



**Division of Development Administration and Review**  
 City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning  
 200 Ross Street, Third Floor  
 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of May 1, 2013  
 Beginning at 12:30 PM  
 200 Ross Street  
 First Floor Hearing Room  
 Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<b><i>Members</i></b>	<b><i>Staff</i></b>	<b><i>Others</i></b>	
Linda McClellan	Sarah Quinn	Jennifer McDowell	Anne Dunmire
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Chuck DiLoreto	Mark J. Sipos
John Jennings		Elise Keely	Jonathan Daniel
Ernie Hogan		Kathleen Echement	Susan Rauscher
		Carol Anthony	Rich Cummings
		Bill Bates	David Price
		Jonathan Kamin	Jonathon Terry
		John Rudiak	Nicholas Kefal
		Jonathan Glance	Russel Blach

***Old Business***—None.

***New Business***

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the April 2013 minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Jennings seconds; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Serrao vote in favor and Ms. McClellan abstains.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the April 2013 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Jennings seconds; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Serrao vote in favor and Ms. McClellan abstains.

**State Ethics Commission Forms:** Mr. Hogan notes that the Commission members need to fill out their State Ethics Commission forms. Mr. Jennings says that the forms were due today, May 1st; he filled his out already and says they need to go to the City Clerk. Ms. Quinn says that if they fill them out she will walk them over to the City County Building.

**Other:**

1. Ms. Quinn explains that today they have a preliminary determination for the Fairhaven Church nomination. She says that there are also dates scheduled for the Planning Commission, which are running concurrently with the HRC hearings in order to have the nomination completed before the August recess. The Planning Commission dates are May 14 and June 11. The HRC final recommendation will be made at the June meeting.
2. Ms. Quinn states that she and Noor Ismail visited Construction Junction recently to partner with them for salvage, not so much for city owned demolitions but for privately owned properties undergoing partial or full demo. If an applicant wants to call CJ, she has their business cards to hand out, and the applicant could potentially get a tax break because CJ is a 501c3. She is also planning on getting together with the executive director of CJ and Bill

Callahan from the State Historic Preservation Office to see if they can partner with anything on the state level.

3. Ms. Quinn states that Planning staff has another interview with a consultant for the economic study, so they will hopefully have someone before long. Development of contracts for the conservation overlay districts is in process as well.
4. Ms. Quinn mentions that City Council's public hearing on the Mexican War Streets District Expansion will be at the end of May.
5. Ms. Quinn says that at the end of the agenda today there will be a chance to hear public comment for the Allegheny Commons National Register nomination, but no action will be required of the Commission.
6. Ms. Quinn mentions that the applicants for 1922 E. Carson Street had requested their documents be reviewed by the Commission.
7. Mr. Hogan states for the record that 1922 E. Carson Street is being discussed. A decision was rendered by the Commission on September 5, 2012 regarding the renovation of the façade and side elevation. According to his notes there was discussion around the façade continuation, installation of a retractable front, and the introduction of wood panels in keeping with the company's brand.
8. Ms. Quinn states that there was one set of documents submitted with the original application, and additional documents were provided in the hearing.
9. Mr. Serrao states that the case is pretty open-and-shut in that they need to stick with what was approved.
10. Ms. Dunmire states that they had brought samples of the siding materials they intended to use as well as photographs, and the minutes say that all of that was approved as submitted.
11. Mr. Hogan states that this is not the case; what was approved was the rendering that was provided to the Commission. He states that they would not have approved the siding for the front façade, but according to his notes they approved the color and also the use of the wood band.
12. Ms. Dunmire asks if the materials were then approved after the samples were provided.
13. Mr. Serrao says it was a general statement that the materials were approved; it did not specify which materials.
14. Ms. Dunmire references the minutes, in which she was asked what the bottom material would be, and she answered that it would be metal similar to what was used at the other location. She provided samples and reviewed pictures.
15. Mr. Serrao states that the pictures are referential.
16. Ms. Quinn states that there is also a question about the awnings. The sign contractor came in with drawings that were different than the original drawings provided—the awning was more prominent and the sign was smaller. In email correspondence the applicants seemed to be saying that they were going by the original drawings. She also met with the applicants to try and clarify things.
17. Ms. Dunmire says the difference in the level of detail between the sketch and the construction drawings may be a factor.
18. Mr. Hogan states that the sketch is still what was approved.
19. Ms. Dunmire says that they didn't know they would have to come back unless something significantly changed. She states again that she thought the materials were approved.
20. Mr. Serrao states again that approval was all based on the drawings, which represent a more historic treatment of the façade.

21. Ms. Quinn states that she didn't have problems with the signage itself but with the scale, which doesn't match the original drawings.
22. Mr. Hogan says another issue is that the siding they were proposing was for the side and not the front. He states emphatically that he would never approve that siding for the front façade of a building in a historic district.
23. Mr. Kamin asks if the expectation then is that the siding will be metal.
24. Mr. Serrao says yes, metal in a different profile like they had originally proposed.
25. Ms. Quinn states that with the signage, the diagonal canopy on the new drawings was never approved.
26. Mr. Hogan recalls from the original discussion that they preferred one drawing but would accept the other if necessary. He says he would be fine with the signage and canopy.
27. Mr. Serrao agrees.
28. Ms. Dunmire states then, if they go back to the profile in metal from their original drawings, that will be acceptable.
29. The Commission says yes. It is determined that no motion is needed as this is a clarification.
30. Ms. Quinn states that she will do a new Certificate of Appropriateness to reflect everything approved and one for the signage.
31. Mr. Hogan states for the record that there was a review of what the original intent of the Commission was, and the intent was restated and clarified for the applicants. Staff will issue a Certificate of Appropriateness reflecting the discussion.
32. Ms. McClellan asks if Staff has the ability per the ordinance to revise and restate a motion for an applicant after the HRC has voted.
33. Ms. Quinn states she would not do that.
34. Ms. McClellan then asks if today the Commission has made some kind of an administrative decision.
35. Mr. Hogan says that they were clearing a fact.
36. Ms. McClellan asks if they can clear a fact without making a vote. She is concerned about the precedent, and about the authority of Staff in administrative decisions.
37. Mr. Jennings asks if the HRC's decision was changed.
38. Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, and Ms. Quinn say it was not.
39. Ms. McClellan states for the record an objection to the way this issue was brought back before Commission, even if it was just as a clarification. She says it should have gone through the normal procedure.

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn.

Mr. Jennings seconds.

Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and meeting is adjourned.

**The discussion of the agenda items follows.**

**2017 E. Carson Street**    *East Carson Street Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**

Nicholas Kefal  
112 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-F-141

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**

Nicholas Kefal  
112 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 3/21/13

---

---

**National Register Status:**    **Listed:**                      **Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Window replacement.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Nicholas Kefal steps to the podium; he is the owner of the building. He states that in the 80's there was remodeling done on the upper two floors, turning them into apartments. They are in the process of renovating those apartments again, which will include replacing the windows. They have already replaced windows on the side and rear of the building. He states that he had the windows evaluated and was told they were not installed correctly and have very poor insulation, and are in bad condition. He had initially thought they were vinyl but found out they are aluminum, and he is seeking approval to improve the windows by replacing them with vinyl double-hung windows.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be restoring the windows to their full openings.
  3. Mr. Kefal says no, because the apartments have drop ceilings.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks if they will be replacing the windows in-kind within the existing openings.
  5. Mr. Kefal says yes, as well as painting the trim to blend in and look better with the building.
  6. Mr. Serrao asks if they had planned to replace the windows with aluminum.
  7. Mr. Kefal's son states that the existing windows are aluminum and they are looking to upgrade them to vinyl. He says that what is there now is basically a set of storm windows. He also says that at this point they need to keep the windows the same size because there are make up air vents above them.
  8. Mr. Hogan states that the guidelines are pretty clear that vinyl is not an acceptable replacement material, but they would be able to replace the windows with better aluminum ones. He says the preference would be for the windows to be restored to their full size, but he understands that might not be possible at this point.
  9. Mr. Kefal states that they have looked at the options and aluminum clad wood windows are definitely out of their price range. He states that to be held to a
- 
-

---

---

standard that didn't exist when the previous renovations were done would create an onerous burden. He is open to the Commission's suggestions about what he can do.

10. Mr. Hogan mentions the URA's Street Face program as an option, which the upper windows would be eligible for, that would consist of a five year forgivable loan.
11. Mr. Kefal says he has to think about the tenants in the apartments.
12. Mr. Hogan says he understands the dilemma, but will not vote for vinyl windows.
13. Mr. Kefal's son asks if it is just a question of materials and if aluminum windows would be allowable.
14. Ms. Quinn says that would be an over-the-counter application that she could approve.
15. Mr. Hogan says that may be the easiest way to go, although again the preference of the Commission would be to work with them to get to a restoration.

---

---

**Motion:**

16. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application for vinyl window replacement.
  17. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  18. Mr. Hogan asks the applicant if they would rather continue the hearing, to preserve their right to come back in case they want to pursue a bigger project.
  19. The applicants state they would rather have it tabled.
  20. Mr. Serrao rescinds his previous motion and motions to table the application.
  21. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  22. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**Fairhaven Church**

**Individual Landmark Nomination**

---

---

**Owner:**

Fairhaven United Methodist Church  
2415 Saw Mill Run Boulevard  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15234

Ward: 32nd

Lot and Block: 138-B-291

Inspector: Jack McGoogan

**Nominator:**

Board of Trustees  
Fairhaven United Methodist Church  
2415 Saw Mill Run Boulevard  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15234

Council District: 4th

Application Received: 4/15/13

---

---

**National Register Status:**    **Listed:**                    **Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Nomination of individual landmark.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Quinn briefs the Commission, stating that Staff received a nomination for Fairhaven United Methodist Church. She shows historic and current pictures of the church, noting some differences including the fenestration, but showing that the church it has retained its original form overall. She gives some background on the history of the church, stating that the congregation was formed in 1881 and the building was built in 1907. The church does meet several of the criteria for nomination. The first criterion is its identification with a historic person or persons; she talks about some of the important people associated with the church and the neighborhood, many of whom were also associated with manufacturing, iron work, and civic duties. The second criterion is an association with a significant engineer, designer, or builder, and the church meets that through its stained glass windows; it is believed that they were manufactured locally. The criterion that Ms. Quinn believes most strongly applies is number eight, which is the exemplification of a significant pattern in neighborhood development. She explains that many of the early settlers of the area were Methodists, and as part of the church they focused on community development and missionary work. Some early settlers became wealthy over time, and at the same time more people kept coming from Europe to work in industry, many of whom also happened to be Methodists. The result was that the leaders of industry and the wealthy of the community were of the same faith as the people that worked for them, which created a different dynamic than what was normally seen at this time, especially during labor unrests. The church represents that unique dynamic. What Ms. Quinn suspects is that the working class would have attended the church, while the wealthy founded a meeting camp outside of town. She states that this is also why the church retains integrity—its original materials would have been donated, simple, and inexpensive, and even though the materials have changed from wooden clapboard to siding, etc., they are still simple and donated and keep with the spirit of the church. For all these reasons, Ms. Quinn feels that the church meets the criteria for integrity and historical significance, and she recommends that it be considered
- 
-

---

---

eligible for historic status.

2. Mr. Rich Cummings steps to the podium; he is a historian for the church and a member, and is also the nominator of the property. He states that the South Hills were organized by coal mining villages, of which Fairhaven, now Overbrook, was a central one. The church is the only surviving non-residential building from the original community. It is an important structure not only because of its age, but because it is significant in the history of coal mining in Pittsburgh.
  3. Ms. Quinn mentions that the nomination form includes a letter of support from the Methodist church for the nomination, as required by the ordinance.
  4. Mr. Hogan notes this for the record.
  5. Mr. Cummings notes that changes to the church have been made in an economical way for the past 105 years, but the church is starting a fundraising campaign to properly restore the stained glass windows to their original state.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks if the church was a significant structure to the community that Ms. Quinn spoke about.
  7. Mr. Cummings says that the church was the central structure of the community. The community, most of which did not have electricity, would rely on the church bell to know what time of day it was. Meetings were frequently held there, possibly including labor meetings and strike organizing among the coal workers.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any other significant persons in the history of the church that he would like to call attention to.
  9. Mr. Cummings mentions a few people and families, including the Horning family that owned the land and donated the windows for the church, and Reverend McConnell who founded an organization for the improvement of the poor.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks if he would consider the Horning family significant in the Industrial Age in Pittsburgh.
  11. Mr. Cummings says yes, they owned several coal mines among other things.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment.
  13. Ms. Carol Anthony steps to the podium; she is the president of Overbrook Community Council. She is voicing the support of the community for the historic designation. She has done research as part of the local historic society and states that the church has always had an important place in the community.
  14. Mr. John Rudiak steps to the podium; he is one of the founding members of the Carrick-Overbrook Historical Society and is also the president of the Carrick Community Council and participates in the Overbrook Community Council. He talks about how important and central the church still is to the community. He says it is one of the first places that meetings were held to form Overbrook Borough, and still today they are open for any event the community organizations need to have as well as having free concerts for the community. He mentions the need to formally protect the church from any future road construction.
  15. Mr. Hogan enters the various letters of community support into the record.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

16. Mr. Serrao motions to accept the nomination of the church for historic designation.
  17. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. He states that the Commission will continue to review the nomination and will take a final vote in June.
- 
-

**1226 Buena Vista Street**      *Mexican War Streets Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**

Jonathon Terry  
1226 Buena Vista Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-308

Inspector: Jim Seskey

**Applicant:**

Jonathon Terry  
1226 Buena Vista Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/20/13

---

---

**National Register Status:**      **Listed:**      **Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Fencing.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jonathon Terry steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he is looking to install a wooden fence at the rear of the property, to match the fence of the neighboring property. He states that it will not extend out as far out as the neighbor's fence, and will have a gate at the rear.
  2. Mr. Jennings asks if the gate will be for a vehicle.
  3. Mr. Terry says yes.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of the fence to be similar to the one on the adjacent property.
  6. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**821 Liberty Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Catholic Charities  
212 Ninth Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-65

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

PWC Property Solutions, LLC  
3 Parkway Center, Suite 102  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/5/13

---

---

**National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** HVAC generator and venting.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Susan Rausch steps to the podium; she is the executive director of Catholic Charities. She explains that they have been working on a establishing a standpipe to make the building completely safe, and she has with her the specialists they hired to guide them through the process.
  2. Mr. Chuck DiLoreto steps to the podium; he is representing PWC Property Solutions, the owners of the property. He introduces Jonathan Glance, the leader on the project, and explains that he will demonstrate that they have exhausted all options in trying to come up with a solution.
  3. Mr. Serrao asks if this is for an emergency generator or a fire pump.
  4. Mr. DiLoreto says it is for an emergency generator.
  5. Mr. Glance steps to the podium; he is with Glance and Associates Architects and is the Chair of the Building Committee for Catholic Charities. He explains that they were told there were three potential options for the location of the emergency generator, and they have exhausted two of the three—the roof and the basement. The location that they are proposing, the front of the building, is the least desirable of the three from an aesthetic perspective. The challenge with the roof is that a structural engineer analyzed it and said that it would not be able to support a generator. They did run into problems with the basement as well, and even if they were able to put it there, they would still need louvers on the front of the building. What they are proposing is to minimize the aesthetic impact of what they are doing as much as possible, and also to make everything fully reversible. He shows pictures of the windows on the front of the building; they are proposing to leave the mullion pattern intact and to insert the louvers into those mullions. The historic glass will be retained and maintained on site, and the generator would be installed in the room beyond the windows.
  6. Mr. Serrao asks what is above the entry door behind the screening.
- 
-

- 
- 
7. Mr. Glance says that there is a mezzanine and a stairwell.
  8. Ms. Serrao says that they are trying to look for another option, to possibly put the louvers behind the existing grill work.
  9. Mr. Glance says they explored that option and could not do anything with it because there is a stair, which may be a fire stair but is a necessary means of egress.
  10. Mr. Jennings says he is not opposed so much to the louvers as to the vents and exhaust. He also likes that it is fully reversible.
  11. Mr. Hogan states that it is a huge portion of glazing that would be going away, and it will probably never be reversed.
  12. Mr. Serrao notes for the record that they need separation between intake and exhaust vents.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks about the alley.
  14. Mr. Glance references the site plan, showing that there is a stair there that functions as a means of egress.
  15. The Commission discusses the sidewalk and the restrictions on having exhaust come out across the sidewalk.
  16. Mr. Hogan mentions that it is a very narrow building and that they have all the circulation on the back of the building. He asks if there are any cubbies that can be punched out for this.
  17. Mr. Glance says no, not that he was able to determine.
  18. Mr. David Price steps to the podium; he is with the engineering firm that was assisting in the project. He states that they are impeded from taking anything out of that side of the building.
  19. Mr. Serrao states that the upper louvers are more palatable and asks if they can move over the other louvers to that upper band.
  20. Mr. DiLoreto states that the first floor space is a spectacular first floor receiving area, and he is trying to mitigate the effects of this to the twelve foot area they are proposing.
  21. Mr. Hogan asks if they don't receive approval for this, with the building having functioned without a backup generator for so long, what would happen.
  22. Mr. DiLoreto says it is precedent setting. There is a new code requirement that they need to comply with for safety, and a lot of other historic buildings will also be subject to this.
  23. Mr. Jennings asks if they have gone to the Board of Appeals, and what their time limit is to get this done.
  24. Mr. DiLoreto says they already went through the Board of Appeals and were denied. He says they will face fines if they don't get this done as soon as possible. It is determined that the state is probably requiring this because of the health care center they have in the building.
  25. Mr. Hogan asks if they could use a grate in the sidewalk.
- 
-

- 
- 
26. Mr. Jennings says an exhaust system that would be blowing heat and air up from the sidewalk is not permitted.
  27. Mr. Hogan asks if they can use any of the second floor windows for the venting.
  28. Mr. Price says the generator is not made for running duct work up so far, and the windows may not even be large enough.
  29. Mr. DiLoreto says this is a safety issue.
  30. Mr. Serrao says that the Commission is sympathetic, but it is not in their privy to be concerned with those issues.
  31. Mr. Hogan asks about the possibility of doing a radiator remote.
  32. Mr. Price says they would still need to project heat out of the room housing the generator.
  33. Ms. Quinn asks if there is any possibility to use several pieces of equipment to accomplish what they need to do. It is determined that this would not be a possibility.
  34. Mr. Price says the roof would be the ideal location, but it can't support the generator with everything else that is up there and such a small footprint.
  35. Mr. Hogan asks if they can even do this with some of the vents exhausting over the sidewalk.
  36. Mr. Jennings says they would have to be over ten feet, which these are not.
  37. Mr. Price says they are able to put something in front of the vents, such as a planter, to prevent anyone from standing there.
  38. Mr. Hogan asks if they could put the generator on the 11<sup>th</sup> floor.
  39. Mr. Price says getting the generator up there would be a challenge, and again the windows may not be large enough for the vents.
  40. Mr. Hogan says he would rather sacrifice more windows on the upper floors than the signature windows on the first floor.
  41. Mr. Price says they would also have to install a filling station.
  42. Mr. Hogan asks what is between the two elevators, and if they could open the back of the building to install this.
  43. Mr. Price says that would interfere with the elevator shafts, and they are right on the property line so it would be an encroachment.
  44. Ms. Quinn asks if they could use some type of decorative grate over the window to hide the louvers yet stay in harmony with the building.
  45. Mr. Glance asks if the grate would go over just the louvered area or the whole window.
  46. Mr. Hogan says he thinks the whole window would be best.
  47. Mr. Glance asks if they should do both front windows.
  48. Mr. Hogan says they should try to keep it all in one window and leave the other as is.
- 
-

---

---

49. Mr. Serrao says they can try to match a similar look to what is above the door.

50. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

51. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of the HVAC generator and venting with a screen over the window to be of a historic nature, with final approval by staff.

52. Mr. Jennings seconds, with the condition that all building codes must be met.

53. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

---

---

**4360 Centre Avenue**

**Schenley Farms Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Marion Lee Spangler  
4360 Centre Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-89

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

Jonathan Daniel  
4360 Centre Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/15/13

---

---

**National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** After the fact landscaping.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jonathan Daniel steps to the podium; he is a resident and is representing the owner of the property. He also has Elise Keely, the landscape architect, with him to help present the application. His first item is the after the fact garage door and chimney caps; he had thought they were approved under the original application but he wants to make sure they goes through approval. They had removed the garage door header and restored the opening to its full height as well as installed a new paneled door. They also painted the chimney caps black. His second item is replacement of the service door. Since they widened the driveway, the service door is more visible, so they replaced it with a two panel steel door to match the look of other doors in the house. They also have six other windows to replace in kind with double hung aluminum clad wood windows.
  2. Ms. Keely steps to the podium. She talks about the house number that she installed in the wall, stating that she didn't realize that she needed HRC approval and also that there is no standard on the street to guide her. She installed a limestone number to match the new limestone caps that they put on the wall. She shows examples of other numbers of varying styles on the street including one in limestone above the front door. She tried to keep the font in keeping with the period of the architecture. She also talks about the wall on the left hand side of the driveway. The background on it is that when they took down the existing wall they found out that the corner of the building was being supported by a flimsy wall. They had an engineer look at it, and rebuilt a wall that could support that corner. As the wall came across she dropped it down, because if she had kept the height all the way across it would have looked like a "flying wall", because it is farther away from the house now and also because it is without the fill that was against the old wall. She was unable to backfill the new wall because of two large trees. She says they can do plantings along the wall to soften it if needed.
  3. Mr. Hogan says some of the properties on the street even have missing walls at this point. He suggests that the wall could be stepped down from the pier, or they could
- 
-

---

---

get rid of the pier entirely.

4. Ms. Keely asks if they could make the pier two bricks high to frame it and keep the sight lines.
5. Mr. Jennings suggests that they keep it the same height as the other side, which looks to be one brick high, and then they can put the capstone on top.
6. Mr. Hogan states that they should try to minimize it and not call attention to it.
7. Mr. Daniel talks about the light that they want to put on the side of the house. They had a complaint about the sodium light they had placed there. They would like to use a halogen light there.
8. Mr. Hogan says the issue is that they introduced a new light fixture to the house.
9. Mr. Daniel says it is a security issue as there is an open lot next door. He was hoping to use a directional halogen light that wouldn't call attention to itself.
10. Mr. Serrao suggests that they use a directional spot light with a cut off to keep the light from coming out toward Centre.
11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the pre-installed garage door and chimney caps, service door replacement, six replacement windows, pre-installed house number plaque, new directional spot light, and removal of driveway pillar to height to match the existing first step.
  13. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1405 Buena Vista  
Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Geraldine Smith  
1405 Buena Vista Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 25th

Lot and Block: 23-J-140

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Bureau of Building Inspection  
200 Ross Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 10/18/12

---

---

**National Register Status:**    **Listed:**                      **Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Razing of structure to the ground.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Quinn says she received another call from the next door neighbor wondering when a decision would be reached on this as it has caused her problems. She says this was before the HRC in January and was tabled for six months to give the community group time to buy it.
  2. Mr. Blaich says Ed Jacobs from realty didn't want the City to take this on as the rear portion is collapsed, so they were going to take it to a Treasurer's sale. He states that there is no floor or roof and the collapsed portion is taking down some brick with it.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the demolition.
  2. Mr. Serrao seconds.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1440 Hamlin Street**

**Manchester Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Amelia Prazer  
1200 Webb Place  
E. Wenatchee, Wa 98802

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 7-B-394

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Bureau of Building Inspection  
200 Ross Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/12/13

---

---

**National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Razing of structure to the ground.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Blaich says the next door neighbor renovated his house and is not able to get insurance because of this structure.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks what is on the other side.
  3. Mr. Blaich says there is a vacant lot. He says there is a one-inch gap between this structure and the neighbor's house, but it is still considered a party wall.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the demolition.
  2. Mr. Serrao seconds.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report –May 2013**

<b>Staff Approval</b>	<b>C of A Number</b>	<b>Date Issued</b>	<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Historic District</b>	<b>Work Approved</b>
Y	13-044	1-May-13	814 Western Avenue	Allegheny West	Painting
N	13-045	2-May-13	1440 Hamlin Street	Manchester	Demolition to grade
N	13-046	2-May-13	1405 Buena Vista Street	Mexican War Streets	Demolition to grade
N	13-047	2-May-13	4360 Centre Avenue	Schenley Farms	After the fact landscaping, etc
N	13-048	2-May-13	1226 Buena Vista Street	Mexican War Streets	Fencing
N	13-048	2-May-13	1226 Buena Vista Street	Mexican War Streets	Fencing
Y	13-049	2-May-13	4360 Centre Avenue	Schenley Farms	Painting
Y	13-050	9-May-13	842 N. Lincoln Avenue	Allegheny West	Painting of trim
Y	13-051	9-May-13	1322 Arch Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind replacement of flower boxes

Y	13-052	13-May-13	1204 Resaca Place	Mexican War Streets	In-kind resurfacing and staining of deck
Y	13-053	13-May-13	1530 Buena Vista Street	Mexican War Streets	Painting of front façade brick and trim
N	13-054	14-May-13	1922 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Revised exterior plans
Y	13-055	15-May-13	26 Oakland Square	Oakland Square	Window replacement
Y	13-056	16-May-13	1011-1015 Bingham Street	East Carson Street	Repointing
N	13-060	23-May-13	1209-11 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Storefront alterations
Y	13-057	17-May-13	601-605 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	In-kind replacement of wooden windows
Y	13-058	22-May-13	1514 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind roof replacement
Y	13-059	22-May-13	1922 E. Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
Y	13-061	23-May-13	1707 E. Carson Street	East Carson Street	Door alteration
Y	13-062	30-May-13	1307 W. North Avenue	Manchester	Painting

Y	13-063	30-May-13	100 Lytton Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	Signage
Y	13-064	31-May-13	417 Lockhart Street	Deushtown	In-kind window frame and sill replacement
Y	13-065	31-May-13	734 N. Beatty Street	Alpha Terrace	In-kind repair of front concrete steps