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 June 3, 2009
Beginning at 12:00 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

Members	***Staff***	***Others***
		Ray Hildereth
Michael Stern, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Jack Grzybek
Paul Tellers		Mark Kinney
Noor Ismail		Lisa Anderson
Sergei Matveiev		Marilyn Brooks
Jill Joyce		Justin Greenawalt
Earl Onque		Michael Bennet
		Jeff Brandau
		John Yehambaram
		Martin Kline
		Gurdial Mehta
		Didar Singh
		Andrew McSwigan
		Carol Kowall
		Moira Cleary
		R. Blaich
		Anne Nelson
		Bob Baumbach
		Michael Friday
		Cliff Levine
		Dave Montgomery
		Jeffrey Woodard

Old Business

Nominations Report: There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Old Stone Tavern building was scheduled for Planning Commission, and that the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange would be scheduled for a preliminary vote, today, at the end of the hearing.

Schenley Place Development Update: Mr. Ray Hildreth addressed the HRC to show samples of glass proposed for the development on Bayard Street. He showed limestone, mullions, and glass to describe the exterior of the building. All of the HRC members agreed that the glass he showed was the type of "clear" glass described in the Certificate of Appropriateness.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the April 2009 minutes. Mr. Tellers motioned to approve the minutes; Ms. Joyce seconded the motion. Mr. Matveiev abstained since he was not at the April meeting. All others voted in favor. Minutes were approved.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards t the May 2009 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Tellers moved to approve, Mr. Onque seconded the motion, all voted i favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Upcoming Demolitions

Ms. Molnar listed 1206 and 1208 West North Avenue, and 1419 Juniata Street, as projects that would be before the HRC i July. She said that the community wants a plan to discuss these demolitions. Molnar indicated that the recently adde "upcoming demolitions" section of the agenda could serve as a warning to the community groups about which demolition are most imminent. This way the community can stay involved during the early stages of demolition consideration.

Adjourn: Mr. Onque motioned to adjourn, Mr. Tellers seconded the motion, all voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

ATTACHMENTS

800-802 Cedar Avenue

Deutschtown Historic District

OWNER:
VAN DYKE FERRARA ENERGY INVESTMENTS LLC
119 CHURCH ST
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA 15767

APPLICANT:
Robert Baumbach

WARD: 23rd
LOT & BLOCK: 0023-S-00258
INSPECTOR: .....
COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....
ARCH. RATING: ..... Typical

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

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ..... ☒ ELIGIBLE ..... ☐

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application and invited Bob Baumbach to speak.

2. Bob Baumbach explained the drawings and each scheme. He explained the removal of windows, terrace, and stairs. He referred to the drawing showing lines of sight as they pertain to the addition of a roof terrace. He presented two versions to the HRC; the second version was developed due to budget constraints and contains a "stair house." In this version, windows would not be removed.

3. Jill Joyce asked about dashed lines on the drawings. Baumbach explained that the window sills will be pulled up higher because they cannot bring them to the historic level. He also wanted to bring up the windows in the stairwell that are slightly lower.

4. Mr. Stern asked if the existing brick will be matched when the sills are raised. They have found a brick that matches the original where the paint has worn away. They also plan to use a red mortar. Stern mentioned that the brick sample should be shown to Katie.

5. Mr. Baumbach explained that they plan to carefully salvage the brick from a window that has been filled in, and reuse it where necessary. This would work with either option.

6. Mr. Matveiev discusses how the building, which is moving from a six unit to a two unit, will now be classified under the IRC, as opposed to IBC. He wondered if the addition of a roof terrace would impact this due to the fact that the classification pertains to residential structures of three stories or less. Mr. Baumbach replied that he would check this out right away.

7. Mr. Stern asked for any public comments. Seeing none, Mr. Tellers proceeded to express his preference to scheme two; however, he remarked that he would deem scheme one satisfactory as well. Ms. Joyce preferred scheme two because the room in the back would be kept intact. Mr. Stern suggested that the group make a motion.

MOTION:

Ms. Joyce.....moved to approve both schemes presented for 800-802 Cedar Avenue.

Mr. Tellers.....seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

1707 East Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

OWNER:
Mary DeMauro
1707 E CARSON ST
PITTSBURGH, PA 15203

APPLICANT:
David Morgan Architects

WARD: 17th

LOT & BLOCK: 0012-E-00307

INSPECTOR: ..... Bob Molyneaux

COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... LNC

ARCH. RATING: ..... Typical

APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00

SITE VISITS: 00/00/00

CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ..... ☒ ELIGIBLE ..... ☐

Proposed Changes:
Addition to rear of structure

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar reintroduced the application from last month's meeting, and architect David Morgan introduced himself.

2. Mr. Morgan discussed his proposal of an addition the same height as the existing structure in order to install bathrooms of the first floor. He explained that the current facilities are not adequate and that this new plan would accommodate eight fixtures per sex. Morgan also mentioned enclosing an exterior back staircase and a current handicap ramp. The new structure would be a simple block building. Morgan mentioned having had some issues with the Zoning Department regarding occupancy.

3. Mr. Tellers asked to see photographs of the site.

4. Mr. Stern asked if the existing building is painted. Morgan replied that it is painted blue-grey. Stern asked if it will stay the same color, and Morgan mentioned the possibility of painting it red like the adjacent structures.

5. Mr. Tellers asked about the alley, which services all of the adjacent buildings, and mentioned that the addition will be "closing them in." Morgan explained that they have been in contact with then neighboring owners, and there does not seem to be any issue. He mentioned that they are currently facing the issue of parking. They are currently working with Zoning to establish shared parking.

6. Mr. Stern voiced his distaste for split-faced block and suggests the consideration of a ground-faced block. He approved of the color but feels that the proposed block is too industrial. Morgan thought that the clients would be willing to consider ground-faced block. Then, Morgan referenced questions from the previous meeting concerning the second floor. He mentioned that his client is trying to be cost-conscious. Stern mentioned that it is, after all, the alley, the "utilitarian" side of the building.

7. Morgan explained that the extent of his work would be the three walls of the addition. There would be not alterations made to the front.

8. Morgan said that going to Zoning about parking might require a variance. There is currently no public parking, only two spots for the owners.

9. Matveiev asked about the total square-footage of each floor. Morgan was not sure, but thought that the lot size is 3,000 square feet.

10. Matveiev then asked about what was in the basement and if it would be extended. Mr. Morgan replied that the existing basement contains utilities and that there will be no extension.

11. Stern asked for any public comments. Seeing none, he suggests the group move to motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers..... moved to approve plans as presented under the condition that colored ground-faced block would be used and that the existing building should be painted to match the block.

Mr. Onque..... seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

4100 Bigelow Boulevard

Schenley Farms Historic District

OWNER:
North American Islamic Trust, Inc.
745 McClintock Dr.
Suite 314
Burr Ridge, IL 60527

APPLICANT:
The Islamic Center of Pittsburgh

WARD: 4th
LOT & BLOCK: 027-G-256
INSPECTOR: ..... Bob McPherson
COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....
ZONING: R1D-VL
ARCH. RATING: 1950s

APPLICATION RECEIVED: 05/20/2007
SITE VISITS: 0/0/0000
CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000

Proposed Changes:
Construction of a playground.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar reintroduced the application, which was tabled a year ago for a zoning review. She explained that the commission now needs to review the aesthetics of the playground because the zoning issues have been resolved. A representative from the Islamic Center introduced himself as Adam Zur (sp.?) and asked if a member of the Schenley Farms Association may speak as well. Stern agreed to this.

2. Carol Kowall, the Association member, explained that this issues concerning color, size, and inconsistencies within the neighborhood have been resolved in ways everyone deemed appropriate. She explained a plan with more natural materials, natural wood, green plastic, fencing identical with neighboring home with accompanying hedge, preservation of landscaping and lawn, alternative material under the playground equipment, and the removal of the canopy to meet height regulations.

3. Mr. Stern asked if the hedge will be inside or outside the fence. Kowall replied that it will be on the outside.

4. Kowall explained that the fence will accommodate the London Plain trees, so as not to disturb the order along the street. She then mentioned that the neighbors have worked long and hard to put together a packet of all the information, which all affected organizations have signed. She asks if there are any other questions.

5. Ms. Joyce asked if there is a site plan of the landscaping. There is none. Kowall explained different locations of the playground elements. She mentioned that the largest structure would be shielded on two sides.

6. Mr. Stern requested that the plan as well as a schematic plan, once developed, be submitted to Katie.

7. Mr. Stern asked for public comment. Moira Cleary, a woman who worked on the agreement and is also a landscaper, spoke regarding the request for landscape drawings. She said that everything the Commission should need is in the agreement.

8. Various Commission members reiterated that a drawing showing the placement of the trees/shrubs is necessary as well as more detailed drawings of the equipment.

9. Molnar wished to review the packet before issuing a CoA and required the additional information as soon as it becomes available.

10. Stern asked for a motion.

MOTION:

Ms. Joyce..... moved to approve plans for the playground, provided that additional documentation of the schematic proposal is submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

252 Parkman Avenue — Schenley Farms Historic District

OWNER:
Didar Singh
252 Parkman Avenue
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

APPLICANT:
Didar Singh
252 Parkman Avenue
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

WARD: 4th
LOT & BLOCK:.....027-G-272
INSPECTOR:..... Bob McPherson
COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:... RM-M
ARCH. RATING:...Non-Contributing

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

Proposed Changes:
Installation of Governor's Drive in front yard

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application and explained that the purpose of this going before the Commission was to decide if this driveway will disrupt the integrity of this historic landscape. She explained that the work has already started without approval.
2. Mr. Stern asked if the work was largely complete. Molnar replied that was her understanding. The concrete, however, has not been poured.
3. Didar Singh, the owner and applicant, introduced himself. Then, several individuals wishing to make public comment attempted to speak but were asked to take their seats until the Commission was ready to take public comment.
4. Mr. Singh explained his troubles with the existing driveway and that he needed this improvement in order to safely turn around before entering the one-way street.
5. Ms. Joyce asked about the landscaping shown in the photographs. Molnar explained the stage at which they were taken.
6. Mr. Stern asked if there are any questions for the applicant. Seeing none, he asked for public comment.
7. Gurdial Mehta, a good friend of the applicant, testifieed about the dangers of the existing driveway situation. He also claimed that they knew nothing of the "laws of the area" before work commenced.
8. Further comments in support of the project were made by Andrew McSwigan, Mark Kinney, and Michael Friday.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved to approve the installation of a governor's driveway and landscaping.

Mr. Onque..... seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

1226 Sheffield Street — *Manchester Historic District*

OWNER:
BRANDAU JEFFREY D &
JUDITH A
1226 SHEFFIELD ST
PITTSBURGH, PA 15233

APPLICANT:
SAME

WARD: 21st
LOT & BLOCK: 0022-R-00131
INSPECTOR: ..... Russell Blaich
COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....
ARCH. RATING: .....

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

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED ..... ☒ ☐ ELIGIBLE ..... ☐

Proposed Changes:
Demolition of rear garage structure

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application for the demolition of a rear garage structure.
2. Jeffery Brandau, the owner and applicant, explained that his garage has been condemned by the City of Pittsburgh.
3. Mr. Stern wondered if zoning restrictions would apply if the applicant wished to reconstruct an historic garage.
4. Ms. Molnar suggested that the Zoning Department be consulted about this in case Brandau wished to rebuild the garage in the future.

MOTION:

Mr. Onque.....moved to approve the demolition.

Ms. Joyce.....seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the properties up for demolition (five Sedgwick properties as well as 1218 N Franklin).

2. Molnar asked for a continuance on 1218 N Franklin Street so that the community might have more time to present their plan for restoration.

3. Russell Blaich notified the Commission that three of the five properties on Sedgwick Street have burned. He said that it would be easiest to demolish them all at once.

4. **Anne Nelson**, a representative from the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation, agreed with Molnar's plan to demolish all properties except that of 1218 N Franklin.

5. **Maryilyn Brooks,** a Manchester resident, spoke in favor of demolition.

6. **Lisa Anderson**, a Manchester resident, spoke in favor of demolition.

MOTION:

Mr. Onque.....moved to approve the demolitions.

Mr. Tellers..... Seconded the motion.

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*

HISTORIC NOMINATION FORM

HRC Staff Use Only

Date Received: ..... April 30, 2009
Parcel No.: 11-J-328
Ward: 1st
Zoning Classification: ..... LNC
Bldg. Inspector: ..... Ed McAllister
Council District: .....

Fee Schedule

Please make check payable to *Treasurer, City of Pittsburgh*

Individual Landmark Nomination:	$100.00
District Nomination:	$250.00

1. HISTORIC NAME OF PROPERTY:
   Paramount Pictures Film Exchange

2. CURRENT NAME OF PROPERTY:
   Paramount Pictures Film Exchange

3. LOCATION
   a. Street: 1727 Blvd. of the Allies (aka 1727 Bluff Street)
   b. City, State, Zip Code: Pittsburgh, PA 15219
   c. Neighborhood: Uptown

4. OWNERSHIP
   d. Owner(s): UPMC and/or CURRAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
   e. Street: 600 Grant Street, 57th Floor (UPMC CORPORATE REAL ESTATE US STEEL TOWER, 60TH FLOOR, UST 01 06 03, 600 GRANT ST)
   f. City, State, Zip Code: Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Phone: (____) ____ - ____

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application and briefly explained the building's significance as well as her intention to work with nominator Dan Holland on the task.

2. Mr. Stern asked for questions and public comment.

3. **Dan Holland**, CEO of YPA, fully supports the nomination. He remarked on its capacity for reuse as well as the possibility of UPMC playing a role in its preservation.

4. **Cliff Levine** spoke on behalf of UPMC in opposition to the Paramount Picture building's designation. He presented written testimony, and took some time to explain the packet, making the case that it was only a warehouse building for Paramount, and then a poison center for the City of Pittsburgh for a while. UPMC is not interested in the significant maintenance costs associated with this structure.

5. **Anne Nelson**, a representative from the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation, spoke in support of its designation and remarked that the group had previously identified the building in its countywide survey in the 1980s.

6. **Drew Levinson** made some clarifications regarding the nomination and spoke in support of the building's historical significance.

7. Mr. Tellers remarked that the significance of the building is more cultural than architectural. He further remarked that the Commission needs to look at its responsibilities when designating an individual building. He asks if there was a broader plan for the site, and mentioned that he is inclined to deny the application because it may hinder the development of the Bluff area, the argument is weak, and he thought it could be a rather insignificant building.

8. Mr. Stern added that he has an issue on another perspective, which was that if the Commission says "no" now, then the building will be demolished tomorrow, but if it says "yes," then there will be more time to get feedback from the community, and to learn more about the significance of the structure. He reminded the Commission that it is currently making a preliminary decision to "consider" the building, not to formally designate it today.

9. Mr. Onque agreed that it would be good to see what options are available. Mr. Tellers agreed.

10. Ms. Molnar commented that between now and August there would be more time to explore the historical significance of the building, and to learn more about its history.

MOTION:

Mr. Tellers.....moved that reasonable cause exists to determine that the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange, located at 1727 Blvd. of the Allies (aka 1727 Bluff Street), will meet the criteria for designation, in accordance with Title 11 of the Pittsburgh Code.

Mr. Onque..... seconded the motion

ALL **VOTED IN FAVOR** *MOTION PASSES*