



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 September 5, 2012
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>
Noor Ismail	Shelly Majcen	Jeffery Cieply
John Jennings	Sharon Spooner	Andy Dunmire
Linda McClellan		Evelyn Jones
Ernie Hogan		Bill Bates
Joseph Serrao		Jennifer McDowell
		Anne Dunmire
		Jim McMullan
		Tim Frew
		Ken Holmes
		Andrew Moss
		Robert Loos
		Bob Russ
		Robert Ruhlofl
		Rachel Rue
		Carol Peterson
		Katie Laforest

Old Business- Discussion of representation at September 20, 2012 Mexican War Streets Expansion meeting. Ms. Majcen and Ms. Ismail explain that the item on the table is the decision of who if anyone will represent the Historic Review Commission at the meeting. Ms. Ismail states that normally Mr. Hogan would be the one to attend. Mr. Serrao proposes to get back to staff and distribute an email in order to decide who would like to volunteer. Ms. Ismail states she will probably be there anyway in an official capacity.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the June 2012 minutes, Ms. McClellan notes that her name was misspelled throughout but otherwise she didn't see any problems. Mr. Serrao notes the correction. Mr. Jennings moves to approve the minutes. Ms. McClellan seconds the motion. All members vote in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the August 2012 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Jennings moves to approve. Ms. McClellan seconds the motion, all members voted in favor.

Other:

1. Mr. Serrao asks if there is any additional information on St. Nicholas. Ms. Ismail states that as far as she understands the city is appealing the decision, but she has not heard back from the legal department.
2. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Jennings if there had been any follow up with the building inspector on the Manchester property with new windows installed behind the old windows [1101 W. North]. Mr. Hogan states that he took pictures.
3. Mr. Jennings indicates that he had discussed it with Ms. Sarah Quinn. He states that he and Ms. Quinn thought that if the new windows were painted to match the existing window color they wouldn't be quite as obvious; right now the new windows are white.
4. Mr. Hogan states that it's odd that the owner spent the money to replicate the windows on the first floor, but then "cheated" with vinyl windows on the upper floor.
5. Mr. Jennings says, per his conversation with Ms. Quinn, if the vinyl was painted so there was less contrast, it would be acceptable.
6. Mr. Hogan states he believes it sets a bad standard.
7. Ms. Ismail talks about pushback with regards to the HRC and what its purview is. She states that the ordinance doesn't require "improvement", but covers any changes that are made. However, she states she was not involved in the discussion so is not sure about this case.
8. Mr. Jennings states that the discussion was very short, what was discussed before was basically it.
9. Mr. Hogan asks if it is a fire hazard; Mr. Jennings and Mr. Serrao say no.
10. Ms. McClellan asks for clarification of the issue. Mr. Hogan recounts that the applicant originally asked for approval to replace existing windows with vinyl windows and was denied. The applicant has now installed the vinyl windows behind the existing windows.
11. Mr. Jennings adds that the façade is still the original, but the issue is that the vinyl windows are white and very visible. He reviews the painting solution that was previously discussed and deemed acceptable.
12. Mr. Serrao states that this is a loophole; Mr. Hogan states that he feels that it is within the Commission's privy to decide if it is or is not acceptable. He also states he would be inclined to accept the windows if they were removable storm windows for use during the winter, since those are often covered and acceptable by the principles and guidelines of the historic districts.
13. Ms. Ismail asks if a letter has gone out to the applicant; Mr. Jennings indicates that the discussion happened some time ago; he clarifies with Ms. Ismail that at the time the new windows had not been painted and the recommendation was to be that the applicant do so.
14. Ms. Ismail gives the option that if Commission wants to withdraw the approval, they can wait until Ms. Quinn returns and pursue a course of action at that time.

15. Mr. Serrao asks if a Certificate of Appropriateness has already been issued; Mr. Jennings is not sure that it has been and Mr. Hogan does not think that it has been either.
16. Ms. Ismail recommends that Commission finds out what has been done to date and devises a course of action from there; all agree and Mr. Hogan requests that this be an item of followup for the next meeting. Address was determined to be 1201 W. North [it is actually 1102 W. North].

Adjourn:

Mr. Hogan motions to adjourn.

Mr. Jennings seconds.

All members voted in favor.

Motion passes.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

1500 Bingham Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:
1500 Bingham Partners, LLC
223 Fourth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-99

Applicant:
Premier Architecture
1273 Washington Pike, No 202
Bridgeville, Pa 15017

Inspector: Pat Brown

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 6/21/12

National Register Status:

Listed: X

Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Renovation and construction of an additional floor

Discussion:

1. Mr. Hogan asks the applicant to come to the podium.
 2. Mr. Jim McMullen comes to the podium and introduces himself. He advises he is the principal of the architectural firm that has been retained as designer for the project.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for an update of what has been worked on since the project appeared before the Commission a month or so ago.
 4. Mr. McMullen recounts that at that time the reaction to the project was favorable, but they were asked to come back with more specific information on materials selection. They also met with the Local Review Committee to get their input and obtained a letter of support from them.
 5. Mr. Hogan prompts Mr. McMullen to outline the project. Mr. McMullen states that the property is an industrial property which the pending owner would like to renovate into rental units as well as an ownership unit. Existing parking on the ground floor will be retained and the dwellings will be on the existing second floor and a third floor which will be added. They intend to reuse as much of the existing structure and materials as possible, and the new construction will be of contrasting materials, which they have additional information about today.
 6. Mr. Hogan recalls that the Commission had some concerns about the windows.
 7. Mr. McMullen advises that they have encountered some pushback from the owner around changing the windows in the ownership unit. The owner is specific about keeping the original design for added privacy and reduction of street noise.
 8. Mr. Hogan requests to talk about the new materials.
 9. Mr. McMullen states that the existing material consists of two kinds of brick. Their intention
-
-

1500 Bingham Street

East Carson Street Historic District

with the new materials is not to match the brick and blur the lines between old and new, but to use contrasting panels to highlight the difference. There will not be much other variety in the materials.

10. Mr. Hogan mentions known issues with the brick in this building; he recalls there is split brick attached to underlying brick.
 11. Mr. McMullen says no, the brick appears to be full face brick, but adds that there are condition issues that they won't fully be able to analyze until they start work.
 12. Mr. Hogan mentions his concern that it is an unpainted building and that they will have to make it work without masking anything with paint.
 13. Mr. McMullen advises they will not be painting the brick and that they will replace and reuse the brick after completing any maintenance.
 14. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any other questions or anything else Mr. McMullen would like to bring forth. Since no, Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 15. Mr. Bob Russ from the LRC introduces himself. He has the concern that once work begins they may find the building in worse shape than they thought, and he wants to encourage them to come back if the situation changes so that other materials can be considered to complete the restoration.
 16. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Russ if the LRC accepts the windows; Mr. Russ says they do, in part because the building is far enough back from E. Carson that they consider it to be non-contributing and can give greater latitude to the design.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any other public comment. Since there is none, he acknowledges a letter dated September 3, 2012 from the LRC to the historic planner Ms. Quinn, which raises some of the same issues heard in the presentation from the LRC.
-
-

Motion:

18. Mr. Serrao motions to approve application as submitted with the caveat that they would need to come back if any major changes occur.
 19. Mr. Jennings seconds.
 20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all members are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1922 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:
GB Properties DA, LP
101 Freeport Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15215

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-K-07

Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:
Eat n' Park Hospitality Grp.
285 E. Waterfront Drive
Homestead, Pa 15120

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 8/17/12

National Register Status:

Listed: X

Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade and side elevation alterations

Discussion:

1. Mr. Andy Dunmire comes to the podium and introduces himself. He is with the applicant Eat n' Park Hospitality Group. He also introduces Jennifer McDowell and Anne Dunmire from the design firm Quad3. He states that they will walk the Commission through the updated proposal that has taken into account concerns presented by the South Side Development Review Committee.
 2. Ms. Dunmire steps to the podium. She explains that Hello Bistro is a new concept for Eat n' Park restaurants. She states that the proposed site is adjacent to a Pittsburgh Parking Authority parking lot. The restaurant will occupy the first floor of the building with part of the basement as prep area. The upper two and a half floors are a residential apartment unit. They are looking to maintain parking for the residential unit in the back of the building as well as adding a refuse area for the restaurant. They are going to maintain historic features of the front façade and will be adding an exit in the back for egress purposes. She explains that their client is also interested in adding an entrance through the side wall from the parking lot. They are on the agenda for the Zoning Board of Adjustments this month with regards to this; they are also looking to see if there is already an easement in place on this side of the building as there is a fire escape there providing egress from the residential unit, and if so if that easement could be used to allow the side entrance as well. The applicant also wants to involve a certain amount of branding in the design. She says that there was concern expressed when they met with the SSDRC that the original design seemed too applied to the side of the building, so they have made some changes which are reflected in the new front and side elevations at the back of the packet. The building has several additions, and the applicant and design firm were encouraged to move the new side entrance to the center addition as well as reduce the amount of applied material. Regarding the front façade, she says that they were under the impression that the entire thing is covered under historic guidelines but found out that the curtain wall portion is considered non-contributing.
-
-

1922 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

3. Mr. Hogan comments that that portion was not original.
 4. Ms. Dunmire continues that they were encouraged to move some of the branding design and materials to the front façade while keeping with the original massing and the rest of the street. As far as materials she mentions that they looked at good and bad examples from the rest of the neighborhood for guidance.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks Ms. Dunmire about the storefront materials.
 6. Ms. Dunmire says they would paint the existing wood band, crown molding, and other decorative elements. They are adding a wood panel system used at their Hello Bistro in Oakland. The windows will be a custom-made vertical folding system that will open.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks if they are creating a corner entrance.
 8. Ms. Dunmire explains that there already is one existing on the building.
 9. Mr. Jennings asks if they have spoken with building inspection about the property line.
 10. Ms. Dunmire indicates that they had a conversation with Eric Harliss who said that they would need a variance and to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
 11. Mr. Jennings clarifies that she is speaking about the Board of Appeals.
 12. Ms. Dunmire confirms that she is.
 13. Mr. Jennings asks if they have applied to the Board of Appeals yet.
 14. Ms. Dunmire says no.
 15. Mr. Jennings says that there may be some issues with the side entrance and additional windows.
 16. Ms. Dunmire explains that those are just punched openings and not actual windows. She continued on to say that in her conversation with Mr. Harliss he said that since the side entrance is not a required means of egress that it wouldn't be out of the question to get a variance.
 17. Mr. Jennings states that he is more concerned about openings along the property line.
 18. Mr. Hogan states that it is not in the HRC's privy, but that it will be an issue.
 19. Ms. Dunmire believes Eat n' Park is in discussions with the Parking Authority about the matter.
 20. Mr. Jennings and Mr. Hogan state that it is not in the HRC's privy to have this discussion at this time.
 21. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification that the storefront would have retractable glass.
 22. Ms. Dunmire confirms this.
 23. Mr. Hogan also wants to confirm they are keeping the banner across the top.
 24. Ms. Dunmire clarifies that the transoms above and the base would be fixed and the center portion would be retractable.
 25. Mr. Serrao asks what the bottom material would be.
 26. Ms. Dunmire says it would be metal similar to a material used at the other Hello Bistro
-
-

location.

27. The Commission reviews pictures of the materials.
 28. Ms. Dunmire states that they are trying to keep the massing of the existing storefront, including the recessed entrance and the base, middle, and transom portions.
 29. Mr. Serrao asks if they are painting the façade.
 30. Ms. Dunmire confirms and provides the paint samples for the Commission to review.
 31. Mr. Hogan asks if they are going to repaint the side.
 32. Ms. Dunmire says that the owner is looking to add a painted mural on the side of the building. The existing building is already painted.
 33. Mr. Serrao asks if the rear will have a garage door.
 34. Ms. Dunmire says that it will have a single car garage door and also a separate door for the refuse area. She indicates that they changed the design after speaking with the SSDRC, as they found out the upper part of the back was in poor condition.
 35. Mr. Hogan comments that the new design is good. He clarifies which were the old and new proposals for the side of the building. He asks if there were any other comments or questions from the Commission.
 36. Mr. Serrao clarifies that basically they are going to clean up the rear of the building.
 37. Ms. Dunmire confirms.
 38. Since there is nothing else from the HRC, Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 39. Mr. Bob Russ from the LRC steps to the podium. He indicates that the LRC still considers this a work in progress. They had not seen the changes made to the design, but they do recommend conceptual approval of the direction the design is headed. They see the 1989 storefront as being replaceable, but they are looking for continuity in the redesign. They have reservations about the side entrance and do not want to see that precedent set. They do not want any signage added.
 40. Mr. Hogan asks for any other comment. There is none so he introduces two letters to the record, a letter from the LRC acknowledging non-support and a letter from Jason Roth of the SSDRC.
 41. Mr. Hogan asks for the HRC opinion. He thinks overall the design is headed in the right direction and the materials are acceptable. He still worries about the precedent the side elevation may set.
 42. Mr. Serrao asks for clarification on the front façade materials. He also believes that they will have bigger issues with getting the easement for the side, but that the revised version of the design is a big improvement. He also thinks the cleaning up of the front and back of the building is good.
 43. Mr. Jennings also speaks about the easement issue. He suggests that the motion contain a condition that if anything should change with the design, they would have to come back to the HRC.
-
-

1922 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

44. Mr. Hogan agrees.
 45. Ms. Ismail and Mr. Dunmire ask for clarification.
 46. Mr. Hogan says that the approval would not include the side entrance.
 47. Mr. Jennings clarifies that his suggestion was to approve the proposal as submitted, but if anything changes from there they would need to come back.
 48. Ms. Ismail mentions that this approval would not include the signage.
-
-

Motion:

49. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve revised proposal as submitted, with the condition that if anything should change with the side elevation they need to come back.
 50. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 51. Ms. McClellan advises they need to amend the motion to not include signage.
 52. Mr. Jennings amends the motion to not include the signage on the side.
 53. Mr. Serrao seconds again.
 54. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

3340 Liberty Avenue

Pittsburgh HRC – September 5, 2012
Historic Iron City Brewery

Owner:
Collier Development
5020 Thomas Run Road
Presto, Pa 15071

Ward: 6th

Lot and Block: 23-A-300

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:
Tim Frew
980 Ridge Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15202

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 7/12/12

National Register Status:	Listed:	Eligible:	X
----------------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------

Proposed Changes: Installation of streetlights, painting, cleaning, re-roofing

Discussion:

1. Mr. Tim Frew of Collier Development comes to the podium and introduces himself. He states the first building he will talk about is building A, for which he is proposing roof replacement. The roof is deteriorating; it is a concrete roof that at some point had trusses put over it, then sheeting and tar paper, and then it was tarred. They propose to tear all this off down to the concrete roof, insulate it, and install a new rubber roof.
 2. Mr. Jennings asks where the concrete roof is in the picture.
 3. Mr. Frew says it is under the added roofing system visible in the picture.
 4. Mr. Jennings asks if the trusses are over the concrete roof.
 5. Mr. Frew confirms this.
 6. Mr. Hogan wants to confirm that none of this is visible from the street.
 7. Mr. Frew confirms.
 8. The next building Mr. Frew wants to discuss is building S for which they are also proposing roof replacement.
 9. Ms. Majcen first wants to confirm that building A was in the initial packet submitted to staff. It is confirmed that it was included.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Frew to define all the buildings and lettering that will be included in the proposal.
 11. Mr. Frew indicates they will be building A, building S which is the office building, and all the buildings along Sassafraus.
 12. The Committee discusses the fact that the lettering has changed several times, and followup needs to be done to determine if the original buildings and lettering involved are in the files.
-
-

3340 Liberty Avenue

13. Mr. Frew says that the current lettering and map match Historic Review documentation.
14. Mr. Frew starts over with the list: buildings A, S, B, O, P, N, M, and U.
15. Mr. Hogan asks for confirmation that this is 8 buildings.
16. Mr. Frew confirms and apologizes for the confusion.
17. Mr. Hogan recaps work on building A and asks what is being done on building S.
18. Mr. Frew explains that this building currently has a slate roof that can be seen from the street. They are asking for approval to replace it with a polymer simulated slate product.
19. Mr. Hogan questions if the roof can't be saved.
20. Mr. Frew says the slate is damaged and leaking. He also states that the flashings and metal on the roof are in good shape and will be coated. All decorative work would be put back. He notes that some of the decorative ridge is missing and has been replaced by copper, and the options they have considered to deal with that would be either to make them all copper or to try and match the ridge in the simulated product.
21. Mr. Hogan asks if the box gutters will remain.
22. Mr. Frew says yes, and adds that it is important to his company that everything on the front street side remains as original as possible.
23. Mr. Serrao and Mr. Hogan confirm building B is next up for discussion.
24. Mr. Frew explains that there are a series of silos in this building that they would like to remove. They would remove the roof and take them out that way.
25. Mr. Serrao advises that the Committee is having a hard time following the presentation and wants to confirm that they are looking at the right picture.
26. Mr. Hogan clarifies which picture shows the roof in question and asks if it is a truss roof.
27. Mr. Frew says yes, it is a truss roof with corrugated metal and rubber on the top. They won't need to remove the trusses to remove the tanks and therefore it will keep the building structurally intact.
28. Mr. Serrao asks what they will be replacing the tanks with.
29. Mr. Frew indicates that it will be determined by the master planning process they are going through right now.
30. Mr. Hogan asks that since they are now going to have a three story opening in this building if they have had an engineer look at that to see if it will still be structurally sound.
31. Mr. Frew states they did and that it is in the engineering report that the tanks are not structural.
32. Mr. Serrao asks if they are going to repair the roof.
33. Mr. Frew says they will be repairing the roof in like and kind, in corrugated metal with black rubber on top.
34. Mr. Hogan asks if the next building up for discussion is O.
35. Mr. Frew clarifies that buildings O, P, M, N and U are all part of the warehouse painting along

3340 Liberty Avenue

Sassafrass. He states they are all concrete block buildings.

36. Mr. Hogan states that some of these warehouses are cinderblock that was added later.
 37. Mr. Frew confirms.
 38. Mr. Hogan states that one of the buildings pictured is an original brick building.
 39. Mr. Frew states that the lower part of that building is cinderblock.
 40. Mr. Serrao asks which building that is.
 41. Mr. Frew says it is the old stable building, the letter assigned is M.
 42. Mr. Serrao clarifies that M is the standalone original building in this group and that buildings O, P, N, U are newer, from the 40's, 50's, or 60's.
 43. Mr. Frew states that this request is to paint everything on these buildings that is cement block and corrugated metal. He states that most of the buildings have already been painted with the exception of building O, which has graffiti and paint in patches where the graffiti was covered up.
 44. Mr. Hogan asks if this building is all cinderblock.
 45. Mr. Frew confirms that it is.
 46. Mr. Hogan asks about the color.
 47. Mr. Frew points out the Dapper Tan color in the packet.
 48. Mr. Hogan asks what else they are proposing to do with the warehouse buildings.
 49. Mr. Frew says that they would like to cover the windows from the outside with a polycarbonate enclosure system.
 50. Mr. Jennings clarifies that they would be putting this over the top of the existing windows.
 51. Mr. Frew says yes.
 52. Mr. Serrao confirms they are keeping the existing structure.
 53. Mr. Hogan comments that these are all metal windows and asks if they can't just be reglazed.
 54. Mr. Frew says quite a few windows are gone and some don't work and are rusted. They are doing this right now just to protect the buildings and clean them up.
 55. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification that for building N, they are proposing to paint and cover the windows, but they will not be removing any of the infrastructure.
 56. Mr. Frew says yes, the enclosure system slides over the existing window on a track attached to the surrounding brick or block.
 57. Mr. Hogan asks what the next area is for discussion.
 58. Mr. Frew indicates that sidewalk lighting is the next thing he wanted to talk about. His company has removed the lights along Liberty Avenue and will be reinstalling them. He says the lights are damaged and don't work.
 59. Mr. Hogan asks if this is public right-of-way lighting.
 60. Mr. Frew answers that his company has talked to the city about ownership of the lights but the
-
-

3340 Liberty Avenue

city was unclear about who owns them. He states that the city said the lights aren't needed anymore but if his company wanted to replace and relight them they could. He says he will speak with Mr. Jennings and depending on what BBI says they can either store them or put them back, but they are putting them back anyway now.

61. Mr. Jennings says it is not up to the BBI but would be up to the Commission if they could be removed. He says he will have an inspector come out, because they were removed without approval.
 62. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any photos of the lights.
 63. Mr. Frew points out the images in the packet. He shows where the globe on one light is broken and the base has damage as well. He says each one of the lights has some type of issue like that.
 64. Mr. Jennings asks how many light fixtures they removed.
 65. Mr. Frew states that there were eight of these fixtures but three were already missing, so they took down five.
 66. Mr. Jennings asks if they are asking permission to store the lights on site for future reuse.
 67. Mr. Frew states he doesn't know if they can be reused because of the damage. He also talks about an issue they had with power to the building and to the lights.
 68. Mr. Serrao asks if they have power now.
 69. Mr. Frew says yes, not to the lights but to a central location where they would just have to jump in power for the lights.
 70. Mr. Jennings remarks that they would need electrical permits for that if they own the lights.
 71. Mr. Frew says they still have to find out who owns them. He states that the reason this is included in the proposal is that his company asked the URA about street front or façade money and light replacement was one of the things they wanted to add to that request if it turns out the lights are theirs.
 72. Mr. Hogan asks if Liberty Avenue is a PennDOT roadway.
 73. Mr. Jennings doesn't believe so because in the picture city street cleaning signs are visible along the street.
 74. Mr. Frew says that permits they have received did not identify it as a state route.
 75. The Commission confirms it is a city street not a state route.
 76. Mr. Frew asks if the city does own the lights, would the HRC still need to approve work on them.
 77. Mr. Jennings says if the lights are city property, then taking them down would be trespassing on city property.
 78. Mr. Hogan says if the lights were ornamental lights added by the brewery, it would be the HRC's privity to review them as part of the building. However, he says the first thing is to find out who owns them.
 79. Mr. Frew directs the Commission to the smokestack section of the packet. He says they are
-
-

proposing to remove the top fifteen feet, cap it, clean it, and put new lightning suppression on it. He says the stainless steel cap would not be visible. He says they would do a structural inspection also.

80. Mr. Hogan asks how tall the smokestack is.
 81. Mr. Frew says it is 208 feet tall.
 82. Mr. Hogan asks if they would retain the ornamental topping of the smokestack.
 83. Mr. Frew says no. He says that this concludes his requests.
 84. Mr. Hogan says they need to go back, as he doesn't have any notes on buildings O, P, U or M.
 85. Mr. Frew says this would be the painting of the cinderblock.
 86. Mr. Hogan asks to talk about building M.
 87. Mr. Frew says this is the stable building with cinderblock infill. He says they just want to paint the cinderblock to cover graffiti.
 88. Ms. McClellan asks if that is also what they are also doing with O, P, N, and U.
 89. Mr. Frew says yes.
 90. Mr. Jennings asks if they are painting the metal and roofing.
 91. Mr. Frew says they will be painting the corrugated metal panels but not the roofing.
 92. Mr. Hogan tries to recap and realizes brick cleaning on building S was not discussed.
 93. Mr. Jennings confirms that they were looking to use an alternative cleaning method.
 94. Mr. Frew says yes and points it out in the packet.
 95. Mr. Hogan asks if this method is approved by the National Park Service.
 96. Mr. Frew says he does not know. He says the brick is painted but it is starting to wear and dirt has gotten into the brick so it will be difficult to clean. He says they want to restore the building and don't want painted brick or stone, and he says their masonry experts confirm this cleaning method will accomplish what they want.
 97. Mr. Serrao asks who their masonry expert is.
 98. Mr. Frew says it is Cost Company.
 99. Ms. McClellan confirms they don't have a written report from them.
 100. Mr. Frew says no, it was just a verbal report.
 101. Mr. Hogan doesn't know if this method would be acceptable. He asks if there is anything Mr. Frew would like to add. Since no, he asks for public comment.
 102. Ms. Carol Peterson steps to the podium and introduces herself. She is representing Lawrenceville Stakeholders. She says they are concerned by some of the proposed changes because they have not had a chance to work with the site ownership on a master plan. It was their understanding that there would be nothing applied for until that process was complete. She says that they are concerned that the whole process is done correctly so that possible URA as well as federal and state funding is not jeopardized. With regards to specific alterations, she says that that slate roof is a big concern. She says the imitation product will be too
-
-

3340 Liberty Avenue

recognizable and the slate roof should be repaired and replaced in kind. She also says the smokestack and its ornamental details should be repaired. She talks about the proposed cleaning and that it may be too harsh for the porous brick and other materials. She states that they are not clear about the covering of the windows, as the presentation specifies replacement rather than just covering. She says they are OK with the proposed painting, but states that some of these buildings even though they are concrete block should be considered historic, as the site's historical significance extends to 1960. She states they are very concerned that the old light fixtures were taken out without permission, and that the community does not yet trust the owners to do the right thing with regards to this site.

103. Ms. Majcen states that the three minute time limit is expired.

104. Ms. Peterson mentions in conclusion that they believe the stable building M is also important.

105. Mr. Hogan asks for the next commenter.

106. Mr. Moss steps to the podium and introduces himself. He is also a member of Stakeholders. He says he just wants to add that they would appreciate more advance notice and more detailed information from the property owners as they are still a little unclear on what exactly is being proposed.

107. Mr. Hogan asks for any other comments, there are none.

108. Ms. McClellan asks if they can establish exactly what is before them.

109. Mr. Hogan states that the application as submitted is very generic, with very few photos. He thinks that they should come back with a more detailed proposal, but they can proceed with some approvals. He says that Mr. Jennings will need to take a close look at the engineer's report before issuing a permit.

110. Mr. Jennings agrees, and says that for building A, he would like to see the roof repaired as soon as possible.

111. Ms. McClellan adds they could approve the painting.

112. Mr. Hogan agrees.

113. Mr. Serrao agrees about the building A roof and also the painting and windows as long as the original windows stay intact. He wants to comment for the record that the submission was extremely hard to follow, and next time they should have a logical progression to what they are requesting. He has doubts about the imitation roofing material for the office building, and thinks they should fix the smokestack instead of taking it down. He commends them for wanting to secure and protect the buildings. He doesn't have an issue with the roof removal to remove the tanks but wants to see the roof replaced as soon as possible.

114. Mr. Jennings agrees.

115. Ms. Ismail comments that they need to proceed with the motions in a logical sequence for the record.

116. Mr. Hogan proposes that they should move things forward to prevent further deterioration, but at the same time he doesn't want to disrupt the existing architecture and heritage of the site. He believes the Commission can move forward with some limited approvals.

3340 Liberty Avenue

Motion:

117. Mr. Hogan recommends motion to approve, for building A, removal of the existing rubber membrane roof and truss system down to the original concrete roof, installation of foam insulation, and addition of a new rubber roof on top, with all parapet walls and clay capping to be restored.
 118. Mr. Serrao makes the motion.
 119. Mr. Jennings seconds.
 120. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
 121. Mr. Hogan moves on to building S. He says that the approach to both the cleaning and the roof need to be further examined. He is not sure if the roofing material is acceptable by Department of Interior or city standards, and comments that none of the ornamental details are replicable in that product. He recommends restoration of the roof and suggests that they come back with other alternatives. He would also like more information on the cleaning materials, and advised that since after it is cleaned it may need to be painted, that they should come back and seek approval for everything all at once for this building.
 122. Mr. Hogan moves on to building B. He has some concerns with the engineer's report. He is inclined to approve but that Building Inspection would need to take a careful look at the structure before issuing a permit. He is also concerned that they would have to come back for this building if pointing or anything else is deemed necessary.
 123. Mr. Frew states that all the buildings need to be repointed, but that is another issue and they are aware of that.
 124. Mr. Serrao motions to approve that the existing roof be removed so that the storage tanks can be removed, and that corrugated metal and rubber roof is replaced in kind.
 125. Mr. Hogan brings up the engineering notes and clay capping that would need to be restored.
 126. Mr. Serrao amends the motion.
 127. Mr. Jennings clarifies that amendment would specify that all structural reinforcement is reviewed by Building Inspection, which it would have to be anyway.
 128. Mr. Hogan clarifies that motion is amended to include restoration of clay capping and review by BBI of engineer's report.
 129. Ms. McClellan seconds the motion.
 130. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
 131. Mr. Hogan moves on to buildings O, P, U, and N. He proposes a motion to approve the painting of concrete block and corrugated metal only using Dapper Tan. No unpainted surfaces are to be painted. The windows would be covered with removable polycarbonate enclosures, leaving the existing windows intact to be evaluated later.
 132. Mr. Serrao make the motion.
 133. Mr. Jennings seconds.
 134. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

3340 Liberty Avenue

-
-
135. Mr. Hogan proposes to defer action on the lighting until ownership is determined. He also proposes to defer any action on building M except repainting of the cinderblock.
 136. Mr. Frew clarifies that is all they were looking to do with M.
 137. Mr. Hogan proposes a motion to approve painting of cinderblock only of building M using Dapper Tan.
 138. Mr. Serrao makes the motion.
 139. Mr. Jennings seconds.
 140. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
 141. Mr. Hogan says than with regards to the smokestack proposal, he would seek to deny, but says that staff could probably approve a restoration as long as they are not modifying anything.
 142. Mr. Frew asks if they can approve his proposal if he agrees to restore instead of take down the top fifteen feet.
 143. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a motion to amend the proposal to include restoration and capping of the smokestack.
 144. Mr. Serrao moves to approve restoration, as well as the capping and installation of lightning protection as proposed.
 145. Mr. Hogan says the proposal also included cleaning but more information is still needed. He says that the applicant should see the historic planner with more information to see if that can be approved.
 146. Mr. Jennings seconds.
 147. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1339 W. North Avenue

Owner:
Paula Cellini
1339 W. North Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st
Lot and Block: 7-B-271

Applicant:
Paula Cellini
1339 W. North Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Inspector: Bill Kelley
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 8/17/12

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of a garage and balcony

Discussion:

1. Ms. Majcen explains that Ms. Cellini called in the morning and advised that she had a burglary in her home and was unable to attend, but wondered if the Commission could still review her proposal.
 2. Mr. Hogan says they could if they have the materials to review.
 3. The Commission reviews the information and pictures that were provided.
 4. Ms. Majcen reads from the applicant's email that she was concerned about getting a mason in to do the work prior to winter. She wanted to have her proposal reviewed and was also willing to work with Ms. Quinn if needed.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification on what the applicant wants to do.
 6. The Commission reviews the pictures of the proposed balcony and garage.
 7. Ms. Majcen states that the applicant had a shingle listed on the application, but in the email she said that in discussions with the Manchester Local Review Committee it was determined that board and batten would be more appropriate, so that is now what she is proposing.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks where the shingle or board and batten would be going.
 9. Ms. Majcen clarifies that in the email the applicant said she would be using board and batten instead of siding on the garage.
 10. Mr. Jennings says that she would be eliminating the cinderblock then, or having block as the foundation only.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 12. Ms. Evelyn Jones steps to the podium and introduces herself. She is from the Manchester
-
-

1339 W. North Avenue

LRC. She states that they have been working closely with the applicant. At their July meeting they reviewed her proposal and looked around the neighborhood for similar projects that had been approved. They found two similar garages on the same street that had been approved. She advised that the garage had been there for years and is not a new addition. She says the LRC guided the applicant on material choices that would be more appropriate, and as long as she follows their guidance they approve of the project. She also says the window had been there and was not new. She mentions that the house had not been lived in for 50 years prior to the current owner.

13. Mr. Hogan wants to clarify then if she and the LRC are in support of the applicant.
14. Ms. Jones says yes. She also states that the Manchester house discussed earlier [in the Internal Business] was on the 1100, not 1200, block of W. North.
15. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment. There is none.

Motion:

16. Ms. McClellan moves to approve proposal with the modification of the board and batten siding to the garage.
 17. Mr. Jennings proposed that the approval be subject to final submission of colors and materials to staff.
 18. Ms. McClellan amends the proposal to include final approval of colors and materials by staff.
 19. Ms. Ismail mentions the balcony.
 20. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the motion will include approval of an iron French balcony on the side of the building as submitted.
 21. Mr. Jennings asks if the garage dimensions will remain the same.
 22. Mr. Hogan reads from the application that she is proposing to replace material to match the old material if necessary, but she does not propose any change to the size or structure.
 23. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion.
 24. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all members are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Certificates of Appropriateness Report – August 2012

Staff Approval	C of A Number	Date Issued	Application Address	Historic District	Work Approved
N	12-094	1-Aug-12	907-909 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Addition of balconies and two story addition
Y	12-095	1-Aug-12	3959 Fifth Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	Window replacement
N	12-096	1-Aug-12	315 S Bellefield	Oakland Civic Center	Installation of window louvers
N	12-097	1-Aug-12	4220 Centre Avenue	Schenley Farms	Non-compliant window replacement
Y	12-098	1-Aug-12	1525 Bidwell Street	Manchester	Painting
N	12-099	2-Aug-12	2128 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Rear renovations
N	12-100	2-Aug-12	1003 Sheffield Street	Manchester	Garage demolition
N	12-101	2-Aug-12	3900 S Butler Street	Schools	Playground installation
N	12-102	2-Aug-12	1404-1414 Juniata Street	Manchester	Refenestration
N	12-103	2-Aug-12	1401 Columbus Avenue	Manchester	Rehabilitation
N	12-104	2-Aug-12	1301 Columbus Avenue	Manchester	Rehabilitation
N	12-105	2-Aug-12	920 Fort Duquesne Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Façade renovations
N	12-106	2-Aug-12	851 Beech Avenue	Allegheny West	Construction of a new porch
N	12-107	2-Aug-12	629 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Addition of the rear of the building
N	12-108	3-Aug-12	500 W North Avenue	Mexican War Streets	Replacement of door and windows
N	12-109	3-Aug-12	1404-1414 Juniata Street	Manchester	Construction of decking, fire escapes, and creation of doorways.

