



Division of Development Administration and Review

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning
200 Ross Street, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH
Minutes of the Meeting of April 1, 2009
Beginning at 12:00 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>
		Chuck Wallace
Michael Stern, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Art Merrell
Paul Tellers		Chris Minnerly
Ruth Drescher		Charles Moore
		Anne Nelson, PHLF
Jill Joyce		Tony La Russa
Erik Harless for Sergei Matveiev		Bob Russ
Noor Ismail		Gretchen Haller
		Alan Dunn
		Michael Hertrich
		Gabe Fontana
		Dan Rothschild
		Richard Piacentoni
		Bob Baumbach
		Geof Comings
		Brendan Hanley
		Rich Lord

Old Business

Nominations Report: There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Workingmen's Savings Bank building was designated by City Council. The Old Stone Tavern will have its public hearing today. Next month will be the vote for the Old Stone Tavern.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the February and March 2009 minutes. In regards to both sets of minutes, Ms. Joyce motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Tellers seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the March 2009 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Tellers moved to approve, Ms. Drescher seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Adjourn: Ms. Drescher motioned to adjourn, Ms. Joyce seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

ATTACHMENTS

Local Landmark Nomination – Old Stone Tavern

1. Ms. Molnar reintroduced the nomination, provided the HRC with updates from the previous HRC meeting, and indicated to the HRC what their role and responsibility would be in regards to the nomination today, as well as next month.
2. Mr. Stern invited Public Testimony:
 - a. Mr. **John DeSantis** to the table. DeSantis introduced himself, 719 Brighton Road. When the nomination first came to light, he said, the building was important. Now, with all of the information that has come to light, the potential for more significance has grown dramatically. When we went to visit the building yesterday, we had low expectations. However, the building has a lot of intact historic fabric, which surprised those of us who toured the building. There is some original fabric of the exterior west-facing 18th Century building. It appears the building could even be earlier... I believe the building could be even as early as 1750. At the time, the structure had to be one of the earliest in the region. It is possible that the kitchen wing was the original structure. It looks as though some of the stories are turning out to be factual.
 - b. **Dr. Art Merrell** introduced himself as “the one to blame for all of this,” and he spoke in favor of the nomination. He drove by the building about a year ago and saw a for sale sign. Mario Pettica gave Merrell some newspaper articles about the building. He said that the building isn’t typical to the type of early structure built on the Pennsylvania frontier, but more like something from Quebec.
 - c. **Anne Nelson** from PHLF introduced herself, saying that PHLF supports the nomination. The building is included in their surveys and in the VanTrump and Walter Kidney books.
 - d. **Dru Simeone**, introduced herself as a representative of various West End neighborhood organizations. They support continued research, and love to see the building date back further and further. She knows it is going to take considerable resources to bring the building back. Her organization is willing to work with preservation community and with the property owner to promote the building.
 - e. **Charles Moore**, introduced himself as a Jacksonia Street resident, from the northside. He is representing himself. He’s known it was an old building for quite sometime. He went into it when it was a biker tavern, so he didn’t want to go in, but the building drew him in. He supports the nomination.
 - f. **Gretchen Haller** speaking for Preservation Pittsburgh, who supports the building. The building is older than her grandparents, and that strikes her as significant.
3. No one spoke in opposition of the historic nomination.

OWNER:	WARD:.....17 th	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
Joseph & Gerardine Clark			00/00/00
CLARK JOSEPH F JR &	LOT & BLOCK:.....003-H-158	SITE VISITS:	
GERARDINE M (W)	INSPECTOR:.....Bob Molyneaux		00/00/00
955 FREEPORT RD	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PA 15065	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....LNC		00-000
APPLICANT:	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
Same			
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>	

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application.
2. Mr. Stern invited the applicant, Joe Clark, to the table where he addressed the HRC. He said that he wanted to put the awning on the building because he thinks it looks better. He didn't know he would have to go through the HRC because he is not from the city. He thinks the building looks better with the awning, and the awning will protect the people. There's a bench for people to sit on.
3. Mr. Stern called for public comment on the agenda item. Mr. Bob Russ from the East Carson Street Local Review Committee introduced himself. The LRC looked at the awning application with Katie at the last meeting. They think that the awning does not fit the guidelines because it is not sloped and triangular and because of the colors. The awning should be considered as a new awning on an existing building.
4. Mr. Clark indicated that he was not aware of the guidelines and asked what they were. Mr. Stern replied. Mr. Stern read the relevant guideline to Mr. Clark.
5. Mr. Tellers said that the awning does not comply with the guidelines, and the awning is not the appropriate type in the district. Individual buildings should contribute to the character of the district. It is his opinion that the awning that not only does not meet the guidelines, but also is garish and loud. It is unfortunate that property owners can buy property in a historic district and not be made aware of the restrictions.
6. Jill Joyce agreed.
7. Molnar said that they would also need an encroachment permit, and other zoning and building inspection permits.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved to deny the application for a CofA for this particular awning. He stated that the HRC would consider an alternative, if it were shown to us, or to staff. Staff could review and approve an alternative awning that meets the guidelines.

Ms. Joyce.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*

1713 -1715 East Carson Street

OWNER:	WARD:.....17 th	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
S P P PROPERTY BUSINESS	LOT & BLOCK:.....12-E-311	SITE VISITS:	00/00/00
MANAGEMENT INC	INSPECTOR:.....Bob Molyneaux	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
1715 E CARSON ST	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		00-000
PITTSBURGH, PA 15203	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....LNC		
APPLICANT:	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
Same			
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE.....	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. Mr. Stern called the applicant to the table.
2. Alan Dunn introduced himself as the architect representing the building owner. The photograph of the Isaly’s [formerly in the building] shows another recreation of the arched facade. The building has changed many times over the years, and any historical reference is long gone. Because his client has a business next door, his client is looking to expand that use into the new space. There is a proliferation of businesses expanding into neighboring spaces along Carson. For that reason, they are looking to communicate the building with its neighbor in a literal and playful manner. They are looking to bring a lot of the natural light into the building. The arch seen on the building is really just a film, and is a ghostly gesture to the Nickelodeon that used to be there.
3. Mr. Stern asked if Mr. Dunn could explain the materials a little better. Ms. Drescher was interested to know what the use of the space would be.
4. Dunn went on to explain that they needed the ADA ramp due to construction changes, and that the owner would like to install a decorative gate to prevent loiters from hanging out in the entrance way. They were trying to restore the brick on each side of the building, though they have discovered that the brick was “tacked on,” so they will have to remove it, and install a brick veneer instead. The veneer would run into the hall-entrance. The second floor is one pane of glass, and the arch form is just an etched glass.
5. Mr. Tellers began to ask questions about materials, treatment of the new façade, etc. In reply, he found that the cornice, apparently, is wood. The sides and all other divisions of the façade are wooden. On the first floor, Mr. Dunn said they would install marble for the knee wall. The window framing will be aluminum.
6. Mr. Harless asked about the ADA entrance. He said that an alternative to the ramp could be an internal lift. Mr. Tellers wanted to know if the entire floor could be lowered somewhat. Tellers was very concerned about the deep 12’ recess for the ramp. Mr. Tellers said he would be opposed to the deep recessed gate because it is a departure from what we typically see on Carson Street. Not just for safety, but also for aesthetics. Further, Mr. Tellers was not convinced that the aluminum fins create an effective relationship to the adjacent structure, and he was not sure that they will be effective from a practical standpoint.
7. Ms. Drescher asked about the cornice, and which portions of it were original.
8. Mr. Bob Russ addressed the HRC saying that the SouthSide Local Development Committee wrote its comments to the HRC, but that the LRC did not put its comments in writing. Under the basic principles of the guidelines, original materials should not be removed. In the mid 1990s, the owner got a CofA for a design, but what they built was a very cheap rendition of that drawing. The new owner should be applauded for making better changes to the structure. We (the LRC) want to know if there is any original fabric under the existing façade. Much of the materials are rotting away, and probably good riddance. This is a very contemporary design for the historic district. The arch has probably been reconstructed, but we know that there was one there in

1713 -1715 East Carson Street

the past. The LRC thinks it would be appropriate for the arch to be rendered again as part of the new design, but not as opaque glass. The LRC does not agree that the buildings need to communicate with each other visually. The LRC is opposed to the depth of the recess of the ADA ramp. The LRC asks that the applicant come back with another design.

9. Ms. Joyce agreed that the sloped entry is way too long, and that will be problematic. She had mixed emotions about the design. She likes the aluminum framing on the front, and wondered if the aluminum could be a scrim, applied to the front of the glass. Joyce said she would be more apt to agree with the scrim if the opaque glass could be made a solid.

10. Ms. Drescher said she found the building to be totally unappealing. The proportions, the colors, the materials, the metal strips (add nothing), and are inappropriate.

11. Mr. Stern said that he sees a consensus around the inappropriate character of the deep recessed entry.

12. Mr. Michael Hergter (sp?), director of LaFonn Galleries, stated he works next door to these buildings. He has been next door for 20 years. The arch from Isaly's has not existed for at least 20 years. He pointed to the cornice and said that was the only original portion of the building. He said that the proportions of the building are original. He said there is no historic value to the building whatsoever. He said that the SSLDC is a leader in the nation of green building, and that is what this new design does. He asked that the HRC tell the applicant exactly what they should do. He thought the application was a wonderful design. It incorporates history, but looks to the future. He said there is a disconnect between what the design review committees are telling the applicant, and what the ADA guidelines say.

13. Mr. Stern and Mr. Harless said that they would be happy to help the applicant understand the ADA guidelines, and provide them with literature.

14. Mr. Geof Commings from the SSLDC approached the HRC saying that the organization has always worked toward historic preservation. He said that the SSLDC's comments and the HRC's comments are similar, thus far. Mr. Commings asked if the ADA requirements were different in an historic district. Molnar replied that it would vary from address to address, and that building owners should work with the SHPO to determine whether a variance could be sought.

15. Gabe Fontana addressed the HRC, as the owner of the properties. The building [1715] was near foreclosure when he purchased the property.

16. Mr. Stern asked if there was a use for the building. Gabe said that as of right now, he did not have a use for the structure. Regardless of the use, it will be his building. He would like to keep the arched reference. He would like to get some feedback from the HRC regarding the materials they would like to see. At the end of the SSLDC meeting, they did not have any real guidance as to what to do next.

17. Mr. Stern said that the SSLDC letter does give suggestions. He also said that if the buildings would be connected internally, then ADA access to the second building might be achieved through the first building. He thought the arch could come or go. Mr. Stern said he would recommend that the applicant rethink the character of the building – because the applicant is trying to mix two buildings. He should focus on one building or the other. If the applicant was looking for suggestions, he should filter through the suggestions given in this session, and make his own determination.

18. Mr. Tellers said that we should try to be more consistent and clear in our suggestions.

19. Mr. Russ approached the HRC to quote the historic design guidelines saying new features should either be an accurate recreation of original designs, or be compatible new designs with a contemporary fill. A knowledgeable architect should be able to interpret what this means, because the guidelines say it all. The LRC is open and free to give advice and suggestions.

20. Mr. Tellers said that he agrees with Stern that the arch is non-original and that it is not essential to the design of the new building. The fabric of the building that is still intact should remain.

21. Mr. DeSantis approached the HRC to say that the Certificate of Appropriateness issued at a previous HRC meeting for the building was never followed appropriately. He gave some background about previous approvals at this address.

1713 -1715 East Carson Street

22. Mr. Hergter said that there was no arch behind the façade.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved that the current proposal be denied. Instead, the HRC will welcome a new proposal that will address the ramped entrance in another way (as suggested through the meeting). In addition, the applicant should reconsider the treatment of façade elements, as discussed throughout the meeting.

Ms. Drescher.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*

916 Cedar Avenue

OWNER:	WARD:.....23 rd	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
SUSTAKOSKI RICHARD J & LINDA	LOT & BLOCK:.....23-M-220	SITE VISITS:	00/00/00
M (W)	INSPECTOR:.....	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
916 CEDAR AVE	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		
PITTSBURGH, PA 15212	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....		
APPLICANT:	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
Bob Baumbach			
REGISTER:			
	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>	

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application.
2. Mr. Stern invited Mr. Baumbach to the table. Bob Baumbach introduced himself. At the front of the building, the owners intend to replace the windows and restore the stained glass. At the rear of the building, the owners intend to do a one-room deep addition the full width of the lot. They are doing what they can do while being consistent with the remainder of the alley. The new addition will have one-over-one windows, etc. They were a bit imaginative by including an interior terrace, articulated by columns and a cornice line. Additionally, they intend to construct a one-and-a-half story garage at the rear of the property line. Because it is adjacent to the funeral home, they are using brick on the lower floor (to protect the building), and siding on the upper stories. Bob Baumbach showed the lines of site sectional to illustrate that the rooftop deck would not be visible from Cedar Avenue or from the alley.
3. Baumbach indicated that he has met with the neighbors on several occasions, who are in agreement with the proposed design.
4. Mr. Stern asked about materials. Mr. Baumbach said that they would be using hardi-siding, but in the proportions of wooden siding. He added that Nick Kyrazi is in favor of this project.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved to approve the application as shown with the request that colors and final details come back to Katie for final approval.

Ms. Drescher.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*

906 Western Avenue

OWNER: RAMSEY MICHAEL S 5562 HOBART ST APARTMENT 518 PITTSBURGH, PA 15217-	WARD:.....22 nd LOT & BLOCK:.....7-D-148 INSPECTOR:.....R. Freyermuth	APPLICATION RECEIVED: SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	 00/00/00 00/00/00 00-000
APPLICANT: Same	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:..... ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>	

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. Mr. Stern invited the applicant to the table.
2. Peter Kreuthmeier said that his client was away, but that he was very interested in green and sustainable design. The building currently is not up to energy code. The intention of the use of the building is to have a residential second floor, and a commercial first floor. All of the glass has to come out because it has no insulative value. The canopies are in bad repair, and what we have over the “lintel” is just a sheet of plywood. The owners do not want to keep that element. Because the building is a vintage but not a contributing building, the architects took a more modern approach to the building, but still wanted to work with the LRC for approvals. What they are proposing is to replace the glass with new glass, remove the canopies, and add shutters to the façade. The shutters would animate the façade, and also add solar screening to the building. It would be a type of movable privacy screen. They are still investigating various materials, including transparent photovoltaic materials for the louvered portions of the shutter. Another possibility is some type of painted monolithic material. A third option would be a natural material, like wood or bamboo. The other portion of the Western Avenue application would be the addition of the “monolithic undefined panel,” like a hardi-board. This would allow them to further separate the indoor and outdoor spaces and functions. They think that by adding the quasi-residential feature of the shutters helps the building to be a better neighbor in the residential district.
3. Ms. Joyce asked if they would be reglazing the windows, and wondered if the windows would be operable. Kreuthmeier said that the new glazing would be operable. The sidewalk encroachment of the awnings would be less than the encroachment of the canopies, about 2.5 feet.
4. Ms. Drescher asked about the final colors. Mr. Kreuthmeier said that the colors and materials aren’t final yet.
5. Kreuthmeier said that they would operate the shutters with a hand-crank device called the “gizmo.” Joyce asked if the shutters could be placed on the interior, and the answer was no, because the intention would be to reject the solar light before it even enters the building. Mr. Kreuthmeier wanted to get a conditional approval from the HRC and possibly come back to HRC with final drawings and materials.
6. At the rear, Kreuthmeier proposed to make the private balcony off the master bedroom at the rear, and add garage doors to the parking area.
7. John DeSantis addressed the HRC saying that the photos shown were taken from his property, the gas station. In this case, it is a non-contributing building, being taken farther away from being considered part of the fabric of this street. There is no building on Western Avenue that is further away from being a contributing building than this one is. This one is beyond non-contributing. He would encourage the HRC to tell any reasonable architect to follow the guidelines and come back to the HRC with something more appropriate.
8. Mr. Tellers read the guideline aloud that says “All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.” Mr.

906 Western Avenue

Tellers disagreed with Mr. DeSantis. He did agree that materials should take the building closer to the character of the district than further away.

9. Mr. Stern said he would be inclined to approve everything except for the shutters. Mr. Tellers agreed, saying that the shutters were incongruent with the existing building, in its current configuration.

MOTION:

Mr. Stern.....moved to approve the façade modifications and rehabilitation with the condition that the shutters, in their current perpendicular-to-façade configuration, do not come back to the HRC.

Ms. Joyce.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*

OWNER & APPLICANT: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Mistick

WARD: 22nd

BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER: 008-A-089, - 091

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: R4

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Unrated (Recent construction)

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the project, and told the HRC about the history of this project. Mr. Stern invited the applicant to the table.
2. Dan Rothschild addressed the HRC and provided a packet of information to the HRC.
3. In 1990, according to Rothschild, the site plan showed the wooden fence, which the owner has an occupancy permit for. The applicant is looking only to replace the old rotted-out fence with a new one, and incorporate the design of the house into the fence by adding a trellis portion to the fence.
4. Rothschild said that the new fence runs the full length of the property. The wood fence would be six-feet solid. They took photographs to give context to the new fencing materials. The fence sits atop the retaining wall. The applicant went on to describe the fence, according to the drawings and photographs submitted to the HRC.
5. Mr. Stern asked when the fence was/ will be completed, and where the fence was being erected.
6. Mr. Tellers wondered if he was correct to assume that the only change to Maolis Way was the addition of the steel element to the top of the fence. Rothschild said that was correct, except that there is another fence to the interior of the property as well.
7. Mr. Bob Mistick addressed the HRC and said that if he could have done it all when the building was first built, he would have done it all at once. Mistick said that he assumes the fence is still six feet tall, but that the trellis portion should not be considered a fence, because it is just an additional trellis. He wanted the trellis to provide more privacy to his yard.
8. Mr. Stern called for comments. None.
9. Mr. Tellers said that the steel frame was not a problem to him. He did have a difficult time with the extremely tall fence to the interior of the property. Mr. Mistick said his alternative would be to plant some extremely tall trees.
10. Ms. Joyce said that the open panels at the top of the fence help to diffuse the height impact, and that the scale of the adjacent building also helps to disguise the height of the fence. Mr. Rothschild said that the fence between two buildings really should not be considered part of the public realm.

MOTION:

Ms. Joyce.....moved to approve the two different fencing styles

Ms. Drescher.....seconded the motion

Mr. Tellers.....Abstained

FIVE EYES, ONE ABSTENTION, NO NAYS → MOTION PASSES

OWNER: Mr. John DeSantis
WARD: 22nd
BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER: 007-D-163
BUILDING INSPECTOR: Jack McGoogan
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: LNC
HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Unrated

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. Mr. Stern invited the applicant to the table.
2. Mr. John DeSantis described the project by giving the context of the address, in the middle of Western Avenue. He described some of the neighboring buildings and their uses. He purchased the property at the end of December 2008, with the intention of turning the site into a “park.” The existing building would be given some modification to the “skin”. The Pittsburgh Home and Garden Show would be moving its offices into the modified building. DeSantis showed the site plan to the HRC. There is a public space improvement project along Western Avenue to restore the sidewalks, move utilities, etc. He said that the perimeter wall would be approximately 2 feet tall, with 4 or 4.5 feet of cast iron on top of it. The retaining wall would be pulled back at the corner. The rest of it is all landscaping. It is being planted to look more like a park than a garden.
3. Mr. DeSantis showed the elevation drawings from Western and from Galveston. He said the material to the building is a polished concrete meant to look like limestone. They would be adding brick piers, a brick cornice, replacing the roll up doors with fixed composite doors to look like stable door, applied shutters on the side wall. They want to tie into the red brick in the rest of the neighborhood. They’re adding brick cornice and soldier courses to the windows. The LRC had some qualms about the style of the windows, and John agreed with them. Mr. DeSantis and his architect are not making any proposals regarding the alley side of the building at this time. They propose to close the windows on the eastern side of the building with concrete block to match the rest of the building, visible from the alley.
4. John said that if he didn’t buy the lot, then it would likely get turned into a surface area parking lot.
5. He said he also considered doing a solid wall where the carriage doors are, and treating it like a background to the garden. He felt like the wall would truly be artificial, because it would be a wall disguising a building. The otherwise proposed faux doors are actually going where doors used to be.
6. John said he had thought about the idea of restoring the gas station, but decided it wouldn’t be feasible because he said there wasn’t enough “cool stuff” left to work with.
7. Mr. Tellers asked about the “park,” and wondered if it would be accessible for passersby. John said that it would be a private garden, and not accessible to the public.
8. Mr. Stern said one of the problems with approving this right now is that the HRC doesn’t have enough information. He wanted to know more about details on drawings, details on the retaining wall, details on the landscaping, etc.
9. Mr. Tellers said that he was having some difficulty accepting the insertion of brick and quoins and arched carriage house doors into the unique 1940s material, the garage. He said that was inappropriate. It almost would have been better to cover the whole thing with red brick. John asked if it would be preferable to keep the building without

the brick? Mr. Tellers said “yes,” that it would be better to have the existing building, without the arches, without the carriage detailing, without the cornice. Mr. Tellers said he did not have a problem with the landscaping.

10. Mr. DeSantis said that they considered leaving the building alone, but that they didn’t want the building to look like a boarded up garage. They also considered covering the building with ivy. Mr. Tellers said there would be a tremendous lost opportunity for saving money and saving original fabric by keeping the building intact.

11. Mr. Tellers said his final comment would be to reinforce the prominence of the corner at Galveston and Western.

12. Mr. Stern said that he thought the applicant should consider the comments and return to the HRC with more details and revisions.

13. Mr. DeSantis said they had considered filling in the garage doors, setback, and filling-in the opening with grillwork, and planting ivy. Part of the approval would involve the removal of the light standards and other lot details.

14. Mr. Tellers and Mr. Stern liked the idea of using the green-wall, filling in the openings with ivy.

15. Mr. Tellers moved to table the application to allow a new set of drawings and further information to be sent to staff. Ms. Joyce seconded the motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved to table the application to allow a new set of drawings and further information to be sent to staff before the next HRC meeting in May.

Ms. Joyce.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*

1 Schenley Drive – Phipps Conservatory

Local Landmark

<u>OWNER:</u>	City of Pittsburgh
<u>LESSEE & APPLICANT:</u>	Phipps Conservatory, Incorporated
<u>APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:</u>	Mr. Richard V. Piacentini, Executive Director
<u>ARCHITECT:</u>	Mr. Alan Fishman, AIA & Mr. Joel Bernard, AIA <i>IKM, Inc. Architects</i> One PPG Place Pittsburgh, PA 15222
<u>WARD:</u>	4 th
<u>BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER:</u>	027-S-150
<u>BUILDING INSPECTOR:</u>	Mr. Tom Breisinger
<u>ZONING CLASSIFICATION:</u>	PO
<u>HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RATING:</u>	National Importance

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. Mr. Stern invited the applicant to the table.
2. Richard Piacentini, executive director of the Phipps Conservatory addressed the HRC. He said that they have a master plan showing various changes to the grounds, and the third phase is the construction of the structure behind the Phipps Conservatory. The building was approved as part of the original master plan.
3. Chris Minnerly with Design Alliance Architects said that he would like to give an overview of what the pertinent issues are. He showed what he presumed to be the historic structures on the site, and indicated that the new work would be considered part of the non-contributing campus on the site. The proposed work is planned for the rear of the site, behind the tropical rainforest. Right now, the site is mainly a service yard. Chris described the partial demolition of one of the service structures. One of the goals is to produce a net-zero building, they will control water on the site, etc. The service building that they are maintaining, the “CSL” will have a photovoltaic array on the roof.
4. Chris said that there were very limited opportunities for lines of sight to the buildings and new construction. He went through the PowerPoint presentation and described the project to the HRC. The new building could be described as a “cast in place” structure. There would be two types of cladding – though they are uncertain as to what exactly which one would be installed. One of the options would be core-10 steel because it would weather with the structure and interact with the environment. Another option would be to incorporate wood siding, which would accomplish the same thing.
5. Ms. Drescher wanted to know if this would be the main offices of the Conservatory, and Richard answered in the affirmative. There would also be classrooms in the new construction. The reused service buildings will be used as mechanical and maintenance areas.
6. Molnar explained that the review process on this building was somewhat vague, because the building is in a public park, and the review also has to go before the Art Commission.

1 Schenley Drive – Phipps Conservatory

MOTION:

Ms. Joyce.....moved to approve this administrative building as presented.

Mr. Tellers.....seconded the motion

ALL VOTED IN FAVOR *MOTION PASSES*