



**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 June 6, 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>
Joe Serrao	Sarah Quinn	Robert Loos
Linda McClellan	Isaiah Jones-Lane, Intern	Anne Chen
Arthur Sheffield		Evelyn Jones
John Jennings		Barb Belle
Noor Ismail		Debbie Fossick
		Brian Walker
		Mike Gurnick
		Ken Helmes
		Brian Kaminski
		Rob Indovina
		Ryan Indovina
		Bob Ober
		Amaris Whittaker
		Jaewoo Chung
		Chad Wheatley
		Anne Nelson
		Barrett Reiter
		Betsey Sweeny
		Reed McLaughlin
		Todd Palck
		Brent Bissell
		Geof Cummings
		Devid Bishoff
		Paul Svboda
		Ron Graziano
		Doug Sipp
		Peter Landis
		Kate Rakus
		Susan Mansaro - ????
		Michal Kratsas
		Andrew Dash

## **Old Business**

## **New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Serrao proceeds to ask for a motion to accept the approval from the May, 2012 meeting minutes. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 2012 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ismail. Ms. McClellan abstained. Remaining members were in favor and the motion was carried.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the May 2012 Certificates of Appropriateness which was submitted on June 6, 2012, Ms. Ismail moved to approve, Mr. Jennings seconded the motion, all members voted in favor and motion was carried unanimously.

## **Other:**

1. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any new information related to the Certificates of Economic Hardship for the property at 941 Liberty Avenue.
2. Ms. Quinn indicates that she received some paperwork, but it was just copies of things that had been submitted to the legal department.
3. Ms. Quinn indicated that a question came up about 1401 East Carson Street and she discussed the issue with Ms. Ismail. She states that Mr. Vetere brought in plans and that the motion that was made when portions of the project was originally approved, as indicated in the minutes, it was contingent of the final review of the fire escape and review of the canopy. Mr. Vetere's expectation was the Ms. Quinn could do over-the-counter approval for those items. Ms. Quinn checked the original minutes and it indicated that the additional items would need to come back to the commission.
4. Mr. Serrao indicates that that was his memory.
5. In Ms. Quinn's conversation with the applicant, he indicated that he thought everything was approved when he spoke with Mr. Jennings.
6. Mr. Jennings did confirm that Mr. Vetere did come to speak with him and spoke about code issues.
7. Mr. Serrao asked if he was on the agenda for this month.
8. Ms. Quinn indicated that he asked to be put on the agenda for July.
9. Ms. Quinn indicated that Mr. Vetere had been making phone calls about expediting the review process.
10. Ms. Ismail indicated that Mr. Vetere had asked her about the situation when they were both at another meeting.
11. Ms. Ismail indicated that the planning department was going to be having a PreservePGH public meeting this week on Monday and Tuesday and then meetings next week.
12. Ms. Quinn indicated that Ms. Whittaker was an intern of Richard Meritzer – ADA Planner – and they are going to be asking the Commission to look at some details regarding the "One Step" program. We're going to be including that on the July agenda. The question will be whether the Commission will grant over-the-counter approval power for items included in the program.
13. Mr. Serrao indicated that he thought it was mostly a code issue.
14. Mr. Jennings indicated that it would be an aesthetic issue depending if they would have to displace the door.
15. Ms. Quinn indicated that she spoke with Mr. Meritzer about this.

16. Ms. Whittaker indicated that she and Mr. Meritzer were the only ones working on this excepting one other architectural intern who was minimally involved.
17. Mr. Serrao asked Ms. Whittaker to address the Commission on what the program is.
18. Ms. Ismail indicated that this is a program that was started to make it simpler to get through the permitting process to encourage accessibility so you could build the ramp into the right-of-way, and Richard understand what the restrictions are and he reviews the applications too. Any projects that Ms. Quinn is not comfortable approving should come to the Commission.
19. Mr. Jennings indicated that the code, as it is written, says that if you are replacing the storefront, that you must make it accessible. Mr. Jennings indicated that he thought that this was more of a voluntary program.
20. Ms. Whittaker indicated that it was.
21. Mr. Jennings that if the applicant was encroaching into the right-of-way, that the applicant would need to go to the Department of Public Works for an encroachment permit. If they want to step in, then they would be destroying the historic fabric of the storefront.
22. Ms. Quinn indicated that these are the reasons why we asked them to come to the Commission.
23. Ms. Whittaker discusses the program and indicates that Ms. Quinn, herself, and Mr. Meritzer had a discussion about the special nature of alterations within a historic district.
24. Ms. Whittaker indicated that the goal of the program is to remove only one step from the front of the building so the program is very restricted as it only addresses buildings with one step. The applications can only include the one step and no other items. So, the review will not include any other items.
25. Ms. Whittaker indicated that the goal of the project is to make the process move as easily and less costly as possible. Ms. Whittaker indicated the they were able to get the Department of Public Works to waive fees and with zoning was able to waive the application fee through legislation. They are also working to make the submission process as easy on the applicants as possible. Ms. Whittaker indicated that she would be talking to Mr. Jennings about this next week. She indicated that this would all be a part of the presentation at the next meeting and that this program is crucial to get people with disabilities into these services, especially in historic districts.
26. Ms. Quinn states that the Commission will see the presentation next month and that it will be included as a hearing and action item on the agenda.
27. Mr. Serrao thanked Ms. Whittaker.

**Adjourn:**

Ms. McClelland motions to adjourn

Mr. Jennings seconds

All members voted in favor

Motion passes

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

**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

---

---

**Proposed Changes: Facade Renovations**

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Serrao asks the applicant to come to the podium
  2. Mr. Brent Bissell comes to the podium and introduces himself and indicated that he finally owns the property and that he lives in Mt. Washington. He was unable to attend last month. He indicates that they want to restore a lot of the original detail on the exterior including the porch which is brick but was originally wood. The property has been abandoned for nearly thirty years and needs some touching up.
  3. Ms. Quinn asks if he would like to go through each of the scope of work items.
  4. Mr. Bissell indicates that he would.
  5. Mr. Serrao asks if he was here last month.
  6. Ms. Quinn indicates that there was a representative present.
  7. Mr. Bissell indicates that the first item is the porch posts which are currently brick but were originally wooden. He was able to find a historical photo but it was from far away. They want to remove the brick posts and replace them with wooden ones that are similar to ones seen in the neighborhood. Mr. Bissell indicates that it will be triple wooden columns.
  8. Mr. Serrao asks to confirm his.
  9. Mr. Bissell does and indicates that his contractor can replicate them and use cypress.
  10. Mr. Bissell indicates that the pediment detail will be restored. He also indicates that the porch roof will be replaced with painted red tin. He also indicates that the metal railing will be replaced with a cypress reproduction similar to those on other properties in the neighborhoods. He indicated that they plan to reset the front porch steps. He also indicates that they researched the windows and indicates that they have been infilled – they would like to use tempered glass to restore them.
- 
-

- 
- 
11. Ms. Quinn asks if they have any pictures as examples
  12. Mr. Bissell indicates that they do showing windows in other parts of the neighborhood.
  13. Mr. Bissell indicates that they will be construction new doors that are pocket doors that hide in the foyer area when they are open. Mr. Bissell indicates that the basement windows are currently boarded up and they would like to replace the glass and then add decorative black bars for security.
  14. Mr. Serrao asks if the bars would be the same as the ones in the photos.
  15. Mr. Bissell indicates that they would be similar and appropriate to the period. He also indicates that this is what they want to change on the front of the building. He then states that there are things they want to change on the side of the building. Mr. Bissell indicates that they would like to remove the concrete from inside the fence and landscape the area. Mr. Bissell indicates that they would like to remove the side porch and create a patio. The porch is structurally unsound. They would like to restore the side steps and then restore the doors. On the side, they would like to restore the coal chute door. They would like to restore the windows in the whole house but would like to replace the glass with double paned glass to mitigate the noise on the helicopter that lands nearby. Then they have the colors for all of the exterior colors in the scope of work. Mr. Bissell lists the colors.
  16. Ms. Quinn asks the commissioners if they would like to see any more of the photos.
  17. Mr. Serrao asks the Commissioners if they have any questions for the applicant.
  18. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment. There is none

---

---

**Motion:**

19. Mr. Jennings makes a motion the Commission approve the proposal submitted by the applicant and that details be approved by Staff.
  20. Ms. McClelland seconds
  21. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote
  22. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
- 
-

---

---

## **279 Fisk Street – Carnegie Library**

*Pittsburgh HRC – June 6, 2012*  
**Individual Landmark**

---

---

Owner:  
Tom Graziano  
Carnegie Libraries of Pittsburgh  
4000 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 9th  
  
Lot and Block: 49-F-160

Applicant:  
Anne Chen  
EDGE Studio  
5411 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Inspector: Mark Sanders  
  
Council District: 7th  
  
Application Received: 5/14/12

---

---

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of non-compliant windows in the attic and HVAC upgrades

---

---

### **Discussion:**

1. Ms. Anne Chen indicates that she is with Edge Studio who is the architects for the Carnegie Library here in Pittsburgh. She indicates that the scope of work includes the replacement in-kind of the roof which is slate shingles.
  2. Ms. Chen indicates that her client Ron Graziano is present. Ms. Chen indicates that the basement and first floor windows will be refurbished. The basement windows are in the rear of the building and the first floor windows wood double hung windows and transom windows and the attic – the dormers on the back – there are no dormers on the front. They are proposing to refurbish the existing sashed offsite and the other parts will be painting. They will be doing a paint analysis.
  3. She indicates that only place they are proposing not to refurbish or to replace the transom windows is in the attic. The library is proposing to air condition the space as it is not currently air conditioned.
  4. She indicates that the window on the right hand side dormer, there is one window that will be replaced with an aluminum louver for fresh air intake. There are two light bump-outs that don't really effect the window just above the roof line of the stack area which is the area that with the window in front of it.
  5. She indicates that those would be ducts that would serve the stack area below it. She indicated that this is the semi-circular area on the plan. She indicates that the remaining windows would be replaced with an aluminum product. There are three and then several that cannot be seen. They want to replace them for maintenance reason.
  6. She indicates that they are not clearly visible from the Street. She indicates that the two areas of duct work will be hidden by the parapet wall. She indicates that in the bottom left hand corner of the plans is where the chiller unit will be placed it will be at the rear of the building and will not be seen within the public right of way.
- 
-

---

---

**279 Fisk Street – Carnegie Library**

*Pittsburgh HRC – June 6, 2012*  
**Individual Landmark**

---

---

7. She indicates that the last item in the scope of work is to remove the chimney but they have reconsidered that and are removing it from the project because it isn't in bad condition.
  8. Mr. Serrao asks the Commissioners if there are any questions.
  9. Mr. Jennings asks if there will be any piping from the chiller.
  10. Ms. Chen indicates that the piping will all be interior.
  11. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment.
  12. Mr. Serrao asks the Commissioners if there is any discussion or a motion.
- 
- 

**Motion**

13. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the renovations at 279 Fisk Street as submitted with any finishes to be approved by Staff.
  14. Mr. Sheffield seconds
  15. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote
  16. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
- 
-

---

---

**3941 O'Hara Street**

*Pittsburgh HRC – June 6, 2012*  
**Oakland Civic Center**

---

---

Owner:  
University of Pittsburgh  
3400 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15260

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 49-F-160

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:  
Brian Kaminski  
Indovina Associates  
5880 Ellsworth Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15232

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 5/14/12

---

---

**Proposed Changes:** Non-compliant window replacement

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Rob Indovina introduces himself as the architect working for the University of Pittsburgh for the window replacement and indicates that the building was built in 1915 and was the original Mellon Institute and has had several different uses. – the medical school and the engineering school. He indicates that the impetus for this renovation is that the interior is being upgraded for hi-tech laboratories and one of the requirements is that the windows not be operable. He states that fixed windows need to be used to make the interior of the building work. He provides photos of the exterior's current conditions including many window A/C units. He states that the existing windows have been "butchered". He describes the window and explains that the windows need to be altered to accommodate the central air conditioning system that will be installed. The windows they are proposing will match the existing windows "just about precisely". He indicated that even some of the existing windows have already been modified and are in bad shape. Mr. Indovina presents a drawing - in the upper left is the existing profile and on the right is the proposed profile. He indicates that there are three different window types – the profile and the layout of the windows is exactly the same as what's there. The upper section is the existing window profile. The interior profile will change somewhat. They are historic windows with a glazing bead – the will have nearly the same depth. Also, the color will replicate the dark brown from the 1930s. There is also a rendering of what the windows will look like.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks if there are questions from the Commission.
  3. Mr. Jennings indicates that they have approved other aluminum windows in Oakland to replace wooden windows if the profile is the same and that he doesn't have any problem with that.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment.
  5. Mr. Serrao asks if there needs to be any discussion.
- 
-

**3941 O'Hara Street**

*Pittsburgh HRC – June 6, 2012  
Oakland Civic Center*

---

---

6. Mr. Serrao asks for a motion.
- 
- 

**Motion**

1. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the aluminum windows to replace the operable wooden windows at 3941 O'Hara Street with color, finishes, and profiles to be approved by Staff.
  2. Ms. McClelland seconds
  3. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote
  4. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
- 
-

**907-909 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

Owner:  
Penn Avenue Renaissance III  
941 Penn Avenue, #201  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-158-01

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:  
Brian Kaminski  
Indovina Associates  
5880 Ellsworth Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15232

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/18/12

---

---

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of balconies and a two story penthouse addition

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Rob Indovina introduces himself as the architect for the total renovation of the building at 907-909 Penn Avenue in the Cultural District. H indicated that it was originally built as a warehouse building and has gone through a couple of iterations of use and they are proposing to change this into a residential project. He provides several pictures of the existing conditions and notes that there are actually two buildings that are divided with a wall down the center. They plan to refurbish the wooden windows. They are proposing to construct a recessed balcony as has been done at 941 Penn Avenue. He indicated that the profile of the window and the sash of the window would remain in place. So on the Penn Avenue side, the rendering represents the appearance. He explains again that it is the same treatment done at 941 Penn Avenue and that it worked out well. He states that on the side of the building they are proposing to increase the size of the windows to create balconies that will partially project and partially be recessed in the side of the building.
  2. Mr. Indovina provides a drawing showing the replacement of the brick with metal siding and replacement of the windows with new fire-rated windows. The other thing that we are proposing is adding an additional two floors to the building. This will be a contemporary addition and should be viewed as such. This will be a metal translucent screen over it with some projecting metal balconies. To change the use from a warehouse building into a residential building is to bring it into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, so even though it is in a historic district, we feel that the reuse of the building justifies the interventions that we are making to the building. In the booklet, there are two other options. One is where we would leave the existing brick panels on the side of the building in place and the windows in place which would not require us to use firelight glass and has a different detail for the roof structure.
  3. Mr. Indovina describes the elevation from Penn Avenue showing the front of the building with some of the windows removed and the new structure on the top. The other change we would be making is a slight modification of the storefront on the first floor. Currently it is
- 
-

**907-909 Penn Avenue**

***Penn-Liberty Historic District***

---

---

vacant and there is a restaurant slated to go in there, so they would like to do kind of a Paris to Pittsburgh kind of opening. A portion of the wall would open the building to the street.

4. Ms. Quinn asks if that was included in the packet that was submitted.
  5. Mr. Indovina indicates that it was and that those are the balconies.
  6. Mr. Brian Kaminski of Indovina indicates that above the doors that can be seen on the drawings there are leaded glass transoms and they would be maintained.
  7. Mr. Indovina indicates that would all stay the same and that another portion would be modified.
  8. Mr. Serrao states that just for clarification – the second window from the right will be the balcony.
  9. Mr. Indovina indicates that that is correct.
  10. Mr. Serrao asks if the other three windows will be replaced in-kind.
  11. Mr. Indovina indicates that they will be refurbished existing windows and that they are not changing out the windows at all.
  12. Mr. Serrao asks if Mr. Indovina has a blow up of what's happening on the street.
  13. Ms. Quinn indicates that she doesn't have anything.
  14. Mr. Indovina indicates that he doesn't have any specific detail of it.
  15. Mr. Serrao indicates that the Commission needs a detail of it.
  16. Mr. Indovina indicates that it is there but the section would stay the same and that the entrance would stay the same that that would be the restaurant side.
  17. Ms. McClelland asks about the stories that are going to be added. She asks about how much a setback there will be from the current dimensions of the building.
  18. Mr. Indovina stated that this section is the closest section and that it steps back another seven or eight feet. It is between 15 feet and seven or eight feet. He indicates that part of that is so that from the street there is a very sharp cut off angle.
  19. Mr. Serrao states that basically they are saying that this is option B.
  20. Mr. Indovina indicates that it is and that it would keep the brick panels on the side of the building and the existing windows on the side of the building and is just another option for how the new addition is clad. That the concept is basically the same and that it is intended to be a contemporary addition.
  21. Mr. Jennings asks that the intended option B asks if there is some type of screening that goes around on the top of the addition.
  22. Mr. Indovina indicates that it is a perforated screen.
  23. Mr. Jennings asks if it is the same around the addition.
  24. Mr. Indovina indicates that they are basically the same. He indicates that there is the intent to light it at night so that there is a softly glowing element on the roof.
  25. Mr. Todd Palcik introduces himself as the developer and says that he lives on this block and
- 
-

**907-909 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

they bought this building because it was vacant, just like they bought two other buildings on the street in this section of town. He says that he would like to make it clear that it is very narrow from Penn Avenue unlike Liberty Avenue so if you're standing across the street you would be at great pains to actually see anything – to see the top of this building as it is, and just like with 941 Penn, where they added floors above it, you can't see them. So the only place you can see them is from the corner of Ninth and Penn.

26. Mr. Indovina indicates that they did a similar treatment to 941 Penn Avenue – they added an additional floor to the top of there. There are great views to take advantage of and to expand the residential possibilities of the building.
  27. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any questions from the Commissioners.
  28. Mr. Jennings indicates that what he thinks the board should do is have them make a decision as to which option they would like to present to us for approval.
  29. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that he likes option B.
  30. Mr. Jennings agrees that out of the two, that is his preference as well.
  31. Mr. Kaminski indicates that option B is the easiest to do. They thought the Commission would have an opinion on which option was best.
  32. Mr. Jennings indicates that the Commission's opinion is based on what was presented to them.
  33. Mr. Kaminski indicated that they like option B – so it is option B.
  34. Mr. Serrao asks for public comment.
  35. Ms. Anne Nelson with Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation introduces herself and states that they support option B which is maintaining more of the brick façade but that they are very happy to see another building rehabbed into residential which is greatly needed downtown.
  36. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any other public comments.
  37. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any other comments or questions from the Commission.
  38. Mr. Jennings states that again, if the option B is the one they are reviewing, that they don't have any material samples for the addition so they're not sure what the screening is going to be or what the finishes are. He indicates that it is difficult to vote on something based only on renderings. He asks how the screening is perforated – they don't know that.
  39. Mr. Serrao indicates that his inclination is that option B is favorable but that they do need a little more information.
  40. Ms. McClelland indicates that the rendering is from the street level and that they really don't know what that is either.
  41. Mr. Jennings states that they will need details for the railing that are protruding from the side.
  42. Mr. Serrao says that the applicant needs to have a little more information. He indicated that the Commission will need to know specifically what the materials are for the upper two floors. He states that he can't speak for the other Commissioners but that he doesn't have a
- 
-

**907-909 Penn Avenue**

***Penn-Liberty Historic District***

---

---

problem with what they're going to do from a macro point of view – he thinks that it is a great project, but they just need a little more information on the railings. He states that his only other question is what's happening on the first floor. It is one area that they have been concentrating on - what happens at street level and what happens if – how the doors and the nano wall – or whatever they intend to use – how that works.

---

---

**Motion:**

43. Mr. Jennings makes a motion that this be continued until the July meeting so the applicant can bring more details as to the finishes on the exterior of the building.
  44. Ms. McClelland seconds.
  45. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote
  46. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
- 
-

---

---

**1416 N. Franklin Street**

*Pittsburgh HRC – June 6, 2012*  
**Manchester Historic District**

---

---

Owner:  
Michelle Murphy  
1416 N Franklin Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 22-K-279

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:  
Bill Miller  
121 Fireside Drive  
New Castle, Pa 16105

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/15/12

---

---

---

---

**Proposed Changes: Non-compliant window replacement**

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Serrao introduces the project.
  2. Ms. Quinn indicates that the applicant was the permit guy and not the actual installer, that he had called yesterday to see if they had been approved. She let him know that the meeting was today and that they needed to have someone here.
  3. Mr. Serrao acknowledges that they are not here and that the item should be tabled until the July 2012 meeting and that Staff should make appropriate contact.
- 
-

## **21 Market Square**

## **Market Square Historic District**

---

Owner:  
Nicholas Nicholas  
20 Market Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-D-127

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:  
Sienna on the Square  
21 Market Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/16/12

---

### **Proposed Changes: Installation of non-compliant signage**

---

#### **Discussion:**

1. Mr. Sipp introduces himself and indicates that his client Tom Certo is not present. He indicates that they have been before the Commission before for changes to the façade and that they are currently pursuing those changes. The opening façade is in place and it is exciting what they are doing. He states that his client is proposing signage to identify his location. The façade is very small and they are crammed back in on Graeme around the corner from the market. His client is requesting a sign that will light up a bit to get around the sign for the coffee place and the adjacent Italian restaurant to the left. Basically they feel that their building can't be seen for all of the street activity. What they have done is taken the idea of the two vertical signs and made them horizontal. He states that there have been some minor renovations to the inside and they're taking the curves from the inside and bringing them to the outside. What they are proposing is a glass and steel curved sign elements with the letters fixed. You can't actually see the steel pins there but the letters will be fixed and mounted to that steel beam below.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks if the actual sign will curve.
  3. Mr. Sipp states that it will and that the whole thing is curved and will only come out 14 to 14 inches. It's about 6'8" to 7' wide and it will light up. It will have a back-lit effect to it that will silhouette the letters.
  4. Ms. Quinn indicates that the backlit style of lighting is not within the guidelines.
  5. Mr. Sipp indicates that that's the part of the non-compliance issue.
  6. Mr. Serrao asks what the sign is made of.
  7. Mr. Sipp indicates that there is steel below and that they were looking at bent glass or plexiglass but an opalescent white with steel letters. It will all be painted brown – a low key coloration.
  8. Mr. Jennings asks if the light will escape from the top of the sign as well.
  9. Mr. Sipp says that he hopes that it will wash the façade – in the same area where they show the color - they are looking at some halogen lights at the rear of it that will light it up in a
-

***21 Market Square***

***Market Square Historic District***

---

way that he can adjust. He indicates that it will wash down too. The wall will be lit and it will reflect off of the steel. They also still have the historic hood lights up above.

10. Mr. Serrao asks if there are questions or comments from the Commissioners.
  11. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment.
  12. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any discussion or a motion.
- 

**Motion:**

13. Mr. Jennings makes a motion at the sign, as presented for 21 Market Street for the Sienna restaurant with the backlighting and the up-and-down lighting be approved and that any finishes be approved by staff.
  14. Mr. Sheffield seconds the motion
  15. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote.
  16. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
-

**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

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:  
Sipp and Tepe Architects  
PO Box 332  
North Lima, Oh 44452

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4-13-12

---

---

**Proposed Changes: Façade Renovations including non-compliant signage**

---

---

**Discussion 1:**

1. Mr. Sipp indicates that he is the architect for this job as well.
  2. Debbie Fossick from Fastsigns introduces herself and indicates that they are hoping to backlight the face of the sign which is completely black. The only lighting area that would come through are the champagne glasses. She passes out a printout to the Commissioners which show the signage both lit and not lit. She indicates that it does not look like a standard cabinet type sign because the entire background is not lit. It is only the characters and the champagne glasses that are lit with LED lights and not with fluorescent lights.
  3. Mr. Serrao asks if it is a picture of the actual sign in the shop.
  4. Ms. Fossick indicates that it is.
  5. Mr. Serrao asks if the sign graphic is theoretically not lit.
  6. Ms. Fossick indicates that that is correct.
  7. Ms. Quinn indicates that the reason this is up for review is that the guideline say that backlit signs are to be individually lettered.
  8. Ms. Fossick indicates that the sign is made like a channel letter, which she brought to show the Commission. She says that basically the face pops off and doesn't have a sliding base like others so the big circle has a face on it like the "S" except that it pops off of the front and that the lights are held inside the big circle.
  9. Mr. Sipp indicates that this would be the only identifying element for Perle for the second floor. There is still the Breugger's Bagel on the first floor so they wanted to be subtle about it. He explains that it is not very large. It will only be four feet wide and the canopy would be more prominent on the elevation.
  10. Mr. Serrao asks the Commissioners if they have any questions.
  11. Mr. Jennings asks if the champagne glasses are lit from behind and asks about the letters
- 
-

themselves.

12. Ms. Fossick indicates that that is exposed neon.
13. Mr. Jennings asks if they blink.
14. Ms. Fossick indicates that they do not.
15. Ms. McClelland asks if the two drawings seem to make the name Perle look and different.
16. Ms. Fossick indicates that on the picture, just the exposed neon is lit. On the other picture, they turned on the lights behind the letters and that's in order to light the champagne glasses.
17. Mr. Serrao suggests that the drawings were done just as an example.
18. Mr. Sipp indicates that that is what you will see on the building that will be lit atmospherically up in the gable.
19. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment.
20. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any more questions or discussion for the Commission.

**Discussion 2:**

21. Mr. Sipp states that he has brought revisions to the canopy which was originally presented at the May meeting. The Commissioners had asked for a reduced version of this and what they looked at is that there is historical precedence for a semi-circular awning but they agree that the original design was heavy-handed so they took the arch of the balcony in the plan and inverted it to elevation with the same kind of arch that is seen in the color perspective. You can see that there is an arch to the balcony that was converted to a vertical element in the arch of the canopy. He also has an approval from public works for a five foot awning and the Commission has the drawings for the eight foot canopy. The approval is for the five foot awning contingent on HRC approval. The whole section behind the angled tie-backs will just be lopped off. Hopefully this design will be a little less intrusive and it meets all of the requirements for Public Works.
  22. Mr. Jennings asks if the pull-backs are structural arms.
  23. Mr. Sipp indicates they are.
  24. Mr. Serrao indicated that the whole plan is scaled back.
  25. Mr. Jennings indicates that it all goes back one bay.
  26. Mr. Sipp indicates that the tie-backs will come back also.
  27. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any questions or comments from the Commission.
  28. Mr. Jennings comments that the awnings pick up the arched windows as well.
  29. Mr Sipp indicates that they are open to revise the lower level windows when Bruegger's leave comes up so they are willing to tie the whole façade together in some historical nature.
  30. Mr. Jennings asks what the structural supports of the canopy are made of.
  31. Mr. Sipp indicates that it will be an aluminum frame covered with a stretched awning and he has some samples. There would also be a three inch tie rod, it will be steel.
  32. Ms. Quinn states that they sent some more detailed drawings.
- 
-

**25 Market Street**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

33. Mr. Sipp confirms that.
  34. Mr. Jennings states that he was just concerned with the profile and how big it is.
  35. Mr. Sipp indicates that there is another r construction document in there.
  36. Mr. Jennings ask if they were saying it was only 3/8”
  37. Mr. Sipp indicated on the drawing that it is the balcony in the back and the canopy in the front.
  38. Mr. Serrao confirms that the drawing is incorrect in that it shows an awning of eight feet and they have approval from public works for a five foot awning.
  39. Mr. Sipp confirms that and states that it will keep more in line with the balcony.
  40. Mr. Jennings states that the rendering wad representing a thicker presentation.
  41. Mr. Sipp advises that Commission that they should go by the construction documentation that is presented because the perspective was a quick sketch to get things on paper then it became the presentation document.
  42. Ms. Ismail comments that there are so many shaped awnings on the structure that thee needs to be some consistency in terms of colors and patterns because it’s definitely not shape at this point.
  43. Mr. Sipp states that there is a proposed color selection – they have abandoned the yellow, tan, and blue selection and now want to use tan and charcoal. They are going to try to take off some of the red panels and will be doing a striped tan and black sunbrella fabric. Mr. Sipp provides the color samples.
  44. Mr. Serrao states to the applicant that the Commissioners are having a conversation about that amount of things going on in a very small elevation.
  45. Mr. Sipp agrees. He states that what they are trying to do is reduce that with the new color scheme. He states that his client agrees that the cross bracing “muddys-up” the façade so they are looking at one continuous color across the façade in a light tan and using charcoal for the new elements with the intent to delete out the red that’s on the façade. He states that they are aware that there would be a dichotomy between the lower element and the upper element, but they don’t have any control over the lower element at this time – until their lease is up. They would love to take away the canopy at the left. The have control of the right entrance, which is the historic entrance – they plan to keep the wood and the arch mounted about that and on the secon floor they intend to paint things out and take away that element, so the elements that they’ve added are more of the elements that they want people to see. The idea of the balcony was to get some communication between Market Square and the second floor so people know what’s going on upstairs.
  46. Mr. Jennings indicates that he likes the new canopy better than the shed type on it because it does have the arch and matches the windows.
  47. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any other comment or questions from the Commission.
- 
-

***25 Market Street***

***Market Square Historic District***

---

---

**Motion 1:**

48. Mr. Jennings makes a motion that Signage including both LED and neon for the Perle sign at 25 Market Square be approved as presented and any finished by approved by Staff.

49. Ms. Ismail seconds

50. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote

51. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.

**Motion 2:**

52. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the arched canopy being limited to a five foot extension from the building as described by the applicant for 25 Market Street with colors to be selected by Staff.

53. Ms. McClelland seconds

54. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote

55. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.

---

---

**Forbes Avenue TBD**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Millcraft Industries  
95 W. Beau Street, Suite 600  
Washington, Pa 15301

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-184

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Arquitectonica  
100 Fifth Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10011

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/16/12

---

---

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of a new mixed use, high-rise development

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Serrao introduces the project s new construction of Forbes Avenue.
  2. Mr. Sam Luckino with Arquitectonica introduces himself. Their office is at 100 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> floor, New York, New York. They are the architect of record for Millcraft. He states that they came before the Commission two months ago to provide a briefing and to get feedback from the HRC and members of the public. They have spent the last two months meeting with the public, many different agencies and public entities and other groups who have interest in the project.
  3. He states that they were trying to do the best they could to incorporate some of their concerns and make the project a better project for the City of Pittsburgh as a whole. He says that he will go through the presentation but that it's a little abbreviated with regards to the amount of work they have been doing – he's going to provide a brief summary of what's going on.
  4. He indicates that there are several things that the Commissioners should note as the presentation proceeds. He states that the material palette has changes since the last time they came before the Commission. He says that the lighter color scheme was found to be the overwhelming choice for the building which made it feel a lot lighter, so they've incorporated that. Also, we've changed the orientation of some of the fins that you're reading on the glass. There was a lot of discussion about there being a blank glass wall. We've changed the orientation of the fins and also the density to break up the façade to add some texture but to also make sure we're not leaving you a blank wall on two facades.
  5. He states that they will show the Commissioners some new louver details today which are not significantly different, but the renderings are a lot better, which he thinks was misleading. He says that they will show that to the Commissioners to let them know how things work.
- 
-

6. He indicates that there has also been a change to the frame system that is around each of the boxes. They have also reduced the height of the building by 6 feet and the office floors by tightening those up. Since they came before the Commission last time, they did do some research that they wanted entered in the record. There was a concern about the height of the building in the context of the surrounding buildings, so they looked at a simplified stacking plan where you would have two floors of retail at the ground level and be immediately over the retails which would have netted four garage levels to keep the current amount of parking and then above that would be the hotel at four levels and above that would be the office so that would have been about 15 floors.
  7. He states that the issue they ran into was that about half of the office occupants and half of the hotel guests would be looking at the backs of other buildings. In order to get the three story reduction, the building ended up being 220 feet long which is the full extent of their property. They felt that it was just too big of a mass and too imposing to have on Forbes, so they quickly discarded that one. He indicates that the other option they looked at was trying to do below-grade which was brought up for the parking last time. They spent a lot of time looking at that but one of the challenges was ramping in and out. They required five levels to meet the number of spaces they have now and once they get below grade five levels in Pittsburgh, there are some serious de-watering issues.
  8. He states that they will also have to extend their foundations by another 60 feet, additionally, around the Benedum-Trees building and the investment building in particular that are of significant height and significant age, they would have to very carefully do a pile and lagging system with driven piles and lagging installed in between, and in the interest of being a good neighbor, they were very concerned if anything went wrong, it could be a severely damaging situation for either of those two buildings.
  9. In addition to all of that, he states that they have a need for mechanical ventilation, in addition to the expense of removing and hauling away the shear cubic yardage of earth. He states that they investigated the expense and found out that it would be three times the cost of where they are now for that particular section of the building. He states that they just wanted to let the Commissioners know that they did due diligence on those things and discarded them for the reasons stated.
  10. Mr. Luckino states that the drawings in front of the Commissioners begin with the site plan. There is a buffer zone of buildings between their site and Market Square and the same thing can be found on the Wood Street side. When you see the high roof, that's representative of the office portion of the building. The low roof is a C-shaped volume that plugs in under that which is the hotel.
  11. He states, and then the next piece is over the second floor food and beverage.
  12. He says that part of the discussion last time and part of the concerns they heard from people were that what is the height of the building and how it relates to what else is in the context of Market Square Historic District. The diagram they have here shows the outer perimeter of where they are from the street fronts on Market Square and it rotates around in the same distance.
  13. He states that they were trying to find out where they were in relation to contextual heights and they thought it was a good exercise for them as well. He states that you can see that there are several buildings that are at the same height as we are at the same
- 
-

distances that we are. All of them have distances of setback with adjacent businesses in between, but with visions of just the pure, raw distance there are a lot with a similar height. The next drop-down is the twelve-story section, the last one was eighteen, the next section is where the hotel is at twelve and you can see that there are many buildings and the low roof is a non-issue at this point.

14. Mr. Serrao indicates that he would like to make a comment for the Commission and for the public. He states that they have a very unique site.
  15. Mr. Luckino goes on to explain that the green zone that has the red dashed outline represents the Market Square Historic District. The yellow zone with the black dashed line represents a district that is on the historic registry, but it is not a recognized district in the City of Pittsburgh.
  16. He states that what they're really contending with is the red zone with the green dashed line that cuts right through their building almost severing the office from the high-rise portion from the hotel, which is the low-rise portion. Technically, HRC's purview is west of the red line, but they can't possibly present half of the building so please bear with us as we go through the whole thing.
  17. Mr. Serrao adds that there are other City agencies and other Commissions that are looking at the holistic picture and that the Commissions task is to look at the impact to the historic district.
  18. Mr. Luckino thanks Mr. Serrao and states that several other issues that have come up over the past few months are how are we impacting our neighbors and how are the set-backs affecting the Square. We did this quick drawing to provide the public and the HRC with information as to how we are sitting on those two streets and the Square where we're a little over 60 feet away.
  19. He states that the building there that you see on the left side that is the tallest building between us on the left side and Market Square is another six stories and then set back another 50 feet before we get to the high portion at 18 stories – so it's a very generous set back with regards to typical urban planning set-back requirements for public space. Additionally, on Wood Street, we are over 80 feet away and we do not have a set-back on our property but the 80 feet distance is quite generous as well.
  20. Mr. Luckino states that this is a diagram just really to show some heights that are adjacent to us and to really show how we're impacting other neighbors. On the left side and the right side there is a bit of a different situation. We have existing buildings with existing lot line windows which is not permitted by code or zoning today, but they are grandfathered in and we will have to maintain the required five foot easements to their back side, and also these folks have ingress and egress going on, so we're going to maintain that for them. On the right side, which is the east side of our parcel, there are no lot line windows.
  21. He states that building is currently adjacent to an existing building which will be removed, so we have the ability to go right up to our property line there. On the back side we have two different circumstances there. The Benedum-Trees building, we met with several people from there yesterday who were very supportive of the project. They have only two windows on each floor that go up the length of the building and we will be five feet away from them, which is the required zoning distance; however, at that portion we are only at a 12 story building so essentially 2/3 of their windows will be affected and again, that
- 
-

building was built on the lot line and it was envisioned that there wouldn't be a great amount of light in there and we will work with them on the site improvements.

22. He says that on the other side we have the investment building and we did some more research on it and found some interesting news. The zone that we're required five feet and we're doing that, but the survey which you're seeing here represents the property itself. The actual building has a five foot set back above about 18 feet so their building line is right about where that text is, so in reality, when we're five feet away, and that building sets back five foot six, we will actually be ten foot six away from those windows. That was actually some helpful news for the tenants of that building.
  23. He says that the last thing that came up was some discussion about the loading. To reorient everybody, to what we're doing on that side, we do have ingress and egress for the garage here and also ingress from Forbes, so it will be in only and in and out up to the garage only and that is the current state of the drawings. We did do a little reconnaissance and you can see that the significant portion of the Investment Building is solid so the loading dock will stop at about where the paint line is and so none of the second floor or ground floor people will be able to see out into the dock and we will not be storing trash or anything out there the dock will be closed and the only thing that will be seen are trucks that will be parked there when it is not in use so it will be closed off and not visible.
  24. He states that it's not an issue for Benedum-Tries at this point because their loading is on that side. Another topic that came up was sunlight, so we did some shadow diagrams. I won't go through them in any great detail, but basically what you're looking at is the grey zones represent existing building for the current context buildings, the yellow is our roof, and the blue is the overlap between what we're impacting. So we did March, we did June, we did September, we did December and in all cases, the only time that our building affects sunlight in Market Square is in the very early hours of the morning and during the rest of the day as it moves out, there is absolutely no effect, or very little in some cases during the Summer at that time, any shadow that's imposed by us will be gone or just covering the east side of the square on the road only and not in the pedestrian zone. So the maps are there in detail for you to look at if you like.
  25. He states that since this is the Historic Review Commission, they want to talk about contextual heights and materials so I have a section here with some photographs. We already discussed this so I won't spend any more time on that. This is a view from Wood Street looking west on Forbes which will be our main address. Some of the things we discussed last time is that everything has a strong datum line above the ground floor and that everything has a strong datum line at the cornice line and also there is a very different architectural language from the top to the bottom.
  26. He says that they wanted to use that with the dialect in their design. They know that their building is new and modern and they know that the historic guidelines ask for new to be new but also respectful, so we felt that in order for the building to be done in a modern way, the best way they could be contextual is by picking up on cues in the existing massing. This is a view from the other side looking east down Forbes with Wood Street all the way in the back and you can see that this is the dilapidated zone of Forbes on the south that we will be removing and replacing, but regardless of that, there is currently a step down of the west portion of our block to the east so we tried to pick up on cues from that as well which you will see later in the presentation.
- 
-

27. He states that this is a view along Forbes Avenue that shows the nicer portion of Forbes Avenue which our client recently renovated this building, so this is the datum line that we really wanted to focus on – that the majority of this would be removed. As you move away from the Forbes streetscape, just looking at the contextual buildings that contribute to the ambiance and the skyline of Market Square you can see that regardless of their distance away, there is a huge varying palette of materials; from masonry to pre-cast to metal, steel and of various heights looking east and north. So, for us it was an exercise in looking at what was there that we could use that would not really change the atmosphere of materials that had an appearance when you were in the square.
  28. He says that one of the big topics that everybody has been interested in is the garage design and how the pedestrians will interface with that. He states that he wants to be clear about the heights. It is a ten tier garage and you can see the frame which is ghosted in is all part of the retail. When you see the renderings and elevations and streetscape view, you will notice that there is no possible way for you to see this.
  29. He states that what really should be looked at is the section of the garage that we're actually telegraphing out of the façade. So, this is about 32 feet above grade and then within the volume that is going to be presented to you that will read as garage, there are only eight levels or nine. So just to be clear when we are talking about elevations. This is a close-up view that we did not have for you last time which I think will be helpful to everybody in understanding how the garage will actually work and what we're trying to do to eliminate views.
  30. He says that the left side is an enhanced rendering of the system that is detailed in the section on the right which is that we're taking an architectural louver and inverting it in the opposite direction from the way they would normally hang. You would be able to look up, into the garage, but with the sensitivity of the area, we are proposing to flip it the other way so if you're above the garage you will see in, but if you're below the garage you will never see in.
  31. He states that the other nice thing about this is at night, the light will be reflected upward and nobody in the pedestrian realm will be able to see a huge amount of light coming in and out of the garage. We think this is something that will get us the free area that we will need in a design that looks elegant with a minimal impact to the pedestrian experience.
  32. He says that another concern is the potential effect of the garage looming over Wood Street. This is a view from Wood Street that is taken from Google looking up. What you're looking at is as close as we can approximate from this view how much of our building will be seen. The white zone illustrates that and this represents the top four floors of the office building. We didn't spend a lot of time rendering views of this because there's not enough of our building to really see.
  33. He states that Wood Street is so narrow that at the height that pedestrians are, looking above the street wall at our building it is virtually impossible to see anything. Basically, you would not be able to see the garage at Wood Street.
  34. He says that he will go to the renderings and elevations. This is the updated building elevation, again you can see that we've changed the materials to a stainless frame that's around each of the volumes – the architectural language has not really changed since last time. I relooking at ideas for stacking, we came back to this as the most elegant design
- 
-

that we could offer for the City. We did in fact change the fins which may seem miniscule but what we've done over here is – these used to be vertical but we've changed our system for the HVAC that is in the hotel, this is the section of the building that is in the HRC district, so we've added these fins at a horizontal orientation which has allowed us to but the required louvers required for the HVAC system in a dialogue of the façade that does not have them looking like punched openings sticking out.

35. He states that they've tried to do this in a way that looks intentional and looks designed rather than as an after-thought. Then we've also taken that horizontal language up and immediately like it. The old ones with their verticality were really accentuated by having the fins run vertical. Having that horizontal broke that down visually was actually a nice touch. Just to keep things interesting and not the same everywhere, we actually rotated this which was previously horizontal and now we're showing it vertical.
  36. He says that other than that, the concept of the design has not changed and our goal is to have the building appear as three small elements rather than as one large one. In some of the other designs that we've done since our last meeting, we did look at brick, we looked at masonry, we looked at stone, we looked at pre-cast and different systems specifically for the portion that was in the historic district and we found that we were back to a punched opening system.
  37. He states that the P-Tac louvers were very hard to conceal and it really exacerbated that scale of the building. You can imagine that if this had punched openings every five feet across the building, you would rally sense the scale like you would on these buildings behind us. This sort of muddies the water a bit. It's not apparent how many floors are a part of that volume, and the texture that we've added in the fins helps that dissolves. So, while it is a big building compared to some of the buildings that are adjacent to it, doesn't read it's mass as clearly as some of the buildings behind it.
  38. He says that this elevation has changed a bit – this is our western elevation that faces Market Square. Previously when we presented to you, we were very pure in our thinking about how these three volumes should be presented, so the hotel was presented to you as one framed volume and we had a beam running across here and a beam spanning across this opening of the courtyard of the C-shape of the hotel. We removed that and we were really happy with the effect. What happens now is that the building has a portion which is 60 feet away from Market Square. It starts to read as a few vertical buildings rather than as one large horizontal building and it starts to take on the character of some of the other storefronts and street walls that are our neighbors. Obviously, we are a bigger scale but it's no longer reading as one volume and it's more vertical, so we actually thought that was a nice change.
  39. He states that this is the east elevation if you were able to see it from Wood Street. Again, this is the section of the garage that's reading eight-and-a-half/nine stories that are hidden behind the louver. This is from Fourth, and just to orient everyone, this is the portion of the hotel that peeks through behind the two high rises behind us. This side would be where the dock is, this dark opening could be opened and closed. That's the actual physical dock so we could conceal that. Nothing would be left of that on the property for anyone to see, and again, only when trucks are there will there be anything to see. Ad this side here is where the cars would turn and go up into the garage. If the buildings were removed, then you could squeeze between that five foot buffer zone, this is what you would
- 
-

see.

40. He says that back on Forbes Avenue this has not changed significantly since last time – just the materials. As I was discussing, just the contextual height issues, datum lines, and cornices that are there for existing buildings and neighbors on Forbes – we are drawing on those as context for our building. This line is approximately coherent with what we have for our neighbor on Wood Street. The Wood Street building and Market Square is over here and also directly across from us. So, we're trying to make a change in scale and volume, and also the materiality will be different. At this level it will be very clear glass for the retail so there's not that annoying reflection for the people walking by. Then we have the smaller openings that reflect the smaller character of the openings across the street. This is the entrance into the office lobby, this is the entrance into the hotel, retail on both sides, and this is the piece that represents our second floor retail that will have views out towards Market Square.
  41. He says, this is a rendering now, looking east and you can start to read with what we were trying to pick up on our line here and our line her to break down the scale change and the reading of the building when you're at the pedestrian realm. And this is the office building and you can see that when you look up that the depth of the fins helps conceal some of those louvers that are in the hotel HVAC system. This is the garage, this is the second floor food and beverage, this would be the pre-function and meeting rooms for the hotel, and further down you can see the hotel entry and the office entry. Just to highlight – this is the turn in, the one-way ingress only turn into the garage with corner, store front glass.
  42. He says this is the view from the northeast corner of Wood Street which is not a view you can get unless you're manipulating it with the rendering, but we wanted to show it to you because we think it's pretty descriptive. This would basically be inside the lobby of PNC when it's eventually built. So what you're looking at is the office building on top, and this is the section that's reading as the garage, again, it's the addition of the fins that's helping us remove the feeling of the blank wall.
  43. He states that any fire ratings that are required because they are on the property line have been moved inside the louvers, and the louvers will read as a consistent system all of the way across, so we feel that the concern for the blank wall has really been addressed with the texture that we've added with the fins. This is a view from Market Square. Again you can see that connection across has been severed and these things begin to read as two smaller volumes as opposed to one big volume. It's really changed the scale and the read of the experience of the building from the square. We did not have this up here last time but there has been a lot of interest in having vegetation on the roof and we will have that and we do want it to be legible from the square. It's a great amenity for the building and we think it really adds some character to the project.
  44. He states, that it's just a matter of procedure for you guys to let you know that we may be seeking a high sign. This façade is in HRC's purview – about the first five feet of it, so if it does come up, this would be on your plate to review and we'll work on that with you. The hatched zone represents two percent of that façade. We don't know what it is yet or how it will be detailed, but just to keep in everybody's mind that it will be there, if we actually go through with it.
  45. He says that in closing, this is just sort of a night time view to show you the depiction at dusk when the building is active, when people are done with work and there is activity in
- 
-

the square, where the restaurants are filled up. We're pretty excited about the changes we made and we hope that you are as well. So, I don't have anything else.

46. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any questions from the Commission.
  47. Mr. Serrao says that he would like to open it up to the public.
  48. Ms. Ismail asks if there were any communications that came through staff.
  49. Ms. Quinn indicates that she forwarded an email to the Commissioners and email from Mr. Bischoff.
  50. Mr. Serrao asks if that was the only correspondence that came in.
  51. Ms. Quinn indicates that it was.
  52. Mr. David Bischoff introduces himself and says that he thinks he is the citizen.
  53. Mr. Serrao says that he is.
  54. Mr. Bischoff says that he is the president of the Bischoff Company. He states that first and foremost, development is not a bad thing, development is a very positive thing and the City has benefitted very greatly from the development by all sorts of people. The Piatts are certainly one of them.
  55. Mr. Bischoff states that the question that keeps haunting me about this project isn't whether it's a good idea to develop the site, the question revolves around whether the density that it being crammed on to this site is appropriate for the site. Now, these are beautiful pictures and I'm respectful of all of the work that's been put into this, but I'd like to offer a couple of perspectives for this committee to consider before rendering an opinion. This area right here is 60 feet off of the square. Now this tree right here was put there for a reason is the reality.
  56. Mr. Luckino indicated that that was not true.
  57. Mr. Bischoff says that it's a beautiful tree, but the fact of the matter is that this dimension right here is considerable. Now what they're saying from an architectural standpoint is right. They've broken it down into three buildings, or the appearance of three buildings. But make no mistake that that structure is 60 feet off of the square. To keep things in perspective, the Fairmont Hotel is only a couple of stories higher than their structure. So, the question I keep asking myself is would I find it to be appropriate to put the Fairmont Hotel 60 feet off of the square. I come to the conclusion – no. The other point up that I question, and I use that term carefully, the comment was made that this development was half-way in the HRC district and that this is in the HRC district, but that is not. I think we just heard that a portion of the high-rise is in fact in the HRC district.
  58. Mr. Serrao says that that is correct.
  59. Mr. Bischoff says that it is also his understanding that when a development spans a portion that's in the district and a portion that's not in the district, that we may very well have jurisdiction over the entire development. So I hope that that does not preclude us from exercising that jurisdiction that we have. At the end of the day, as I think through this, I say to myself, this is the problem. I own parking garages, and I can tell you that they are never prettier than the day you put them on a picture.
- 
-

60. Mr. Bischoff says that you can put louvers on a garage, you can do anything you want – it's a garage. And to say, or to suggest that I'm not going to hear this and see this and smell this – in reality, after we get past the pretty picture, it's not the case. It's true that it's a nine story garage above the first two or three floors, so in effect the garage does lift itself above grade 11 to 12 stories. Now again, keeping things in perspective, the Kaufmann's garage is a five-story garage. The garage on the corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Penn is a six-story garage. I have yet to find anybody that in hind sight, which is always 20/20 can look at those above grade garage structures and see them as a positive thing for the City.
61. Mr. Bischoff says that it's not a question of whether this site should be developed, it's whether or not the density which is being pushed on to this site can be supported from the site. And I'm not passing judgment on the economics, that's not really anyone's concern here. The pictures are all very pretty and the scale of the project is nicely shown here, on Fourth Avenue, when you look at the sheer density of this.
62. Mr. Bischoff states that it is true that I own the building right here. But I do not own this and I do not own that. There are roughly 120 windows on the back of the investment building that are operable windows and have been since 1923. On whatever floor we want to call it, from this down, those operable windows will be opening into a garage. A garage that has the exhaust, the fumes, and whatever else. Again, that's a question as to whether that's an appropriate use for this site, not whether the site needs parking, but there's a reason in downtown areas that we don't go above grade. There's a reason we didn't go above grade at Gateway, the Lazarus Building, the Fairmont, PNC. We didn't do it and we shouldn't do it here. Now, the comment was made that this is not an elevation that will be seen. I suggest that if you stand there, it's exactly what you will see.
63. Mr. Bischoff states that when you go up 18 stories you don't have to bring your head back too far to see it. This while it's helpful, I would even go so far as to say it's creative, is not what you're going to see – not when it's built. A garage is never prettier than the day you make a picture of it. Garages get uglier with time and that's not what you're going to see. Now, I did want to point something else out – it is very creative, but it is something we'll need to talk about.
64. Mr. Bischoff says, I would happy to get his own light study if it would be helpful. When an individual stands in the middle of the square, you don't have to stand there very long to see that as 12 noon turns to one and one turns to two, and when you picture a building on this site that it 18 stories high – 180 feet off of the ground – what's represented there is most likely not going to be the case. The shadow that comes off of that building – the sun rises and sets in this direction here – is going to cast a shadow on that square, at that square will be impacted once this building is built. Now, from the standpoint of appropriateness, this is in our jurisdiction right now, I find no examples where a parcel of land in the downtown area is used as an on and off ramp. How many cars are in this garage?
65. Mr. Luckino states 320.
66. Mr. Bischoff says 320 cars going and coming twice a day through a parcel of land. Cars I can't find any other parcel of land in the City that is being used that way. 700 cars a day driving in and out of there – to me that is not an appropriate use for a parcel of land inside a historic district. Using it and an on ramp and an off ramp. It is an entire parcel of land being used as an onramp and an off ramp between two occupied buildings. Now, this edge
- 
-

right here, we all know that this is the outer-most edge of the project. If you want to get a good understanding of what's happening right here, it's not that edge, it's this edge.

67. Mr. Bischoff states that when you go around, this is the point of impact right here, when you take a radius right there, you'll see that the square was developed and was protected through a low-rise environment throughout the entire area. The Fairmont, PNC, and even PPG, everyone respected the square as did the architects of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Place. The high rises frame the border, make no mistake, this is the first time that a high rise is going to be put inside the square. You can call it anything you want, but that high rise is a precedent setting high rise that will forever damage the impact that the pedestrian enjoys on the square. Again, it's a pretty picture. If you could just visualize that tree gone and that tree gone, you'll have a much better understanding of the sheer density that this project has.
  68. Mr. Bischoff says, again, if somebody asks if that is a good site for a hotel, the answer would be that that's a great site for a hotel. If somebody said that that's a good site for an office building – I think it's a great site, and I think all of the merchants around the square would love to see either or. But when you ask if that's a great site for an 11 story parking garage above grade, that's where the project starts to fall apart and where the negative impact on this community is going to reside.
  69. Mr. Serrao thanks Mr. Bischoff and asks if there is any other public comment.
  70. Mr. Nick Nicholas introduces himself and states that he owns nine buildings in Market Square. He says that they've watched what little development impacted the City when Market Square was unveiled two years ago. It's been tremendous. He says he was just down there for lunch, I think everybody agrees that you think you're in another city now when you're down there with all of the activity. The Piatt's have been very instrumental in developing downtown into now what it's becoming. This site is an eyesore. If this development doesn't go through, we're going to be looking at it for at least another five years. Any development that gets done downtown has compromises. Mr. Bischoff is very lucky that he has a building that's grandfathered in and didn't require any parking, but his tenants need parking every day and those from the Benedum-Trees building, and the Benedum building, if a building over looks and impacts the square, it's the backside of the Benedum building that impacts the square. That's a much more negative impact that this beautiful building. It is perfect? No, but nothing's perfect. But, in order to make it work economically there are compromises. The site needs parking and it's prohibitive to put it underground. It would triple the cost per space.
  71. Mr. Nicholas states, I am a business man, I understand this. It's nice to just talk about aesthetics, but aesthetics don't bring jobs and activity to downtown Pittsburgh, buildings like this do and activity like this will. I don't see anything wrong, I think the architects have done a great job in addressing the concerns from the last meeting and I don't think it's going to have that negative an impact on the square at all. That's me comment.
  72. Mr. Serrao thanks him and asks for additional public comment.
  73. Mr. Peter Landis introduces himself and says that he is the owner of Perle – which you just approved, that the nephew of Nick Nicholas as well. I strongly believe that this building is going to help. The rest of the development that the Piatt family and Millcraft have done will help spur the vibrancy of the downtown corridor in this district. In Market Square, we've seen the quality of the streetscapes and the tenants improve since we have
- 
-

gone through will all of the undertakings and all of the new construction and there are other areas right outside of this historical district that are very major eyesores.

74. Mr. Landis states that he knows that that is outside of the HRC's jurisdiction, but that's going to beautify the back and hopefully spur the development of that corridor where Mayor Murphy was trying to get a lot of stuff done further up the corridor as well. And here in Market Square, I think that out of all of the designs I've seen, this is the best one. I do like the addition of the trees on the top of the Gardens there. I mean there have been multiple studies done, I pulled up, think a multi-study research program evaluated how the average consumers and pedestrians respond to the urban forest and on roof tops in business districts in cities of various sizes, and trees positively affect the judgments of visual quality but more importantly, they may affect other consumer responses and behaviors, which will affect all of the other businesses around. This building – like me Uncle Nick said, is helping to spur the whole development down here. It's going to be a destination spot in downtown Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh is really coming along and we can't hinder any more development because we need to keep our young people staying here, keep jobs for them, and keep the City growing. Thank you.
  75. Mr. Serrao thanks Mr. Landis and asks if there is any more public comment.
  76. Ms. Anne Nelson with PHLF introduces herself. She states, that they did testify on April 4<sup>th</sup> at Landmarks owns several buildings in the Market Square area and along Wood Avenue. They do not oppose the demolition of the non-contributing structures along the south side of Forbes Avenue and that they did have concerns with the Millcraft project impacting the Market Square historic district and the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue National Register District, which is being expanded along Wood Avenue. Since the April meeting, Mr. Ziegler has met several times with the Millcraft staff to discuss his concerns and it is our opinion is that the revised design is more elegant than the original design. The following changes have been made that we feel better compliment the historic district.
  77. Ms. Nelson states, Number 1, when looking at the building from Market Square, the width of the shorter section has been decreased to better relate to the Lubin and Smalley Building. Number 2, the vertical fenestration on the back of the building has been replaced with horizontal fenestration so that the building seems to be more in scale with the height of the buildings. The horizontal fenestration also lines up with the fenestration of the Benedum-Trees Building. Number 3, the material has been changed from corten steel with a rusty finish to stainless steel with a silvery-gray finish which is more complimentary to the surrounding building of grey brick, with stone, and off-white terra cotta. Number 4, the corner of the building of Forbes avenue near Market Square has been changed from a blank wall to a glass wall which provides views into the interior from the sidewalk. Number 5, the louvers of the parking garage will be slanted inward as discussed to hide the hanging lights and the garage from the outside and it will be more easily cleaned that way. Number 6, greenery has been added to the terraces that face Market Square. We have to say that we wish more space could exist between the historic buildings of Wood Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and that the garage was not as high as it's being proposed, but we do understand that these solutions to these problems are difficult to make a building economically viable. We are also sensitive to the needs of the surrounding property owners and hope that Millcraft can work with those owners to address those concerns as they did with ours. Thank you.
- 
-

78. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any other public comments.
79. Mr. Bischoff introduces himself again. He states that he probably agrees more with what Mr. Nicholas said rather than disagrees with. But the point that I'd like to make is that first of all, this committee isn't part of the economic development of the City. My understanding is that our jurisdiction is to consider what's appropriate and what's inappropriate – that the economics fall to somebody else. Nobody is suggesting that this project isn't worth of being developed, the reality is that the benefit of these types of meetings is to place the onus on the developer to get it right. And so the question I think we all have is, did they get it right? Necessity breeds a lot of innovation and there's no doubt in my mind that we can all have our cake and eat it too, but we don't have to have an 11 story garage. It's not appropriate, we don't have to have it, and there's a way around it. That the site needs developed, we all agree on that, but I don't want to confuse the issue with whether or not it's appropriate or not and with the appropriateness of using a parcel for an on ramp for 700 cars a day for downtown office buildings in a historic district. Again, I just don't think it's appropriate. Now there's another thing that I wanted to ask for your consideration on. These are difficult decisions and ones not to be taken lightly and in many of the situations I've been involved in, the request has been that the plan is created and the funding is secured before anyone asks for permission. Asking for permission proceeds those two things taking place is somewhat counter-productive. One thing I would ask this committee is whether they would find it appropriate to either deny this request all together or postpone the decision until such time as proof of funding is displayed so that we're not simply spinning our wheels in this committee. Thank you.
80. Mr. Serrao thanks Mr. Bischoff.
81. Mr. Chad Wheatley with Millcraft Industries introduces himself. He says, I guess first and foremost, just because that comment was proposed most recently, I'll address that. I think in this case, it would be counter-productive to not have approval prior to financing. I don't believe it would even be feasible to get financing without prior approvals – knowing that we can realistically build what we plan to build. I just wanted to note that we have held public meetings, we have been through CDAP as of yesterday. I believe that the general consensus, and Andrew and Kate are here as well, the general consensus was very positive feedback from both the public meeting and CDAP.
82. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any questions or comments from the commission members.
83. Mr. Serrao says that he will make one comment, that what came up as CDAP – I am on CDAP as well – was the treatment on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue of the loading dock and the on/off ramp, if you want to call it that. There were questions then and that is one of my comments now. And one of the issues I brought up in this series is how is that handled on the street? Right now it becomes an alley way versus 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue being a very significant architectural street. What kind of screening, etc? What kind of help can be done to close that off but make that more integral with the façade of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue? So, that's the only comment I have.
84. Mr. Jennings comments that it currently a surface parking lot anyway, so I don't know how actually just having – my opinion is that just having traffic lanes in and out of there might be less obtrusive of visually cluttered looking than having surface parking out there. That's one way of looking at it. My other comment as far as us approving or not approving based on their financing, one again gets to the impact of the site, which we're not voting on anyway and it wouldn't have any bearing on us whether they have their financing or not. I
- 
-

**Forbes Avenue TBD**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

do favor the new design over the design we were initially given two months ago. I think this is a cleaner design and it doesn't look as obtrusive on the site and it is a big building but it does give it a lighter feel than the original building.

85. Ms. Ismail states that in the last design she thought that it was a little bit bulky, but given the new design, and given the testimonies we've heard, there's been a lot of looking to the neighbors, trying to ascertain what their concerns are and so forth. And I definitely like this design as well as the proposed material as compared to the darker materials proposed earlier. When it comes to proportion and massing, again, we are confined to the review of the historic district. I believe that Planning Commission would review that part of it.
  86. Mr. Jennings states that he agrees that massing would be a Planning Commission's responsibility. It will still impact what our vote would be, but it still falls within the Planning Commission.
  87. Mr. Serrao make a procedural comment that if you do get a sign, it would have to come back. He also states that he likes the new design better. It has a much lighter and cleaner feel. I think that you've done a great job breaking up the mass from the first time around.
  88. Mr. Serrao asks again if there are any other questions or comments from the Commission.
  89. Mr. Serrao says hearing none, I would like to entertain a motion.
  90. Mr. Jennings says that that with no other questions or comments – we don't actually have a street address for this yet other than Forbes Avenue.
  91. Ms. McClelland says that it is TBD
  92. Mr. Serrao says that there is no address.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

93. Mr. Jennings makes a motion that the Forbes Avenue – with the address to be announced – to be determined, with the revised design as presented at today's meeting and to also include the information that any signage to be included in the future need to come back to the board and that any changes or finishes would need to go through Staff.
  94. Ms. Ismail says she would like to add that the screening should be worked through zoning.
  95. Ms. Quinn states that she has some concern about the scale of the project.
  96. Mr. Jennings also notes that there may also be some code considerations related to the garage screening, and the amount of openness in that screening, so that may also be altered by building code. If that does change it might have to come back to us as well.
  97. Mr. Serrao says he agrees with that and that we will have to find a way to word that.
  98. Mr. Jennings agree and states that...if any building finished need to be altered based on building code requirements, other than what was presented today, that should come back to us for additional review.
  99. Mr. Serrao agrees that that is good wording. And states, basically if you change it form
- 
-

***Forbes Avenue TBD***

***Market Square Historic District***

---

---

anything you see here, you will need to come back to us.

100. Mr. Jennings says, even if it is based on building code requirements.

101. Mr. Serrao asks for a second

102. Mr. Sheffield seconds

103. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote

104. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.

---

---

**218 and 228 Forbes Avenue**      *Market Square Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**

Millcraft Industries  
95 W. Beau Street, Suite 600  
Washington, Pa 15301

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block:

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Arquitectonica  
100 Fifth Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10011

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/16/12

---

---

**Proposed Changes:** Demolition to grade

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Serrao states that these are private demos and not tied to the City, so no idem inspector will be present.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any public comment.
  3. He indicated that previous comments do not need to be reentered at this time. He also asks if they are part of the development just reviewed.
  4. Mr. Wheatley indicates that they are.
  5. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any questions from the Commission.
  6. Mr. Serrao states that he would like to entertain a motion.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Jennings makes a motion for the approval for the demolition of 218 Forbes Avenue and 228 Forbes Avenue as a private demolition for the development of the new Forbes Avenue – the Gardens at Market Square project as previously approved.
  8. Mr. Sheffield seconds.
  9. Mr. Serrao asks for a vote
  10. All commissioners vote in favor.....Motion passes unanimously.
- 
-

**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

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report – June 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	12-061	4-Jun-12	3438 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	In-kind replacement of driveway and garage door.
Y	12-062	6-Jun-12	709 Brighton Road	Allegheny West	Painting
N	12-063	7-Jun-12	1010 Cedar Avenue	Deuschtown	Restoration of the front porch and repair of the windows
N	12-064	7-Jun-12	279 Fisk Street	Individual	Window replacement, chimney alteration, and HVAC upgrade
N	12-065	7-Jun-12	25 Market Square	Market Square	Non-compliant signage
N	12-066	7-Jun-12	21 Market Place	Market Square	Non-Compliant signage
N	12-067	7-Jun-12	3941 O Hara	Oakland Civic Center	Non-compliant window replacement
N	12-068	7-Jun-12	1401 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Proposed rooftop deck
N	12-069	11-Jun-12	218 Forbes Avenue	Market Square	Demolition to grade
N	12-070	11-Jun-12	228 Forbes Avenue	Market Square	Demolition to grade
N	12-071	11-Jun-12	TBD Forbes Avenue	Market Square	Construction of a mixed use high rise development
Y	12-072	11-Jun-12	1114 Liverpool Street	Manchester	Fence extension
Y	12-073	20-Jun-12	1425 Pennsylvania Avenue	Manchester	In-kind garage repair/replacement
Y	12-074	20-Jun-12	1102 W North Avenue	Manchester	Painting

Y	12-075	21-Jun-12	1401 Columbus Avenue	Manchester	In-kind repair and cleaning
Y	12-076	21-Jun-12	1109 Liverpool Street	Manchester	In-kind repair and cleaning
Y	12-077	21-Jun-12	1301 Columbus Avenue	Manchester	In-kind repair and cleaning
Y	12-078	25-Jun-12	1416 N Franklin Street	Manchester	Painting