



**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 2, 2012

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>
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	Ed Menzer
John Jennings	Isaiah Jones-Lane, Intern	Page Thomas
Arthur Sheffield		A. Denmersh
Joseph Serrao		Rick Avon
Ernie Hogan		Carol Kowall
		Carole Malakoff
		Robert Loos
		Robert Pendergast
		Evelyn Jones
		Keili Mistovic
		Nick Doichev
		Bill Petrucci
		Doug Sipp
		Canard Grigsby
		Jerry Morosco
		Anne Nelson
		Park Rankin

***Old Business*** – Finding of Fact Status- Certificate of Economic Hardship- Mr. Ernest Hogan leads with “I’d like to have a finding” and take action on either approval or denial of the owner’s economic hardship. Mr. Ernest Hogan ask for a motion to in fact deny the Certificate of Economic Hardship. Mr. John Jennings stated “I do concur with the chairman”, as he too had visited the location recently. He (Mr. Jennings) does not believe it to be an issue of economic hardship a, but much rather convenience.

***New Business***

**Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Ernest Hogan proceeds to ask for a motion to accept the approval from the April, 2012 meeting minutes. Mr. Joseph Serrao makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes from April 4, 2012 as submitted. The motion was seconded by John Jennings; all were in favor and the motion was carried.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the April 2012 Certificates of Appropriateness which was submitted on May 2<sup>nd</sup> 2012, Mr. Joseph Serrao moved to approve, Mr. John Jennings seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

**Other:** There was a certificate of occupancy issue for two projects (The diesel and the local) of the same owner and he has yet to finish the work on the first building (Local Building), but he continues to operate in that establishment. Furthermore, he has added a roof to the building, but

never finished the appropriate screening that was approved. Mr. Ernest Hogan is concerned about maybe a time frame in which this work needs to be completed.

Ms. Sarah Quinn replies by saying, she has spoken with the owner and it is apparently a material, where those materials which were approved do not exist, and there are now attempts to find a substitute for those materials.

Mr. Ernest Hogan replies by say “that’s incorrect the materials do exist”. However the material is very expensive locally and he is trying to import them from China.

Mr. John Jennings suggests another meeting with the owner to find out where he stands with the work.

**Motion:**

**Approval of April meeting minutes**

Mr. Joseph Serrao moves to approve

Mr. John Jennings second the motion

All members voted in favor

Motion carries

**Approval of April Certificate of Appropriateness Report**

Mr. Joseph Serrao motions to accept

Mr. John Jennings seconds the above motion

All members voted in favor

Motion carries

**Other:**

1. Mr. Ernest Hogan states that “there are no new Hardship applications pending”, In addition, he also say there are no upcoming demolitions.
2. Ms. Sarah Quinn replies by saying “I received no applications or anything”

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn

Mr. Jennings seconds

All members voted in favor.

Motion passes

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

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report – May 2012**

<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	12-043	1-May-12	1106 Sheffield Street	Manchester	In-kind roof replacement and soffit repair
N	12-044	3-May-12	1321 N Franklin Street	Manchester	Demolition
N	12-045	4-May-12	939 Western Avenue	Allegheny West	Installation of an ADA ramp
N	12-046	4-May-12	1605 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Installation of NANA wall and lighting
N	12-047	4-May-12	1501 Bedford Avenue	Individual	Alterations to accommodate a stairwell and new landscaping
N	12-048	4-May-12	25 Market Square	Market Square	Remodeling of façade
Y	12-049	7-May-12	3442 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	restore Front Porch and resolve drainage issues
N	12-051	8-May-12	4000 Fifth Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	Creation of a new entrance
Y	12-052	10-May-12	25 Market Square	Market Square	Signage - OTC review
Y	12-053	10-May-12	930 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage

Y	12-054	16-May-12	845 N Lincoln	Allegheny West	In-kind porch repair
Y	12-055	16-May-12	4360 Centre Avenue	Schenley Farms	Extensive renovations
Y	12-056	18-May-12	3426 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	In-kind replacement of windows, columns, and ballusters. Painting.
Y	12-057	21-May-12	1207-1209 W North Avenue	Manchester	In-kind replacement of windows and painting
N	12-058	23-May-12	8 Market Square	Market Square	Demo Only
Y	12-059	29-May-12	1437 Juniata Street	Manchester	In-kind roof replacement
N	12-060	31-May-12	614 Lockhart Street	Deuschtown	Demolition of a garage and new construction of a townhouse

**939 Western Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic  
District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Ed Menzer  
939 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-185

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

**Ed Menzer**  
**939 Western Avenue**  
**Pittsburgh, Pa 15233**

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/21/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Creation of ADA ramp

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Ed Menzer led by saying he has a ballroom in the back carriage house of his bed and breakfast, which is not handicap accessible from the outside. However, he did have a wheelchair ramp in the center of the building, but it restricted access into the courtyard area. Now he would prefer to move it out into the driveway. He proceeds to described the structure of the ramp it precise location on the property.
  2. Mr. Menzer supplied the commission board with a blueprint of the ramp and an additional picture showing an example of what another property has as a reference to what he intends to accomplish with his design.
  3. After reviewing all of what has been presented, Mr. Ernest Hogan opens an opportunity to Mr. Menzer to add any more presentation to what has already been supplied. Mr. Menzer says No, with a head nod.
  4. Mr. Ernest Hogan opens the floor for public comment.
  5. Ms. Carol Malakoff from Allegheny West approaches the podium for a public remark.
  6. Ms. Malakoff state that Ed had met with the LRC and presented his plan for the ADA ramp on his property. She add that they believe this handicap ramp will be minimally visible form the street, and that it's only 12 to 14 inches high.
  7. She mentioned, they (LRC) were in favor of his project.
  8. Ms. Malakoff closes by saying that earlier the commissioner (Ernest Hogan) had made a comment about the windows in Allegheny West had been changed. She anted to call attention to that and let the commissioners know they had never been changed,
- 
-

- 
- 
9. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any other public comment.
  10. Ms. Quinn has a comment, but she leads by saying it is not a public comment rather than ADA concern.
  11. Ms. Quinn mentions that she had turned the plans for the ADA ramp over to Mr. Richard Meritzer (ADA coordinator for the City of Pittsburgh). She asked him to review the plans.
  12. Mr. Meritzer along with one of his interns had reviewed the plan for the ADA ramp. There was a question asked about the slope of the ramp and a concern that it was too steep. The minimum scale is 12 inch for every 1 inch and the ramp does not quite reach that requirement.
  13. Mr. Jennings states that there are some stipulations that allow for the ramp to be a little steeper. He is not sure of the stipulations; however, he does know that they exist.
  14. Ms. Quinn stated that she just wanted to call attention to that, because she had talked with Mr. Meritzer about ADA requirements.
  15. Mr. Hogan closes the topic; by saying the only perspective the commission has is the outside appearance.
  16. Mr. Hogan closes out public comment section and moves towards the decision of the commission.
  17. After the motion carries Mr. Hogan advises Mr. Menzer to consult with the building inspector.
  18. Mr. Menzer replies by saying when can I pull a permit.
  19. Mr. Hogan responds saying Sarah (Ms. Quinn) will prepare the certificate of appropriateness and with that he can pull his permit.
  20. Mr. Menzer asked Ms. Quinn will she inform him when she has completed his certificate so that he can down and pick it up.
  21. Ms. Quinn informs him that she will make a note of it and will inform when it is finished.

---

---

**Motion:**

Mr. Serrao motions to approve the creation of an ADA ramp at 939 Western Avenue with the drawings submitted, with the understanding that there maybe a minor adjustment based on their comments.

Mr. Hogan clarifies that there is an open iron rail on the ADA ramp

22. Mr. Serrao ads to the motion that he will be using the open iron rail submitted in the drawing packet, and exposed concrete. Basically everything that is specified in the drawing.

23. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion

All members voted in favor.

24. Motions carries and he was wished luck with his new ramp.

---

---

**1010 Cedar Avenue**

**Deustchtown Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Brent Bissell  
531 Bingham Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-209

Inspector: Owen Finnegan

**Applicant:**

Brent Bissell  
531 Bingham Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/11/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes: Facade Renovations**

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Keili Mistovic approaches the podium and introduces herself as one of the feature owners of 1010 Cedar.
  2. Mr. Hogan asked if 1010 Cedar was her current address where her mail is going. Ms. Mistovic replied by saying, No, my address is 1506 Arch Street.
  3. Mr. Hogan asked her to begin with her project.
  4. Ms. Mistovic lead with saying she has many proposed changes and there is a provided list of the things and she will go through each as it appears. In addition, there is a detailed overview of the changes as well. There have also been photos provide for example and reference for what the perspective design will be like,.
  5. Ms. Mistovic starts with the photo of the existing porch and some old historical photos of the area. She mentions that she did her best to find some that includes the porch.
  6. Ms. Mistovic suggests taking the brick pillars that are currently on the porch, because they are not what are original to the house. She proposes to change them to wood and provides a photo example as to what she would prefer them to look like. The example photos are those of other houses in the neighborhood.
  7. Ms. Mistovic suggests change to the flimsy iron railing that is on the front porch, making wooden as well. This also was referenced with a photo example.
- 
-

- 
- 
8. Ms. Mistovic says that the roof of this house currently has asphalt shingles on it and she proposes to change those shingles with either tin, copper, or painted aluminum, something other than asphalt.
  9. Mr. Hogan clarifies by reiterating the idea that Ms, Mistovic plans to make this a metal roof.
  10. Ms. Mistovic plans to restore the wooden façade, because it is in pretty poor condition at the present state. In addition, they would like to restore the wooden trim around the rest of the exterior as well.
  11. Ms. Mistovic proposes to take the added brick on the porch out, because they're not original. She plans to make the windows go down to the floor as they once were. She also provided photo example as to what she plans to accomplish.
  12. Ms. Mistovic has stated that her contractor has actually created a replica of the windows that would have been there before, and are wood also.
  13. Ms. Mistovic provided a current picture of the steps that lead to the front door and stated that all of that needed to be redone as well. In addition, she would like to replace to railings that are on those steps to be similar to the wood which were proposed for the porch.
  14. Mr. Hogan mentions that originally this house would not have had wood coming down, but much rather the iron rails that are already present.
  15. Mr. Hogan suggests that Ms. Mistovic considers keeping the iron rails that are already there, and assures that it might be easier as well.
  16. Ms. Mistovic presents an example picture of what they would like the doors to look like, but currently there is no front door in place.
  17. Ms. Mistovic moves the attention to the cellar windows, which she would like to replace and put the iron grates back over the windows. However at this time the windows are boarded up.
  18. Ms. Mistovic would like to create some landscaping to the outside area of the house. In addition, there is a concrete section that she would like to take out and replace with brick.
  19. On the side of the house is another porch Ms .Mistovic would like to take down the pillars on that porch and extend the porch, because the pillars are non-original.
  20. Mr. Hogan ask if she would taking down the wall as well as the pillars to extend the porch.
  21. Ms. Mistovic says yes the half-wall holding the pillars will be coming down as well. Along the porch is cover with a roof that will be changed to match the rest of the roof.
  22. Ms. Mistovic plans to keep the cellar doors and just restore them to a better state.
- 
-

- 
- 
23. The windows in this house are old, so Ms. Mistovic plans to replace them with noise resistant windows, because the house is directly across from the hospital helicopter pad. They will be a double pan window
  24. Mr. Hogan opens up for any questions that Ms. Mistovic may have had on the project.
  25. Mr. Serrao tells Ms. Mistovic that they commission would like to see some further detail as far as materials, and a clearer scope of work.
  26. Mr. Hogan inquired as to whether or not Ms. Mistovic plans to do any masonry restoration or cleaning.
  27. Ms. Mistovic replied saying her contractor informed her that this had been done a few years prior to her purchasing this building.
  28. Ms. Quinn states that she did do some over the counter approving for this building as far as the materials go.
  29. Mr. Hogan opens for public comment
  30. Ms. Quinn says that she has spoken to a member of the community and he has given it “thumbs up”
  31. Mr. Hogan reiterates the concern of Mr. Serrao that Ms. Mistovic is headed in the right direction, however, they need a level of submittal for materials.

---

---

**Motion:**

Mr. Serrao makes a motion to table action for 1010 Cedar Avenue for the June HRC meeting.

32. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion

All members voted in favor.

---

---

**1605 East Carson Street**    *E. Carson Street Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**

16<sup>th</sup> & Carson Street Partners  
1511 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-292

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**

16<sup>th</sup> & Carson Street Partners  
1511 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/13/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Facade Renovations

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Adam leads familiarizing the commission with his previous approval for the roof deck and the façade over 1601 to 1603 building. However, they did not have the design finished for that building at the time.
  2. Mr. Adam states that he came back and made a submission to replace the storefront with a NANA wall. In addition, Mr. Adam states that he had visited the LRC and through some suggestion made by the LRC there have been some minor adjustments.
  3. Mr. Adam had planned to keep the door on the left side however; it was not equal distance with the transom that was installed on top.
  4. Mr. Adam had a drawing done that had shorter doors so that this would be more equal distance to the transom.
  5. Mr. Adam had as suggestion from Jerry (community member) that he make the doors 10' and then make the transom. This would make more of a reminiscent of the old store front.
  6. Mr. Adam believes that either way for them this would work, he stated it just comes down to whether or not they want to spend more money if the commission approves them to create the higher doors or the lower doors.
  7. Mr. Ernest Hogan asks a question of whether or not the transom was original to the existing building.
  8. Mr. Adam does inform him the transom window in not original the building, and the actual store front was redone in 1991.
  9. Mr., Hogan ask for clarification on which plan (higher or lower doors) would Mr.
- 
-

---

---

Adam like for the c omission to consider.

10. Mr. Adam replies by saying he like to have both considered.
  11. Mr. Hogan say “No, you have to pick one, what do you want to do”
  12. Ms, Quinn make a comment pointing out which design was submitted for review with the application prior to the commission meeting.
  13. Mr. Hogan seconds that and lets Mr. Adam know which drawing was submitted to the commission and ask if he wants to know if this is a recommendation to substitute it with the higher doors
  14. Mr. Adam clarifies saying “Yes”, and proceeds to talk about his next submission for style lighting on the signage. He proposes a halo backlit channel sign.
  15. Ms. Quinn make a statement “I don’t recall that being on the application”
  16. It was on the application, however it was over looked.
  17. Mr. Adam references his other property to the commission so that they have an idea what the signage will look like with some minor changes to materials used.
  18. The commission request of photo of the building prior to the current state. Mr., Adam does not have one.
  19. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any public comment on this project.
  20. Jerry Morosco rep for the local review committee stands to give public comment.
  21. Mr. Morosco leads with some history of the existing property; the building was destroyed in 1931 the trolley derailed crashed through that building and took out the next two buildings.
  22. Mr. Morosco informs the commission that the original building was a deco storefront, and the door was actually on the right side. The existing building is a design that Bob Pesalano did prior to the historic district, however, he did so following the street face guidelines. That is the reason for the signboard, transom, and the bulkhead.
  23. Jerry states that the only issue the local committee had was that the proportion with the transom and door. The suggestions of the higher door reflect more of the rhythm and pattern of what could have been a traditional store front. However, the smaller doors look like an entrance to a big box retailer.
  24. In conclusion, Jerry with the approval from Mr. Adam states that the local committee would like them to use the higher doors, because they are proportionally more correct.
  25. Mr. Adam stands to inform the commission that there is not service in the vestibule area.
  26. Mr. Hogan states that the door opens right into the business.
  27. Mr. Adam corrects him saying it does not that is the access to the roof. In addition, it acts as a lobby would.
  28. Mr. Hogan acknowledges the clarification and asked if there are any other public comments on this project.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

Mr. Hogan states he would entertain a motion to approval acknowledging the substitution of the storefront to full height doors (NANA wall system).

29. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the revised and new submission as submitted today with the tall full height doors for 1605 East Carson Street with final shop drawings and submittals to be submitted to staff and the sign and style of design to be approved by zoning.

30. Mr. Jennings seconds that motion

31. Mr. Hogan clarifies once more that all of what has been approved.

All members voted in favor.

---

---

**1737 East Carson Street**    *East Carson Street Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**  
William Petrucci  
1737 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th  
Lot and Block: 12-E-318-0001

**Applicant:**  
1737 Coffee, LLC  
1511 East Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Inspector: Pat Brown  
Council District: 3rd  
Application Received: 4/13/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of vertical folding doors (NANA wall)

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jerry Morosco of Morosco Architects introduces himself and he states that he is working with the tenant Adam D. on the this project.
  2. Mr. Morosco leads with a photo of an image of and some history of the original facade.
  3. As Mr. Morosco move forward he provides more images and history of the building, showing different designs along the way.
  4. In addition, to the history of the building Mr. Morosco point out different features of the building that are not original.
  5. Mr. Morosco mentions that Mr. Adam had come previously to the commission in August asking for an approval of the NANA wall and was denied. They were asking to have the ability to open up the storefront, because it is very narrow and very dark.
  6. Mr. Morosco stated that the tenant has a coffee business in there now and he his actually the 3<sup>rd</sup> in a succession of tenant of have failed with businesses in there.
  7. Mr. Morosco on behalf on the tenant is proposing to do an operable wall system.
  8. Mr. Morosco says that they have taken some time and sourced the manufacturer, what they are trying to achieve is...
  9. Mr. Morosco then goes on to say that “there are a number of people who make theses that are pure bi-fold that they hinge at the middle and that would be the place that you locate the transom bar, which proportionally did not work.
- 
-

- 
- 
10. Mr. Morosco then says “We found a manufacturer that can either do it as one solid panel or an offset bi-fold, which would allow for the transom bar to be move up to the historic location.
  11. Mr. Morosco proceeds with the construction of the panel system and the bulkhead.
  12. Mr. Morosco stated that this would represent an interesting evolution of a storefront of one of these buildings. The original was a wood storefront. I t subsequently had a PPG storefront. Then went through some less appropriate storefronts.
  13. Mr. Morosco on behalf of Mr. Adam is suggesting to come back in and give it another generation, but keeping the scale and proportion that is appropriate to the guidelines for district.
  14. Mr. Ernest Hogan clarifies if they are here “seeking approval of something?”
  15. Mr. Morosco say “We are, we are seeking approval and that we will obtain shop drawings and submit them to staff.
  16. Mr. Morosco says that contour has a number of historic profiles from tax credit projects that they have done. The he states “We are actually going to apply an aluminum extrusion at the break point of the transom bar that would actually give it the depth and dimension suggestive of the historic transom. Everything else would be sort of straight stock from the manufacturer.
  17. Mr. Hogan asked what the finish on this would be.
  18. Mr. Morosco replies say “It would be powdered coated to match sort of a deep burgundy than John had chosen for the original pallet, which the sash upstairs on the doors are and we’re just going to preserve the that same pallet.”
  19. Mr. Hogan thanks Jerry and moves to public comment.
  20. Ms. Anne Nelson with Pittsburgh History and Landmarks 100 west station square suite 450, 15219.
  21. Ms. Nelson says “I know we’re not allowed to ask questions, but are we approving with the wood pillar staying or the wood pillar going? “
  22. Mr. Hogan replies saying “it’s our understanding that the center system is being replaced.
  23. Ms. Nelson replies saying “just the center doors will stay as is, because I saw both in the pamphlet.”
  24. The commission replies saying “yes” the only adjustment in the photo is that the break line actually moves up about a foot or so.
  25. Ms. Nelson says that the one comment that “they” had was that we did think that the transom window that is a later addition and was fitting to the historic character of the district and “we” didn’t want to see that go, and we do want to see the doors maintained as they are.
  26. Mr. Morosco stand and makes a comment to Ms. Quinn that Mr. Adam had sent her a link from the door manufacturer and it shows that door working, and that he would link for her to pass it on.
- 
-

- 
- 
27. Mr. Hogan clarifies that it folds like an old time door.
  28. Mr. Morosco assures that the door folds like an old time door, and it pivots. While pivoting it lifts at the pivot point so that when it comes all the way up it forms an awning and some of the door is inside and outside.
  29. Mr. Hogan asked if there were any more public comments.
  30. Mr. William (Bill) Petrucci stands and introduces himself as the owner of the building.
  31. Mr. Petrucci leads by allowing the commission to know that his is in favor of keeping the two doors, because that was one of the things that he and Adam worked through, and he is glad. In addition, one of their suggestions were to bring that transom bar on the same elevation.
  32. Mr. Petrucci then goes on to say that this is his brother's building, he was an architect. He wants to give the project thumbs up, because he feels it would be great improvement for the business and keep the building still intact.
  33. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any other public comments.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Hogan say "without any other comment, I would seek a motion to approve post storefront alterations, which would preserve the existing entry doors, but replace the center storefront system with an operative door system, which would include the transom to be in line with the existing info of the structure and side doors.
  2. Mr. Serrao states that he makes that motion so moved, with final review by staff of the final drawings. The shop drawings and colors
  3. Mr. Jennings seconds that motion
  4. All voted in favor and the motion carries.
- 
-

**1501 Bedford Avenue**

**Connelly School Individual  
Landmark**

---

---

**Owner:**

Pittsburgh Gateways Corporation  
4514 Plummer Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15101

Ward: 3rd

Lot and Block: 9-R-194

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Pittsburgh Green Innovators  
P.O. Box 2072  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15230

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/11/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes: Revision of Secondary Changes**

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Thomas Bartnik from Pittsburgh Green Innovators and inform the commission that her will be speaking on behalf of the owner (Pittsburgh Gateway Corporation) of the former Connelly Trade School.
  2. Mr. Bartnik states he will only be setting up the context that the project will be discussed. Then proceeds to give some background information about the property location.
  3. Mr. Bartnik then proceeds to say they had already gone through some approvals and that this will be a historic tax credit project. In, addition the project has already been approved on the state level and the various certificates are in included.
  4. Mr. Nick Doichev from DLA Architects take the podium to give a walk-through of the accessibility.
  5. Mr. Doichev goes through the existing entrances on the building as it stands.
  6. Mr. Doichev explains that the only change to the structure would be the 3 story entry volume that include stairs and elevators, which make the building accessible from the parking lot, and the Bedford sidewalk.
  7. Mr. Doichev explains they are trying to create a walk-in experience and so they created a canopy above the walk way and it has solar panels so that it will be self powered.
  8. Mr. Doichev goes into detail about the existing structure and the original things that were and were not on the building windows being one focus. The existing windows were replaced in the 70's with thermally insulated dual sided windows. He then proceeds to say that they are keeping the windows in this project and
- 
-

---

---

won't change those, because they are in fairly good shape. However, in the future phase of the project it is anticipated that they will be replaced with historically accurate windows.

9. Mr. Doichev states "the windows that they we will be dealing with are the windows on the shop area, which is the saw tooth roof portion of the building. Those openings are currently boarded with metal panels that say Connelly. About a third of those are covered, they are in really poor shape, and they are not the original windows to begin with.
  10. Mr. Doichev states that they are proposing to restore the windows to the original size, which is about 20'. He also mention that the played with different economical systems , but the only way to do it is a curtain wall.
  11. Mr. Doichev says to the commission that he does not have much documentation on what the actual windows were, other than historical drawings that are very diagrammatic. However, you can see that I is a grid type of window. So the curtain wall they propose will have the divided glass look.
  12. Mr. Doichev also proposed to have the portions of the building that are deteriorating and damaged restored.
  13. Mr. Doichev proceeds with assuring the commission that all of this was accepted on state and federal level,
  14. Mr. Doichev stated that a comment from the national park service was to use a low pressure water for cleaning, which is standard for tax credit projects.
  15. Mr. Doichev mentioned that the original design was only an attachment that wrapped around the stair that was there. However, the national park service had an issue with that so the design was modified.
  16. Mr. Doichev goes on to talk about the different interiors that will be kept to receive the tax credits.
  17. Mr. Hogan questions that Mr. Doichev has receive show approval and secretary of interior approval.
  18. Mr. Doichev clarifies that is correct and that he filed an application part two and an approval letter was received (approval with conditions).
  19. Mr. Hogan than asked if he has bothe part 1 and part 2 approval.
  20. Mr. Doichev states that they file part 2 and that there was no need to file part 1 because, it was an already national registered building. Then Mr. Doichev states that the approval is contingent upon application part 3.
  21. Mr. Hogan asked if there are any other changes.
  22. Mr. Doichev says there is a piece of the faced that5 is not original. They do plan to take that off and restore if to the original openings.
  23. Mr. Hogan says okay and moves to public comment
  24. Ms. Anne Nelson from PHLF states they are in concordance ith this project and they are glad to see another building rehab.
  25. Mr. Hogan asked if there are any other comments.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Hogan states that he would entertain a motion for approval from the commission.
  2. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the revision of the elevation as submitted in the drawing package for 15 01 Bedford Ave.
  3. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion
  4. All members voted in favor!
  5. Motion carries
- 
-

**1727 Bluff Street**

**Paramount Film Exchange  
Individual Landmark**

---

---

**Owner:**  
PFEX, Inc.  
1727 Bluff Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 1st  
Lot and Block: 11-J-328

**Applicant:**  
Empty Space Design  
1 Odanah Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux  
Council District: 6th  
Application Received: 4/13/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade Renovations

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Page Thomas begins with some history of the building. He explains what the purpose of the buildings was used for.
  2. Mr. Thomas goes on to say who the architect was and that he attempted to find some original drawings. He did say that he found one element of an original drawing, but it is a plan and no pictures or documentation of the building in the original state.
  3. Mr. Thomas states the existing structure and notes there are terracotta elements on the main entry and a brick façade with a terracotta base.
  4. Mr. Thomas proceeds to say the plan is to restore all the building to it's grander in and replacing the windows in kind. They are metal narrow frames and the plan to readdressing the building to Miltonburger, which is the side entry.
  5. Mr. Thomas then proceeds to explain the interior of the building and some of the restoration that will need to be done. In addition, he mentioned that the roof was replaced the previous owner.
  6. Mr. Thomas then walks the commissioners through the elevations explaining to them what they are looking at in each view.
  7. Mr. Thomas then says the building will be an office building with retail space on the first floor for a potential restaurant and lease space.
  8. Mr. Thomas also proposes a roof entrance for any mechanical feature to the building.
  9. Mr. Thomas goes in to detail about each proposal for the building. The first is the door and he would like to change it and either leave the transom and the side lights there and just replace the door "in kind" or replace the whole piece with a door and
- 
-

---

---

leave the frame.

10. Mr. Thomas then proceeds to say that they plan to replace the windows "in kind". As the building currently stands the windows are metal. The replacement will be steel with very similar profile. However, they have not determined whether the windows were original from Alcoa or done later.
  11. Mr. Hogan states the windows look like have been replaced.
  12. Mr. Thomas states that they plan to you  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch glazing so they can use insulated glass.
  13. Mr. Thomas mentions in reference to the Miltonburger entry they would like to add a canopy to protect the entry. It will be over the 3 step entry and it is a pane of glass on 2 metal outriggers.
  14. They plan to make some other changes. One is the exit to the roof from the upper level.
  15. Mr. Thomas uses he elevation drawings to describe some of the planned changes being made to access different parts of the building, as well as different design features.
  16. Mr. Thomas also proposes that two windows be added to the party wall located on the side of the building.
  17. Mr. Hogan makes a comment about the difference in the windows of the building.
  18. Mr. Thomas clarifies that some of the windows are different from and that they plan to change them to all steel, because they believe that is the original window was.
  19. Mr. Hogan ask Mr. Thomas to walk him back through the design of the rear of the building.
  20. Mr. Thomas elaborates on his design for the rear.
  21. Mr. Hogan makes a comment noting that the door on the rear was added,
  22. Mr. Thomas replies by saying he is aware the door was added; however, he is not sure whether or not the opening was there. He states that he believes the opening is original to the building.
  23. Mr. Hogan and Mr. Thomas discuss back and forth the finishes for the windows.
  24. Mr. Hogan goes back through each design proposed and clears any details that Mr. Thomas may not have covered.
  25. Mr. Hogan moves to public comment.
  26. There were no public comments.
  27. Mr. Hogan states the regarding the design for the door he states which design idea he would like to see.
  28. Mr. Hogan and Mr. Serrao go over what design would probably be allowed.
  29. Mr. Hogan states that he would entertain a motion for approval of documents submitted for option B for the door with plans and material finishes to be submitted to staff for final review. Window replacements as proposed again with materials and finishes to be submitted for final review. And approval of option
- 
-

---

---

alternate one on north elevation and approval of installing an operable door there with no canopy or awnings will be constructed there on that deck.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao states that he so moves a motion of everything Mr. Hogan stated.
  2. Mr. Jennings seconds
  3. All voted in favor and the motion carries.
- 
-

**25 Market Street**

**Market Square Historic  
District**

---

---

**Owner:**

HAO-Bigy Group  
25 Market Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 25th

Lot and Block: 1-D-130

**Applicant:**

Sipp and Tepe Architects  
PO Bos 332  
North Lima, Oh 44452

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/13/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade Renovations

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Doug Sipp from Sipp and Tepe Architects stands and introduces himself and leads by apologizing, because he has made some changes to the proposal.
  2. Mr. Sipp begins with a description of the project and explains that the ends use will be a soft night club/banquet hall. In addition, this will be connected to an already existing business so there will be no changes to the entry of the building.
  3. Mr. Sipp states that the design focuses on the second story. He sates that second story was a recreation; possibly of the original faced. He goes on to mention that it was poorly constructed and it is falling apart.
  4. Mr. Sipp is proposing to keep the emphasis of the façade but to open up the front façade.
  5. Mr. Sipp proposes to flatten the bay window, keep the existing copper roof , finishing off the bottom of that and finishing it off with a NANA wall same mullion and partitions of the adjacent windows. In addition he proposes a canvas entry to pull the façade forward. Also a balcony is proposed and the finishes are submitted to commissioners as well. In addition, Mr. Sipp provides the measurements for this design.
  6. Mr. Sipp provide finish colors, which he says are negotiable with staff.
  7. Mr. Hogan makes a comment about the awning and questions the code regarding them.
  8. Ms. Sarah Quinn says the shape is the issue as far as the finishes, she can approve those over the counter.
- 
-

- 
- 
9. The landlord stands to clarify what Mr. Sipp is saying.
  10. The Landlord also makes comments about what was proposed for the design.
  11. Mr. Hogan states that he feel they could do something more creative about the canopies and the awning.
  12. Mr. Serrao comments saying the balcony is a good idea and the matter of the canopy is scale size and shape.
  13. Mr. Hogan makes comments about was originally there and tell him the balcony is a homerun good idea, but it is more about the intimacy of Market square and conserver what is coming there and what was there.
  14. Mr. Hogan opens the floor for public comment..
  15. Mr. Sipp asked if they have any suggestion for the extension of coming forward with the façade.
  16. The commissioners' suggestion was to look around and see what around the market square.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to move forward on the balcony addition not to exceed 4'-0" in length and width and general façade renovation and sever the canopy back 30 days.
  2. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion
  3. Mr. Hogan add that the final materials and color be submitted to staff for approval.
  4. All voted in favor
  5. Motion carries
- 
-

**4000 Fifth Avenue**

**Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

The University of Pittsburgh  
3400 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15260

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-C-10-0-1

**Applicant:**

Rick Avon  
100 East Swissvale Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15218

Inspector: Jim King

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/17/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Creation of new entryway

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Canard Grigsby from the University of Pittsburgh states that he is there as follow-up to previous submission and presentations.
  2. Mr. Grigsby leads by saying he feels he has a design that complies with the direction given from the last hearing and the design does maintain the integrity of one of the main defining characteristics at the base of Holland Hall.
  3. Mr. Grigsby states that the design maintains the horizontal line in the base element of the building. In addition, they have created symmetry along the base of Holland Hall at the base.
  4. Mr. Rick Avon states that this is not the original design of this façade. He gives some detail about the design which is adding an entrance. Then states that they plan to pull some elements that are on the building that are decorative.
  5. Mr. Avon proposes then proceeds to say that they will use the same granite which is already used on the building only it will be polished and placed above the new storefront system. In addition, there will be metal letters on that. All the infill will be done with limestone to match the existing limestone.
  6. Mr. Avon then states that they will be going back to the windows that were there and take the store front system that is currently there out.
  7. Mr. Avon also suggests some architectural lighting for decorative purposes.
  8. Mr. Hogan acknowledges that they have come up with an alternative design.
- 
-

- 
- 
9. Mr. Hogan asked if the commission has any questions.
  10. Mr. Hogan asked if there is any public comment.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the entryway for 4000 Fifth Avenue as submitted.
  2. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion
  3. All voted in favor
  4. Motion carries
- 
-

**941 Liberty Avenue**

**Penn- Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Caterina Varasso  
4769 Oakhurst Avenue  
Gibsonia, Pa 15044

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-44

**Applicant:**

Sonia Varrasso  
4769 Oakhurst Avenue  
Gibsonia, Pa 15044

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/9/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes: Certificate of Economic Hardship**

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Robert Pendergast stands and offers the commission more evidence.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that they have collected previous items from them and believe that they are ready to make a decision.
  3. Mr. Pendergast then introduces himself and states he represents the owner of 941 Liberty Avenue.
  4. Mr. Hogan states that because this is a Hardship case, he is going to close the record and state that “we are in possession” and clarify if there is any other information that has not be presented that they would like to present.
  5. Mr. Pendergast states that there is not.
  6. Mr. Hogan states that with no other information and after reviewing all of the documentation the commission feels that based on the information that was provided “there is no contest with regards to you cannot construct the building renovations and so you didn’t provide any information or numbers or detail with regards to that. You made no argument that there was hindrance to operation or use of the building via being able to enter or exit by the requirements of the commission. Your whole argument was that you need to have the atm on the façade of the building and you are arguing that by us saying you can’t have the atm on the façade of the building, that we are creating loss of revenue.
  7. Mr. Hogan says based on the evidence the atm still exist in the building and still creates revenue for the property owner. In addition it is purely convenience to have it on the exterior of the building.
  8. Mr. Hogan moves for a motion to deny the certificate of economic hard because it still generates revenue from inside. The revenue stream is still present and there is
- 
-

---

---

no economic hardship resulting. They are not prohibiting the use of an ATM, just not on the front of the building.

9. Mr. Pendergast states that the economic hardship appeal because it was originally approved in the original drawings – in a recessed location. The change for this newer review is that the doors were originally changed from a single door to a double door. That was approved but with a denial of the ATM. I am trying to understand what the basis was for the denial of the ATM. Because the wall we are removing to create the vestibule is what's currently housing the existing interior atm. So denying the approval of the exterior ATM is basically denying the entire project.
10. Mr. Hogan states that the first C of A expired because Ms. Varrasso didn't act upon it. The second C of A was approved with the condition of the denial of the ATM. So you do have approval to proceed with the project. There has been no evidence presented that the ATM cannot exist within the facility as a free standing unit. Therefore, I am asking the commission to consider denying the Certificate of Economic Hardship.
11. Mr. Pendergast asks if he could at least have the basis for denying the ATM for the second project.
12. Mr. Hogan states that all of that information will be found in the "Finding of Fact"
13. Mr. Hogan asks for other comments

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao makes a motion for denying approval for the Certificate of Economic Headship for 941 Liberty Avenue and the notice be accordingly sent to the owner.
2. Seconded
3. Mr. Hogan asks the Commissioners to vote

In favor – unanimous

Motion carries

---

---