



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 December 7, 2011

Beginning at 12:30 PM

200 Ross Street

First Floor Hearing Room

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	Jinfu Lu
Ernie Hogan	Makenzie Diehl	Kathy Clark
Linda McClellan		Kristin Boose
Arthur Sheffield		Matthew Smith
Joseph Serrao		Andrew DeWitt
		Matt Hogue
		Evelyn Jones
		Fran Escalante
		Bob Russ
		Dick Stephens
		Don Sivavec
		Aaron Sukenik
		Adam DeSimone
		Mark Fatla
		Mark Masterson
		Jack Schmitt

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the November 2011 minutes, Mr. Serrao moved to approve. Mr. Hogan seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the November 2011 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao moved to approve. Ms. Ismail seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship:

St. Nicholas Church

1326 East Ohio Street

Pittsburgh, Pa 15209

St. Nicholas Parish Charitable Trust, owner and applicant

- Mr. Hogan acknowledges receipt of documents from the diocese (as of 12/01/11) and information from the North side Leadership Conference. The Commission agrees they have enough information to make a determination at today's meeting.

Upcoming Demolitions: Ms. Quinn notifies the Commission of 1402 Liverpool Street. She says it is a party wall situation; the adjacent corner building was taken approved for demolition and taken down and the eastern wall is now exposed so it is an "orphan." She says she has sent information to the state and has finished review so the property will go to the agenda for next month.

Internal Business:

- Ms. Quinn says staff has been receiving phone calls concerning violations and has been directing people to call the 311 number so they can get a tracking number and follow through with BBI.
- Mr. Hogan asks about Allegheny West windows on Lincoln. Ms. Diehl says she spoke to the owner, John Norman, who has made an application for appropriate replacement wood windows.
- Mr. Hogan asks about arch top windows on East Carson St. Ms. Quinn says inspector Brown says an occupancy permit has not and will not be issued.
- Ms. Quinn says she talked to Bob Molyneaux about Market Square ATM and that it was in existence previous to historic designation.
- Ms. Quinn says staff reviewed signage for restaurant on Fifth Ave.
- Mr. Serrao asks about the Brewery, Ms. Quinn says she has not heard anything from the owner. Mr. Hogan says the owner has been stripping the building and selling parts. Mr. Serrao expressed concerns about the structural integrity of the building.

Adjourn: Ms. McClellan moved to adjourn, Mr. Serrao seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

*Pittsburgh HRC – January 4, 2011
Certificates of Appropriateness Report – December*

Staff Approval	C of A Number	Date Issued	Application Address	Historic District	Work Approved
Y	11-113	5-Dec-11	2613 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
Y	11-114	5-Dec-11	1507 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
Y	11-115	8-Dec-11	3612 Dawson Street	Oakland Square	Installation of railing and instillation of siding on façade
Y	11-116	8-Dec-11	431 Market Street	Market Square	Replacement of HVAC unit on rooftop
Y	11-117	8-Dec-11	3 Oakland Square	Oakland Square	Window replacement
N	11-118	12-Dec-11	941 Liberty Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Façade renovation
Y	11-119	13-Dec-11	220 Fifth Avenue	Market Square	Signage
Y	11-120	13-Dec-11	220 Fifth Avenue	Market Square	Signage
Y	11-121	14-Dec-11	1326 Liverpool Street	Manchester	In-kind replacment of asphalt shingles on rear roof
Y	11-122	15-Dec-11	N/A Allegheny Commons Park	Allegheny Commons Park	Replacement of playground equipment on existing footprint
Y	11-124	23-Dec-11	4401 Schenley Farms Terrace	Schenley Farms	In-kind window replacement

OWNER: 17 th Street Partners L.P. 1715 Sarah Street Pittsburgh, Pa 15203	WARD:17TH	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 10/17/11
APPLICANT: 2630 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, Pa 15222	LOT & BLOCK: 12-E-294	SITE VISITS:
	INSPECTOR:.....PAT BROWN	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... 3rd	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....	
	ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: TABLED: Installation of cell antennae screening on building – various locations proposed

Discussion:

1. Kathy Clark, counsel for AT&T, says the antenna’s location is necessary to increase system capacity to comply with new phone uses, and they need the antennas closer together.
2. Ms. Clark says currently there are two antenna installations on site by Sprint and Clearwire. She says the carriers used stealthing to attempt match the existing chimneys that were already on the building.
3. Ms. Clark says they are not able to use existing stealth chimneys on the roof because there is not enough room, and if they try to go behind the existing chimneys there will be interference with the signal.
4. Ms. Clark says they are proposing two options: roof mount similar to what is there with stealthing to match existing chimneys; or side wall flush mount to blend in with existing brick.
5. Ms. Clark says at last month’s meeting they learned of the LRC and met with them on November 30th, and they had another third option. She says the Commission has received notes from the LRC meeting outlining the option.
6. Mr. Hogan says yes.
7. Ms. Clark says based on the discussions, they have created a third option. She provides photographs. She says the north side of the building is not a primary street facing wall. She says they suggested they mount this antenna on the wall 5 feet back from the street. She says the photographs and drawings do not reflect this but it can be done.
8. Ms. Clark says the color would be to blend in with the exposed brick wall. She says the antennae array would be mounted on roof near the west wall five feet back from the edge of the parapet and the LRC’s suggestion was to enclose the antennae with a foam panel screen with a flat matte finish. She says the third foam panel screened antenna array on SE corner of building would be on the roof just west of what is already there and five feet back from the parapet with a finish to match the color of the existing wood cornice.
9. Ms. Quinn asks if they have checked with zoning for use of the third option.
10. Ms. Clark says she believes that it meets all the requirements.
11. Ms. McClellan asks if they have met with zoning.
12. Ms. Clark says no they have not, but they are aware of the requirements.
13. Ms. Clark says that their opinion is that the second option is slightly less obtrusive that the third option provided by the LRC, but would be willing to do either.
14. Mr. Hogan says he appreciates all of the options. He says he thinks it comes down to the screening material because with prior installations it became more obtrusive than they were intended to be.
15. Ms. Clark says they did bring material samples.

16. Matthew Smith, the project engineer, says they have radio frequency transparent materials, but that the main issue is not the material but the color. He says they discussed matching the color of the cornice on the south and east walls with a flat matte finish in a Bordeaux gray as suggested by the LRC.
17. Mr. Hogan asks if this material would be used in all the options.
18. Mr. Smith says the material would be used for all of them, but the finish would be different in some options, but that they are discussing option three with the black matte finish.
19. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
20. Bob Russ, Southside LRC, says they want to untangle what has already happened - the previous applicants' screening do not match the building, and their placement is a problem because they are very visible and not in locations where chimneys and stair towers are ordinarily. He says they objected to mounting the antenna in any kind of stealth material on the principal façade. He says they believe the existing center chimney was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and they are requesting enforcement action on that. He says they recognize that AT&T cannot be denied due to precedent and that the LRC approves of option three where the chimney would disappear quietly above the roof. He says they want to set a new way of handling these, they want to wrap this in a new material which matches the roof and is not visible and are trying to fix an old problem with a new paradigm. He says he hopes these other chimneys would be enforced and they would use this new material/color.
21. Mr. Hogan clarifies that they are supporting "option three."
22. Mr. Russ says yes.
23. Ms. Clark asks if the 5' setback is from the inside or outside of the parapet.
24. Mr. Russ says this is to address the zoning requirement.
25. Ms. Clark says she thinks this would be outside.
26. Mr. Hogan asks if they are trying to match the height of existing "chimneys".
27. Mr. Smith says they are not matching the height of the existing "chimneys".
28. Mr. Russ says there is a question of whether those existing chimneys meet zoning (enforcement concern).
29. No further public comment.
30. Ms. Quinn says before they can process this, they will have to have a full new packet in the files.
31. Ms. Clark agrees, she says they just needed to know what option they would be using before proceeding with full construction drawings.
32. Mr. Hogan says he thinks option three makes sense and he was hesitant to put an appendage on the outside of the building, but that option three is a solution to this.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to approve the application for the installation of cellular antennae screening with the final finished color and new drawings to be submitted to staff, and the option being approved is "Option 3" (rear mounted antenna painted out and set back 5' from the outside of the parapet).

Mr. Sheffield..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

- 15. Mr. Hogan asks in regards to the retractable roof, where does the 20' setback start.
- 16. Mr. DeSimone says it would start from the front of the building.
- 17. Mr. Hogan says if that's the case you will be able to see it.
- 18. Mr. DeSimone says it will actually be 15' back, but that he would not have a problem pulling it back further.
- 19. Mr. Hogan and Mr. Serrao say then based on these renderings you will see it.
- 20. Mr. Hogan asks how high off the deck the roof will project
- 21. Mr. DeSimone says they have designed it yet, but probably 8-10'
- 22. The Commission discusses the various viewpoints and if it will be visible from the right of way.
- 23. Ms. Quinn says the packet was done without having the comments or new drawings.
- 24. Mr. Hogan says they are approving the addition of the canopy and changing of ticket booth to doors, and marquee
- 25. Mr. DeSimone says doors will be clear glass.
- 26. Mr. Hogan says he would entertain a motion to approve the application for roof and façade modifications

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to approve the deck modification, the ticket booth modification to glass doors, and marquee changes with final drawings and materials to be submitted to staff for final approval.

Ms. McClellan..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

OWNER:
Caterina Varrasso
4769 Oakhurst Avenue
Gibsonia, PA 15044

WARD: 2nd
LOT & BLOCK:9-N-44
INSPECTOR:..... BOB MOLYNEAUX
COUNCIL DISTRICT:
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:
ARCH. RATING:

APPLICATION RECEIVED:
SITE VISITS:
CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000

APPLICANT:
Sunny Varrasso
4769 Oakhurst Avenue
Gibsonia, PA 15044

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: TABLED: Changes to previously approved plans and additional façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Sunny Varrasso, says initially they spoke about the first floor façade and got a Certificate of Appropriateness, but then it turned into a signage situation because of the second floor windows. She says she had the opinion that the HRC did not like the Roman Arches as they did not conform to the streetscape. She says they then squared out the facade and the HRC did not like this either. She says staff made recommendations that she did not like to remove windows and leave the frames, she says that makes the building look abandoned.
2. Ms. Varrasso says it has come down to what will and will not work for her business in the building, and that the staff's recommendations will be too expensive. She says they have opted to make very few changes to the building. She says they will shorten the second floor windows so the signage can fit, and the only thing that will change on the first floor is the addition of the double doors.
3. Mr. Serrao says you are just shortening the second floor windows and adding a sign panel.
4. Ms. Varrasso says yes and that she cannot justify the kind of investment staff recommended when she cannot use the renovation to benefit the business.
5. Mr. Hogan asks if they are removing the lower arch and filling it in.
6. Ms. Varrasso says yes.
7. Mr. Serrao asks if the awnings are retractable.
8. Ms. Varrasso says yes so they will put in a 10" box with a steel frontage to contain the straight-pitched awning when it is folded up that would look more aesthetically pleasing.
9. Mr. Serrao asks if they are buying any new brick.
10. Ms. Varrasso says they are salvaging all existing brick and power-washing the final product so the mortar will match. She says there is enough brick because the building is double bricked from the inside to the outside.
11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment, there is none.
12. Ms. Varrasso say the actual box is extended out a bit so that when people look up they will not be able to see wires that go into the signage, so it serves a dual function.
13. Mr. Hogan says just for clarification they will have to approach zoning regarding the signage and awning.
14. Ms. Varrasso acknowledges that she must get zoning approval
15. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations for 941 Liberty Avenue, but he cannot agree with the ATM.
16. Mr. Siravec says that the ATM was an issue previously and that they were approved.
17. Mr. Hogan says the Certificate of Appropriateness is only valid for 6 months and if you do not act it is not valid.
18. Mr. Siravec says the same rules that applied six months ago should apply today. It is the same design but somewhat smaller.

19. Ms. Quinn says that it was approved.
20. Mr. Hogan says they thought the ATM was recessed.
21. Mr. Sivavec says the existing wall is set back 2' from the masonry piers and that is where the ATM would be placed.
22. Mr. Serrao says the drawings and the minutes reflect that the ATM is set further back according to the presented drawings
23. the previous proposal as well as this is recessed back approximately 30" back from the masonry piers, but it is flush with the glass façade that will be installed
24. Mr. Serrao asks for measurement clarifications and refers to a 4'6" measurement.
25. Mr. Sivavec says that the measurement is the awning.
26. Mr. Hogan asks if after the NANA wall is installed there will still be a vestibule and then you will enter directly into the building.
27. Mr. Sivavec says yes you will enter directly through the vestibule.
28. Mr. Hogan asks if they have dealt with ADA issues since there is a staircase to a 2nd floor business in the vestibule.
29. Mr. Sivavec says yes they have clearances and an upcoming meeting with BBI to confirm.
30. Mr. Serrao restates his motion.
31. Mr. Hogan says they were clear throughout the minutes that the ATM would be recessed back and that is currently is not recessed and functions in the vestibule.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to approve the façade restoration of 941 Liberty Avenue with the new windows, signage, awning, and new doors, but deny the ATM with everything subject to final submission to staff and zoning requirements.

Mr. Sheffield..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

32. Mr. Hogan clarifies the approval and states the powerwashing of the building will be subject to historic standards.
33. Ms. Vassarò says they have already bought the ATM since they were approved and that she must use it to get a return on investment.
34. Mr. Hogan says she can file for an economic hardship case or appeal the decision.

933 Penn Avenue

OWNER: iPenn Ventures LP 707 Grant Street, Suite 838 PITTSBURGH, PA 15219	WARD: 2ND LOT & BLOCK: 9-N-140 INSPECTOR:..... BOB MOLYNEAUX	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 11/16/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: iPenn Ventures LP 707 Grant Street, Suite 838 PITTSBURGH, PA 15219	COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6th ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: Proposed first and second floor façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Francisco Escalante, of Rugby Realty, representative of owner, says they are here to present renovations to first and second floors. He says now that the tenant has left the building they want to make renovations for the new tenant.
2. Mr. Escalante shows historic photo and says they are trying to undo some of the renovations that have existed since they bought the building.
3. Mr. Escalante says any wood and stone that was originally on the façade is gone and has been covered over by unattractive metal grating that blocks off the entirety of the second floor, so there is nothing worth saving here. He says they are trying to create a more historically sensitive solution. He says they are trying to create an entry that would work, and have light penetrating into second floor where there is none currently.
4. Mr. Escalante says they want to use insulated metal panels made by “Alucobond,” and they wanted to come to the Commission early on, but they would submit construction drawings to staff later in the design process.
5. Mr. Hogan asks what the vision for the design is.
6. David Howell, of Piper O’Brien Architects, wanted to meet their current needs, but tie in with the existing facade. He said the initial intent was to remove the screening element that covers second floor. He says they discovered underneath the screening is punched out openings with glass block with a double-hung window inside.
7. Mr. Howell says the window openings on second floor mimic the glass block openings dimension-wise. He says they want to introduce a horizontal element that would relate to the streetscape.
8. Mr. Howell says the layout on the 1st floor aside from the metal panel piers that divide larger openings into thirds is the same layout that currently exists. He says the only major difference that occurs is where the entrance recess occurs on the third opening over, the window to the right is recessed as well. He says this currently does not meet ADA codes so they will resolve it by installing a proper accessible ramp.
9. Mr. Hogan asks if they are transitioning into glass from the 2nd to 3rd floor.
10. Mr. Howell says that there are stud frame assembly window infills with metal panels on the outside and then return back, so there will be a slight planar difference.
11. Mr. Serrao asks if they are trying to get back to the original façade.
12. Mr. Howell says they are trying to get away from it.
13. Mr. Serrao asks how much of the original façade is there.
14. Mr. Escalante says if you are standing on 5th or 6th floor you are looking at the back of metal panels, so any brick that might have been there is gone.
15. Mr. Hogan says he assumes that is it clear glass.
16. Ms. Quinn says she is concerned and needs guidance about the intent of the renovation.

- 17. Ms. McClellan says they are ahead of themselves by seeking approval without a final design.
- 18. Mr. Hogan says this is an acceptable approach, he says without materials and further details they cannot approve. He says with a little more information they could get there.
- 19. Mr. Escalante asks for clarification about what they need.
- 20. Mr. Hogan says he is hearing that there are not long term goals to do the entire façade, so he wants to make sure that they are respectful of what is there and that it meets the context of the district even though it is non-contributing.
- 21. Mr. Escalante says that they are not planning to rip off any paneling.
- 22. Mr. Serrao asks if this is a ribbon glass façade or spandrel to punched windows.
- 23. Mr. Howell the darker glass is the vision glass, the lighter is a spandrel glazing.
- 24. Mr. Serrao says he would look favorably on this approach but would need more information on materials (including panels and glass) and its relationship to the context.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to table the application for 30 days pending final construction drawings and materials.

Ms. McClellan..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes**

3 Oakland Square

OWNER: Jinfu Lu & Qin Zhang 200 Timber Ridge Road Pittsburgh, PA 15238	WARD: 4TH LOT & BLOCK:28-M-126 INSPECTOR:.....BOB MCPHERSON	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 10/25/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Jinfu Lu & Qin Zhang 200 Timber Ridge Road Pittsburgh, PA 15238	COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3rd ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: Removal of glass louvered windows and replacement with double-hung windows

Discussion:

1. Jinfu Lu, owner, says he is requesting to replace current non-original and non-efficient windows with efficiency windows.
2. Luke Durmins, window contractor representing Lu, says nothing on façade is original. He says they seek approval for removal of a non-original aluminum louverd windows and replacement with a vinyl double-hung window. He says guidelines state vinyl windows should not be approved, but this vinyl will achieve the look of the original mimicking the size, shape and style.
3. Mr. Durmins says once you paint the wood window it becomes a painted window. He says that most wood windows are clad in vinyl or aluminum, so it would achieve the same aesthetic.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if they have a profile of the window.
5. Mr. Durmis provides the commission with a catalog. He says they will use the 4000 series window which is used to achieve the look of the wood window. The window has a 3.25" depth which matches the depth of the original window.
6. He says they have run into this issue in other townships like Sewickley, and the challenge was getting a window that was not clad in metal or vinyl.
7. Mr. Hogan says the issue is that there is a standard that has been set. He says they are setting a precedent of approving a vinyl window which does not fully achieve the profile of a wood window. He says that in the past they have approved vinyl windows in the district, but never on the façade.
8. Mr. Durmis says he does not understand what you would consider a modern wood window that matches a historic wood window. He says as far as he is concerned there is no such match unless you were to restore an existing wood window.
9. Mr. Hogan says this is not replacing a wood window with another wood window, in which case they would require an exact match. In this case you are replacing a non-conforming window with an additional non-conforming window. He says that he is worried about the message that sends.
10. Mr. Durmis asks if they are seeking the guidelines or material, because he would be willing to provide more examples of the vinyl window.
11. Ms. Quinn says staff can approve this over the counter.
12. Mr. Hogan explains the Secretary of the Interior's window standards.
13. Mark Fatla, of the Northside Leadership Conference, speaks about concerns about setting a precedent for Oakland Square and other historic districts. He says the HRC should clearly define the circumstances under which they approve vinyl windows so that it cannot be used to receive approval for vinyl windows in the future.
14. Mr. Hogan asks if the openings have been altered or shrunk.
15. Mr. Durmis says no, they are the original openings.
16. Ms. Ismail says this is something to consider in reference to design guidelines.
17. Mr. Hogan asks if the intent is to replace the all windows throughout the house.

3 Oakland Square

18. Mr. Durmis says yes.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to approve the removal and replacement of the existing windows on the sides and rear of the house with the product that is submitted, but deny the removal and replacement of the six front façade windows with the submitted product, and if they wish to provide a new product they can submit that to staff.

Ms. Ismail..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes**

OWNER: Dourid Aboud 802 Berkshire Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15226	WARD: 4TH	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 11/10/11
APPLICANT: Dourid Aboud 802 Berkshire Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15226	LOT & BLOCK:28-M-123	SITE VISITS:
	INSPECTOR:.....BOB MCPHERSON	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
	COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3rd	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
	ARCH. RATING:	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Changes: Installation of railing on front porch and siding installation on façade.

Discussion:

1. Dourid Aboud, owner, says he is here to install a hand rail on the building. He says he bought the building in 2001 before it was a district, and there was no existing railing at the time of purchase.
2. He says railings of pre made treated wood are sold at the Home Depot. He says there is siding on the building (all over the front and back) and since he bought the building the siding has been damaged and he would like to replace the missing siding.
3. Ms. Quinn says her understanding the railing situation is that it was cited because it is not up to code.
4. Mr. Hogan brings up the UPMC building damaged by hurricane. He says he thinks that from a damage standpoint he could repair his siding and the HRC couldn't say anything. He says in regards to the railing that is not the case.
5. Mr. Aboud says there is a picture on the Assessment website that shows a railing.
6. Mr. Hogan says the problem is that nothing currently exists, and since it is non-existent the railing must be in guidelines. He says you can use pre-made materials and accomplish a similar look to what was previously there, such as a square balustrade and top cap rail painted out. He says that the attached pre-made railing will not be within the guidelines.
7. Mr. Aboud asks what he should do.
8. Mr. Hogan says a good example is the Allegheny Avenue property (pickets with a bottom rail painted out).
9. Mr. Aboud says there is an architect who would be happy to work with him.
10. Mr. Hogan says he should sit down with the architect and draw something it and come back that mimics what was originally there.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to table the application for 30 days pending a railing resolution, but to approve the siding.

Mr. Sheffield..... Seconds the motion.

All Members.....Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes**

2025 East Carson Street

OWNER: Dick Stephens 2025 East Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	WARD: 17TH LOT & BLOCK: 12-F-143 INSPECTOR:..... PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3rd ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 11/18/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Dick Stephens 2025 East Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203		

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: Modification of the main entrance.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn says the applicant had to leave the meeting and asked that his application be tabled and requested an additional 30 days.
2. Mr. Hogan says he wanted to meet with the LRC.
3. Aaron Sukenik of Southside Local Development Company asks for clarification on the drawings.
4. Mr. Hogan says there are conflicting directions for the stairs.
5. Ms. Quinn says she will talk to Pat Brown for clarification of drawings.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to table to application as per the applicant’s request.

Ms. Ismail..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

OWNER: St. Nicholas Parish Charitable Trust 24 Maryland Avenue Pittsburgh, Pa 15209	WARD:..... 24TH LOT & BLOCK:24-H-90-000 TO 002 INSPECTOR: RUSSELL BLAICH COUNCIL DISTRICT:1st ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 10/05/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: St. Nicholas Parish Charitable Trust 111 Blvd. of the Allies Pittsburgh, Pa 15222		

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes: Certificate of Economic Hardship for Demolition to Grade

Discussion:

1. Mr. Hogan says he wishes to acknowledge the receipt of the response from the applicant dated 12/01/11 and the North Side Leadership Conference dated 11/15/11.
2. Mr. Hogan says the case in front of them is for Economic Hardship for the demolition of St. Nicholas Church, owner of the church is St. Nicholas Charitable Trust of which the trustees are the diocese and the parish. He says at this point the HRC has received all of the information that was requested, the answers were provided and based on the information presented, he would like to entertain a motion...
3. Ms. Boose says she would like to make a statement. She says she would like to address the previous case which was mentioned by the previous Chairman at the November hearing.
4. Mr. Hogan says the record is closed, and that testimony was at the last meeting. He says the HRC is familiar with this case and reviewed information, and realizes that even though that case is similar it is not the same. He says based on the merit of information that has been provided by the diocese and the firm as well as other concerned parties, he thinks there is enough to make a determination if this meets the threshold for economic hardship.
5. Ms. Boose says she wants to clarify that the parish charitable trust owns the church, not the diocese.
6. Mr. Hogan says he understands that the trust owns the asset of the real estate of which the parties involved are the bishop...
7. Ms. Boose says the bishop as trustee for the trust, diocesan assets have nothing to do with the parish.
8. Mr. Hogan says Ms. Boose is correct.
9. Mr. Hogan says at this point, based on the information provided they would like to entertain a motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to deny the economic hardship application as submitted.

Ms. McClellan... Seconds the motion.

10. Mr. Hogan says they he wants to run through what the HRC considered. He says at this point they do not believe that the trust has met the burden of proof that they have exhausted and fully marketed the property. He says he does not think that they have met the case that there is not an interested buyer ready and willing to proceed. He says based on the information received from the NSLC and PCHF they have proposed and has been justified with a market study and a business plan of reuse that seems to be allowable within the requirements or framework of the church and the trust. He says that

the economic cost back to the parish although based on the dwindling resources of a small parish they are not insurmountable costs (in the HRC's opinion) in that the church and the parish has done a good job at minimizing those costs, so it is not putting the church into a situation that the HRC feels has demonstrated past or above to meet the economic hardship case. He says there is a reuse purpose that has been put forward and capital costs have been justified and the opportunity is there. He says the HRC will be conferring with city legal team and will draft their opinion back as per the time frame set in the code.

11. Ms. Boose says that the proposed museum is a contingent offer, and they are in good faith negotiating with them and would be willing. But, it is contingent and there is no guarantee the NSLC will take the property and if they take it the parish will only receive one dollar in return. She says in their opinion that is not a valuable offer.
12. Mr. Hogan says that by the parish's appraisal the property is a negative value, so the offer has already exceeded that.
13. Ms. Boose says she understands this and that is why they are willingly to engage in negotiations with the NSLC, but their offer is only contingent. She says the concern is not receiving HRC denial, the concern is receiving the Commission's denial and the NSLC getting the core borings study and then not accepting the property, in which case the parish will be back where they started and costs will become insurmountable.
14. Mr. Serrao says that you must look at the problem holistically, not just looking at that, but at the fact that the building is not in any eminent danger, there is nothing wrong with the building as it is for the long term, not just the short term and based on the analysis the Commission did, it is holistic. He says they can go step by step and will give the parish a letter statement point by point by point where the HRC agrees and disagrees. He says that is where the parish will then have response to proceed up the chain. He says the HRC would be rehearing the case at the direction that the parish is going and that is not the issue at this point.
15. Mr. Hogan says based on the completeness the parish has given the HRC, the answers to questions and supplemental information there have been past uses, and that unless there is a complete reuse situation of the site in which the existing structure cannot meet that for the land to be reused you have not proved economic hardship.

MOTION:

All members.....Voted in favor.

.....**Motion passes.**