper cornice delineate the central building section, which also has narrow arched windows. The entry level has a series of aluminum door and window storefronts serving as entrances to various commercial tenants. Windows at upper floor levels are also aluminum storefront type frames but with applied horizontal trim (as false meeting rails) to give the appearance of 1/1 double-hung windows. The center section and both end sections set back from East Third Street. Built in ca. 2005, the structure is a contemporary building and therefore non-contributing to the Historic Conservation District; however, it references late Victorian detailing found throughout South Bethlehem.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to replace windows in sleeping units to accommodate egress requirements.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 1.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- see Agenda Item #2
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: Submitted COA Application indicates intent to change out all windows (or portions of windows) to accommodate egress requirements due to change of use at second and third floor levels from Business (B) to

Residential (R-2). Existing window styles and configurations were reviewed during series of HCC meetings, resulting in Bethlehem City Council approval of Case #157 on Nov. 3, 2004. Accompanying resolution noted approval of "aluminum storefront type framed windows configured on ... second and third floors to look like 1/1 double-hung windows". Meeting notes mention Applicant's intent to return with window samples for HCC review; however, subsequent correspondence makes no mention of sample approval so manufacturer, color, model, style, etc. of installed windows could not be confirmed. Applicant recently re-appeared before HCC on Jan. 28, 2019, resulting in COA Case #681 summarized as follows:

All windows along north façade (East Third Street) and east façade (Polk Street) to be changed out; windows to be changed out on south (rear) and west (secondary side) façades dictated by sleeping units. Approved replacement windows include: Pella 450 Series aluminum-clad wood replacement windows configured as operable 1/1 double hung sash; custom Pella aluminum-clad wood casement windows with fixed half-round transoms with full clear glass for narrower windows at center building section. Applicant agreed to ensure color of replacement windows will match color of existing windows; proposed color: Pella Endura Exterior Color Collection "Brick Red". Applicant agreed to supply Historic Officer with sample of existing window and sample of proposed replacement window to confirm color match; if color sample proves unacceptable, replacement windows will receive factory-applied custom color to match existing finish. Applicant also agreed to re-paint entire façade if exterior stucco finish is damaged during replacement window installation to ensure consistent color. However, Applicant contacted Bethlehem City Clerk prior to subsequent City Council meeting to request removal of Case #681 from meeting agenda so current Application represents request to modify original resolution.

Current proposal responds to commentary during previous HCC meeting; however, clarification about certain issues is warranted before appropriateness of various replacement window types can be determined.

Referring to window types within Detail 1. Typical Signage Details (assume Typical Window Details are intended) at top right of Drawing Sheet A6.00, Applicant should clarify what is meant by "Existing Storefront Frame to Remain" ... specifically concerning manner for inserting replacement windows within existing frames. Overall window dimensions are provided; however, no specific dimensions of existing frames, new (replacement) window frames and operable window sash are indicated so ratio of glass to overall frame might be quite different from depictions. Applicant should also discuss approach for dealing with color discrepancies of existing storefront frames, which were fabricated by different window company almost 15 years ago, so inconsistencies in frame color are to be expected.

Concerning specific window types identified on Drawing Sheet A6.00:

Detail W1 correlates with windows at east and west end sections of front (north) façade as well as at side (east) façade on Drawing Sheet A2.00; however, detail implies windows are of equal width while elevation drawings depict central window in triple-window groupings are larger than those on either side so clarification is warranted. Detail W1 also depicts 2/2 double-hung windows with operable sash; however, elevation drawings imply one large window with applied stiles and rails and with top hinge location for awning-type window so additional clarification is warranted. Detail W1 does not include depiction of mullion on either side of central window in triple-window groupings so Applicant should also clarify intention for that detail.

Detail W2 correlates with all windows at rear (south) façade and at side (west) façade on Drawing Sheet A2.00. As previously noted, dimensions of existing frames, new (replacement) window frames and operable window sash are not provided so proportion of glass to overall frame might be quite different than depicted. Current configuration of lower sash with significantly less glass surface than upper sash is not appropriate within HCD.

Detail W3 correlates with windows on either side of central building segment at front (north) façade as well as at front bump-out of center section at both side (east and west) façades on Drawing Sheet A2.00. Detail is contradictory by implying 1/1 double-hung window with operable sash as well as with side hinge as single operable sash so clarification is warranted.

Detail W4 correlates with narrow windows in central building segment at front (north) facade on Drawing Sheet A2.00. Details imply top portions of narrow windows are segmental arches; however, observation of project site confirms existing windows have half-round arches so depiction and associated detail should be corrected. Application includes no notations about intended replacement window; however, detail drawing indicates side hinge as operable sash with non-functional (applied) meeting rail so clarification is warranted.

Applicant proposes Pella as desired replacement window fabricator. HCC has traditionally not approved Pella Replacement Windows within HCD due to large dimensions of Pella frame components so discussion is warranted; replacement window fabricators previously approved by HCC include Norwood, Marvin and Andersen.

Current Application makes no mention of potential need for façade repairs at window heads, sills and jambs resulting from change out of non-operating storefront windows to operating double-hung window sash. Similar to observation about window colors, existing stucco finish has faded and weathered over time so necessary repairs to match existing might necessitate re-painting portions of exterior façade. HCC discussion of this topic is also warranted.

Discussion: Richard Mercado and Lou Pektor represented proposal to replace windows in sleeping units to accommodate egress requirements due to change of use from business to residential at second and third floor levels. Applicant initiated discussion by submitting revised Drawing Sheet A6.00 that addresses certain concerns detailed in Historic Officer's evaluation. Applicant also justified request to remove HCC Case #681 from recent Bethlehem City Council meeting agenda due to need for addressing potential damage to existing EIFS if proposals were implemented so current COA Application represents request to modify original HCC resolution.

Applicant continued that current proposal retains existing storefront frames in window openings and inserts operable window sash within openings, with sizes of operable sash dictated by code requirements. Ms. Starbuck expressed concern that new approach will reduce overall glass surface area of affected windows. Mr. Roeder noted HCC has typically not approved Pella replacement windows within Historic Conservation District because of larger-scale frame and sash components in comparison to other fabricators; encouraged Applicant to investigate additional replacement window manufacturers (Marvin, Norwood, Andersen Thin-Line, etc.) which offer competitive pricing but more glass surface area than Pella. Mr. Lader stated Pella windows represent good-quality replacement windows; Mr. Roeder noted quality of Pella windows is not in question but bulk of window components of Pella windows is typically greater than windows of competitors. Applicant confirmed inquiries with various window manufacturers were conducted and noted existing storefront frames measure 2 inches wide, with inserted operable sash measuring additional 3 inches or 3 ¼ inches (at top, bottom and each side) depending upon new configurations. Applicant continued that window types W3 and W4 will have applied meeting rails to imitate double-hung sash configurations; Applicant also confirmed windows in triple-window groupings do not vary in size (as currently depicted) and are separated by painted decorative wood mullions that will remain. Applicant noted window type W4 will have all new frames to match existing half-round top sash detail (currently not depicted correctly).

Mr. Roeder inquired about intended technique for removing existing windows to avoid damage to EIFS façade system. Applicant responded that most window types will retain existing storefront frames so no damage to EIFS is anticipated; remaining window type W4 will require careful removal, with each replacement window custom fabricated to fit specific opening and with applied caulk joint to ensure tight fit and no resulting damage to existing EIFS system.

Mr. Lader requested clarification about functional component(s) of window type W2; Applicant confirmed window W2 involves creating new operable lower sash for existing full-size storefront, noting result will look like double-hung sash but will function as casement opening. Mr. Evans inquired about potential need for exterior-mounted fire escape(s) in tandem with functional window sash to satisfy emergency egress requirements. Mr. Roeder explained City of Bethlehem no longer allows exterior fire escapes on buildings as solution to emergency egress issues. Mr. Lough inquired about Applicant's approach to match color of new sash with existing, considering current approach involves retaining storefront frames for most windows now 15+ years old.

Applicant noted paint will be custom factory-applied finish to ensure color match with existing storefront frames. Mr. Loush continued by inquiring about lead time for Pella windows with custom color finish; Applicant responded current lead time for proposed windows with custom color finish is 6 to 8 weeks.

Public Commentary: None

The Commission upon motion by Ms. Starbuck and seconded by Mr. Cornish adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work as presented (with modifications) described as follows:

1. Proposal to replace windows in sleeping units to accommodate egress requirements due to change of use from business to residential at second and third floor levels was presented by Richard Mercado and Lou Pektor.
2. All windows at second and third floor levels are to be modified or changed out.
3. Window type W1 correlates with windows at east and west end sections of front (north) façade as well as at side (east) façade. Existing 2-inch storefront trim is to remain while new window inserts include additional 1-inch trim and 2-inch sash; existing wooden mullions in three-gang window configurations are to remain. Window inserts include fixed upper sash with operable lower sash (each with applied vertical stiles) resulting in impression of 2-over-2 single-hung sash; however, lower sash are top-hinged and operate as awning windows.
4. Window type W2 correlates with all windows at rear (south) façade and at side (west) façade. Existing 2-inch storefront trim is to remain while new window inserts include additional 1 ¼-inch trim and 2-inch sash in lower half of existing window. Window inserts include fixed upper sash with operable lower sash resulting in impression of 1-over-1 single-hung sash; however, lower sash are side-hinged and operate as casement windows.
5. Window type W3 correlates with windows on either side of central building segment at front (north) façade as well as at front bump-out of center section at both side (east and west) façades. Existing 2-inch storefront trim is to remain while new window inserts include additional 1-inch trim and 2-inch sash. Window inserts include one overall operable sash (with applied dividing rail) resulting in impression of 1-over-1 single-hung sash; however, single sash are side-hinged and operate as casement windows.
6. Window type W4 correlates with narrow windows in central building segment at front (north) façade. Existing 2-inch storefront trim is to remain while new window inserts include additional 1-inch trim and 2-inch sash. Window inserts include one overall operable sash (with applied dividing rail) resulting in impression of 1-over-1 single-hung sash; however, single sash are side-hinged and operate as casement windows. **note:** COA Application improperly depicts top portions of narrow windows as segmental arches; however, windows have half-round arches so detail will be revised to match existing during window fabrication.
7. Approved replacement window inserts are custom Pella aluminum-clad wood windows with clear glass. Replacement window inserts will receive factory-applied custom exterior color to match color of existing storefront trim.
8. Applicant agreed to re-paint affected portions of façade if EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System) is damaged during replacement window installation to ensure consistent color.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Old Business: None

General Business:

Mr. Cornish inquired about possible standard or guideline for acceptable number of signs allowed for businesses within Bethlehem. Mr. Roeder responded that he is not aware of defined limitations on numbers of signs allowed for Bethlehem businesses. Mr. Cornish expressed concern that Bethlehem businesses could theoretically have signage on all four façades, if

located within stand-alone (detached) structures. Mr. Roeder noted larger structures with multiple tenants are encouraged by City's Planning & Zoning Office to include free-standing directory located near main entrance that identifies names and locations of various businesses inside. Mr. Roeder continued that owners/landlords of larger structures should cooperate with signage or way-finding specialists to establish signage concepts for review by various city agencies as part of overall design process; Mr. Cornish expressed preference for common business directory for buildings with multiple tenants but noted this would not address circumstance of one or select few tenants requesting multiple signs at different locations on same structure. Ms. Starbuck noted current trends for several business signs at one location as well as multiple signs at various floor levels at taller structures is new to Historic Conservation District and suggested current signage guidelines should be amended to address; Mr. Roeder agreed to bring these concerns to attention of relevant parties within Planning & Zoning Office. Ms. Starbuck suggested City of Bethlehem could amend signage guidelines so larger buildings would have no visible exterior signage but rather directories with relevant information inside building lobbies.

Mr. Evans noted recent invitation extended via email by City Planning & Zoning Office to attend two days of sessions about Lehigh Valley historical and cultural assets facilitated by Northampton County. Mr. Evans continued by summarizing evening session about historical overlays and suggested such sessions might satisfy continuing education expectations by HCC members; however, most commission members reported email invitation had not been received.

Minutes from HCC meeting on April 15, 2019 were unanimously approved.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

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