



**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 July 1, 2009

Beginning at 12:30 PM

200 Ross Street

First Floor Hearing Room

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<b><i>Members</i></b>	<b><i>Staff</i></b>	<b><i>Others</i></b>
Paul Tellers, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Maureen Neary
Noor Ismail		Kate McGlynn
Sergei Matveiev		Mary Anne Murphy
Jill Joyce		Brandon Williams
Earl Onque		Eleanor Coleman
Ruth Drescher		Justin Greenawalt
		Carole Malakoff
		Bart Rogo
		Jerome Jackson
		Stanley Lowe
		John Francona
		Cliff Levine
		Evelyn Jones

**Old Business**

**Nominations Report:** There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Old Stone Tavern nomination was recommended by Planning Commission on June 23, 2009, and that it would soon go to City Council. The Paramount Pictures Film Exchange nomination would have a Public Comment period today, at the end of the hearing.

**Q&A with the Allegheny West LRC:** Carole Malakoff addressed the HRC and distributed a printed agenda for her comments. She said that the local review committee has some questions about “the process”, and whether the process can be smoothed out. Among the agenda items, she said that the LRC was concerned about property owners completing projects without getting the proper approvals; that property owners seek approval after-the-fact; that building permits get issued within the historic district without the knowledge of the historic planner; the lack of staff in BBI; and when the HRC deems a project inappropriate, and requests that the owner make amendments, how much time do they get? Where does the City record this? Ms. Drescher said that it would be unlikely that someone would know whether they were in an historic district unless someone bothered to tell them. Mr. Matveiev said he thought the lack of HRC staffing contributed to some of the problems. Ms. Malakoff asked if there could be an “historic inspector,” but Mr. Matveiev said that the regular inspectors catch work in historic areas just as easily. Ms. Maryann Murphy addressed the HRC and wondered why there wasn’t a stronger consequence for non-compliance.

**New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the May and June 2009 minutes. In regards to the May minutes, Ms. Drescher motioned to approve, Mr. Onque seconded, all but Mr. Matveiev voted to approve (Matveiev abstained since he was not in attendance at the May meeting. Regarding the June minutes, Mr. Onque moved to approve the minutes, Mr. Matveiev seconded the motion, and everyone but Ms. Drescher voted in favor (Drescher abstained because she was absent for the June 2009 meeting).

---

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

**Applications for Economic Hardship:** None

**Upcoming Demolitions:** Ms. Molnar indicated that the following addresses would be considered for demolition at the August 2009 HRC meeting:

- 1512 Chateau Street – Manchester
- 1514 Chateau Street – Manchester
- 1508 Chateau Street – Manchester
- 1419 Juniata Street – Manchester
- 1009 Liverpool Street – Manchester (*Renewal of CofA*)
- 1415 Allegheny Avenue – Manchester (*Renewal of CofA*)
- 1417 Allegheny Avenue – Manchester (*Renewal of CofA*)

Ms. Molnar asked for an update on 1218 N Franklin Street. Mr. Stanley Lowe addressed the HRC. Mr. Lowe told the HRC that after sending a contractor out to the building, they found it was the dormer leaking, not the roof. It would take \$12-13,000 to stabilize the building. Knowing that BBI is concerned with safety, MCC is working with PHLF and the URA to secure funding. Mr. Lowe said that by July 30, the partnership would have identified funding and made recommendations for the property. They would be issuing a report with many addresses, and describing a well-put-together neighborhood development strategy. In the meantime, Lowe recommends that the City land-bank the properties. Mr. Jerome Jackson addressed the HRC saying that there will be a new Local Review Committee of nine people: three from the historic society, three from MCC, and three at-large in the community. One person will also be on the demolition committee.

**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**

---

OWNER:	WARD:.....23 <sup>rd</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
City of Pittsburgh	LOT & BLOCK:.....8-B-150	SITE VISITS:	00/00/00
APPLICANT:	INSPECTOR:.....BRIAN HILL	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
Allegheny Commons Initiative	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		00-000
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....		
	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>	

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the project to the Commission and described the general background of the project.
2. Ms. Alida Baker, a staff member of the Allegheny Commons Initiative, explained the design (based in the master plan) and the evaluation process for the pilot project.
3. Mr. Tellers invited public comment:
4. Nancy Lonnett Roman of Pashek Associates spoke about the project’s design. She explained various aspects of the plan. She mentioned that historic photographs were consulted when designing the fountain, and the research that has been put into this project. She discussed the renovation of pathways. She also mentioned coordinating with the farmer’s market (electrical hookups, etc.). She said that historic photographs will be used to determine the next phase of design. Then she spoke about finding the original stone from the fountain was deposited in Riverview Park. The original stone has been used to determine and appropriate replacement. They couldn’t reuse the stone itself because it was too far damaged. Lastly, she mentioned talks with the Health Department to determine the health and safety of the fountain, its re-circulating non-potable water, etc.
5. Ms. Drescher asked where the fountain is on the drawing, and Ms. Roman described the location.
6. Mr. Tellers asked Ms. Roman to confirm the diameter of the fountain to be 50 foot in diameter. Ms. Roman said that they determined the size by using historic photographs. Mr. Tellers asked if additional trees would be installed. The answer is yes. Ms. Roman talked about infill trees continuing around the pathway and along the perimeter. She said that the types of trees are not finalized yet and that the remaining types of plants would be bedding around the fountain.
7. Tellers asked for public comment. Seeing none, he asked for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Joyce.....Moved to approve the design development drawings as presented today, for Allegheny Commons Park.

Ms. Drescher.....Seconded this motion.

**All vote in favor. Motion passes.**

OWNER: Mr. John DeSantis

WARD: 22<sup>nd</sup>

BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER: 007-D-163

BUILDING INSPECTOR: Jack McGoogan

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: LNC

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Unrated

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar reintroduced the project from previous meetings. She described the past history of the project, and described that the materials have changed since the last approval. Ms. Molnar invited Jerry Morosco to the table to describe the project and the changes.
2. Gerald Morosco, speaking on behalf of John DeSantis, discussed the cleaning of the building, which revealed a cement plaster. This destroyed the notion of the original scheme. John would like to cover the building with a veneer brick with stone sills and stone caps on the walls. The only change on the perimeter wall would be to remove the brick accents, and use a stone cap. There is a detail of the fencing in the distributed handouts, as requested. The ironwork pattern is almost exactly what the material design will look like. Mr. DeSantis also prepared a landscape plan to show the Commission members. Mr. Morosco discussed the issues with an asphalt cap on the property regarding subsurface lead. He said that he will submit the final brick selection to Ms. Molnar.
3. Mr. Tellers asked for clarification about the brick on the previous approval. He also said that he was somewhat concerned that the fence is too detailed for the plain, austere structure. Mr. Morosco explained that Mr. DeSantis is really more interested in creating an urban park atmosphere; when the landscape matures, it will really take the attention. He added that it is a neutral way to treat a non-contributing structure.
4. Ms. Joyce said that she thinks the building will fade away and recede behind the fencing and landscaping.
5. Mr. Morosco said that Mr. DeSantis thinks a brick of the same palette of the neighborhood would be the most appropriate. They got into a discussion about the unique material of the gas station, but unfortunately, that material was not substantial and occurred sporadically on the building.
6. Ms. Joyce asked if a stucco finish had been considered. Mr. Morosco explained the decision not to choose any of the modern stucco options. Mr. Morosco asked for a final approval, on the condition that a brick sample would be sent to Katie.
7. Tellers asks for public comment.
8. **Carole Malakoff** said that though the LRC hadn't seen the most current plans, she had talked to Mr. DeSantis. He described the brick, and how it would relate to the house on the adjacent alley. She said that she was in support of the project.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Drescher.....moved to approve the revisions that were brought on this project, specifically the fencing and façade material at 857 Western Avenue, and on the condition that Katie approve final material selection and landscape plan.

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

***857 Western Avenue***

**All vote in favor. Motion passes.**

OWNERS:	WARD:.....21 <sup>st</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
GLAZE ROBERT L & PATRICIA (1206 W North)	LOT & BLOCK:.....22-R-266, 267	SITE VISITS:	00/00/00
ROGENSKI STANLEY & MARGARET (1208 W North)	INSPECTOR:.....BRIAN HILL	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		00-000
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....		
APPLICANT:	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		
The Bureau of Building Inspection			

**Proposed Changes: Demolition to grade**

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the two West North Avenue demolitions sites, and described how we had seen these at previous meetings. She said that the demolition inspector, Russ Blaich, could not be here today. Ms. Molnar did not have a map showing the location of the properties.
2. Tellers asked for questions or comments from public.
3. **Maureen Neary** said that she owns buildings across the street. She mentioned termites and safety hazards in the proposed demolition buildings. She added that these buildings are affecting her own historic properties, which she has put a lot of money into.
4. **Mr. Stanley Lowe** testified that he recognizes that issues do exist with these buildings. He however, wanted to be on the record as asking that these properties not be demolished until MCC, PHLF, and URA could finish updating their vacant properties inventory. If MCC can, they would like to come back to be able to stabilize these properties. They'd like these addresses to be included in the survey, due to be completed at the end of July.
5. Mr. Tellers asks about a timeline for getting bids, etc. Mr. Matveiev said that it is a long process – to get asbestos survey, bids together, etc. It could be anywhere from 30 to 90 days.
6. **Bart Rogo**, a neighbor living next door who is also a contractor, mentioned a variety of problems with the buildings, and that he'd trapped six raccoons on the properties. No one has lived at either of those buildings for at least 10 years. He explained a collapse in rear of building. He spoke in favor of demolition.
7. Rogo's wife, **Meda Rogo**, spoke in favor of demolition, and mentioned that the buildings were a sidewalk hazard.
8. Mr. Tellers asked for a motion.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Onque.....Moved to approve the demolition of 1206-1209 West North Avenue.

Mr. Matveiev.....Seconded the motion.

**All vote in favor. Motion passes.**



**Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange**

**HISTORIC NOMINATION FORM**

***HRC Staff Use Only***

Date Received:.....April 30, 2009  
Parcel No.:.....11-J-328  
Ward:.....1<sup>st</sup>  
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

□□□□□

**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 last agenda item as a Public Hearing for the historic nomination of the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange building. She said the nomination was submitted to the DCP on April 30, 2009. Previously, the HRC had voted that the building has the potential to meet the criteria listed in our ordinance. Today is a public hearing, so there will be no motions made. She also said that she is working with the nominating parties to clear up anything confusing in the nomination form, and to give more accurate and clear information.

2. Mr. Tellers asked who would like to make public comment. To organize this, he asked that those in favor of designation speak first, followed by those opposed to historic designation. Mr. Cliff Levine, a lawyer for UPMC, interjected that the HRC ordinance allows for cross examination, and he told Mr. Tellers that UPMC would like to reserve the right to do so. Mr. Tellers said “okay.”

3. **Mr. Dan Holland**, CEO of YPA, spoke in support of the nomination. He supports the nomination for three reasons. *One*, the building has a “compelling history” which articulates advances in the nationwide film industry, including the streamlining of the film distribution system. He said it is no ordinary warehouse. He mentioned that the building contained a library, office space, and viewing room – thereby consolidating many separate entities under one roof. At the time of its consolidation, the building was one of the most advanced film

**Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange**

exchanges. Part of the building was made of “fireproof construction,” and the seven film vaults had fire sprinklers, suggesting that something more precious than mere consumer goods were stored in the building. *Second*, the building is a critical part of the Uptown Community Partner’s plan for the neighborhood, and that on June 22, the group voted to support the historic nomination. The building is a critical asset to the uptown neighborhood. The Paramount building is a complement to the community’s plan. He said that the community is committed to finding a new use for this building. He said that one possible use would be for a green medical clinic, as suggested by a New York City developer.

4. Mr. Levine said this was an evidentiary hearing, and he did not mean to interrupt, but he objects to the “hearsay nature” of Holland’s argument about an unnamed developer from New York City.

5. Mr. Holland continued by saying that YPA supports the nomination because it represents the future of our City. In an age where the term “greenness” comes to dominate the language of architecture, the “greenest building is that which is already built, and in this sense, the Paramount Pictures Film exchange is a building is already one that could advance the efforts of the Uptown Community and the City of Pittsburgh.

6. Mr. Tellers said he did not recall hearing about the Uptown Community Plan at the first hearing. Is anyone here representing the Uptown Community? Is there a part of that Plan which shows how this building is incorporated into that plan? Mr. Holland said he would get that to the Commission. Mr. Tellers asked if the Commission had any questions for Mr. Holland; there were none. Mr. Tellers asked for the next speaker.

7. **Mr. Todd \_\_\_\_\_**, spoke in favor of the nomination of the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange, and other buildings that have some historical influence. He claimed that this nomination is important to neighborhood revitalization and is not anti-development.

8. **Mr. Drew Levinson** spoke in favor of the nomination. He had spoken with the Pittsburgh Film Office, who also enthusiastically supports the nomination. He discussed his initial research on the film exchange and mentioned that the film industry in Pittsburgh is a little known topic. He walked along Smithfield Street, and walked past a nickelodeon building. He mentioned that the film exchange was separate from the nickelodeon and serviced other areas. If the Paramount building is torn down, even if a plaque is put up, it will not be enough for Pittsburghers to remember the building. He referenced other cities that have preserved and reused their film exchanges.

9. **Laurel Polanick (sp.?)**, Drew’s mother spoke to the Commission. She had tried to help her son determine who owned that building, and she said of course Mercy Hospital owned it at first. Mercy was disconnected and didn’t know anything about the building. She said that when UPMC took over the building, the organization didn’t care about the building until they heard that somebody was recognizing it for its significance. She said that the area has significance and that preservation could help the city. This property is part of a much bigger picture, and a larger history. She said that Pittsburgh “sells” its atmosphere and its character, which attract tourists. The building has beautiful architectural detailing, and is in an area that could “regrow itself.” This building is not essential to UPMC. If you told me that the hospital really needed this land to enlarge its “burn unit,” most people would understand something like this. This is “we own it, and it’s ours to do what we want.” She mentioned how an individual from the Oklahoma City Film Row said that our exchange was nicer than theirs is. Mr. Tellers asked her to wrap-up her comments due to the three minute time limit.

10. **Michael Bennett** with YPA addressed the Commission as a “Pittsburgher.” He said that most people don’t know about Pittsburgh’s film history, and therefore, it is even more important to preserve the Paramount Film Exchange. He mentioned that he studied other cities that have preserved their film histories.

11. **Justin Greenawalt**, a Master’s candidate for Historic Preservation, strongly supports the nomination. He said that we used to have a complete film row, but now there are only two exchanges left in Pittsburgh. He said that after doing a cursory evaluation of the building, he has determined that it “is in fair condition.” The building has managed to survived. He asks the HRC to consider it for designation.

**Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange**

12. **John \_\_\_\_\_ (?)** said that if Pittsburgh wants to move toward being a greener city, then it should preserve the film exchange to create a sense of community identity.
13. Mr. Tellers asked to hear from speakers in opposition.
14. **Mr. Cliff Levine and Doug Shlaunk**, presented exhibits that they asked would become part of the record. Mr. Doug Shlaunk introduced himself as the director of architecture for UPMC. Mr. Levine said that under the HRC rules, he would be presenting the owner's case, but would not adhere to the three minute time limit. He said that UPMC became an owner just by virtue of acquiring Mercy Hospital. It was not an outright acquisition. There are no plans for the site, in terms of expansion, or anything of that nature. There is no opposition to historic preservation, but the building is a fairly dilapidated structure, and historic designation could actually be counter-productive to the building's preservation. He wanted to go through the exhibits presented to the HRC.
- a. Mr. Levine asked Mr. Shlaunk to reintroduce himself. Mr. Shlaunk gave his background and credentials.
- b. Mr. Tellers asked Mr. Levine and Mr. Shlaunk to the table so they could be better heard on the tape recording.
- c. Mr. Levine asked Mr. Shlaunk if he was familiar with the property. He is. Mr. Tellers interrupted and asked what legal process Mr. Levine was heading with his direct examination. Mr. Levine replied, and said that as a lawyer he would be asking the questions to produce the information needed for testimony.
- d. Mr. Tellers read from the Rules and Procedures that indicated the process for the hearing. Mr. Levine read from the City Ordinance, which allows the property owner an opportunity for reasonable examination and cross examination, etc. UPMC has legitimate reasons to want to give their testimony completely. Mr. Tellers said that he would be willing to loosen the Rules and Procedures time limit of three minutes so that the HRC would have the most complete record of information, and that it would be able to make the best decision.
- e. Mr. Levine said that two properties flank the Paramount film exchange, both of which were film exchanges at one time.
- f. Mr. Shlaunk said that the building is basically a brick box with some Classic Revival detailing. It doesn't have much detailing, especially none that convey much of a style. If the building were only reviewed on its architectural detailing, then it probably would not be considered for landmark status. The building has been broken in to many times. The proposal to get a demolition permit for the building is one of public safety. It is uncomfortable to stand in front of the building because it is so close to the road. It is not well suited for public use, because of its proximity to the Boulevard of the Allies. Further, the building would be difficult to use as a medical facility because it does not have an elevator, and it would require steps to traverse around.
- g. It is Mr. Shlaunk's opinion that the windows are not original. There is considerable damage to the doors, windows, etc. The building is built out to the property lines in all directions; there is no opportunity to provide parking for the public use of this building.
- h. Ms. Polanick interrupted saying that there are two huge parking lots nearby, and that there is plenty of parking in the area. She was willing to spend her own money on a new door.
- i. Ms. Drescher said that it seems that all of the condition issues Mr. Shlaunk brought forth would be reparable.
- j. Mr. Shlaunk said that you could do all of those things, but cost would be an issue. UPMC has been looking for a buyer for the building. They had someone from Duquesne University who was interested at first. But

**Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange**

they turned down the possibility of buying it because they didn't want something that had historic designation hanging over it, and they thought it was in too poor of condition.

k. Mr. Levine said that the building did operate as a warehouse. Mr. Tellers asked for clarification, because the nominating parties said that there was a library, a screening room, and offices. Mr. Levine said that he objected to the conflation of the "Hollywood" movie story, but in fact, there was a screening room, etc. Mr. Levine said they have been trying to market the building, but nobody seems to want it at this point, due to reasons mentioned earlier.

l. Mr. Levine and Mr. Shlaunk continued to describe the photographs and exhibits, pointing out damage on the interior, including damage at the screening room.

m. Mr. Levine referenced the Uptown Community Plan, which he included in the exhibits. This building is not mentioned at all, it is not a significant building. He could not show the commission where it was not represented, because it was not represented at all. To note, though, the building may act as a buffer to the highway.

n. Mr. Shlaunk said that in his conversations with the Uptown Community folks, the group seemed more interested in restoring and preserving residential building stock.

o. Ms. Polanick interjected that she thought the building was bigger than Mr. Shlaunk said it was. Mr. Levine addressed this comment by saying that Mr. Shlaunk is an architect who measured the building. Mr. Shlaunk said there is no parking with the building, and any nearby parking belongs to other organizations or entities.

p. Mr. Levine and Mr. Shlaunk reiterated that the building is not useful to UPMC, and anybody or organization wishing to make a "low ball offer would be seriously considered." Harry Davis is adjacent, and the Paramount property is not next to their other properties. The block that UPMC is interested in developing is between Van Braam and Marion, next to Mercy. Parking will become an issue in the future, so for long term, they would be interested in building a parking garage. In the short term, they would be looking at parking in that immediate area. Mr. Levine said that it is important to note that there is no identified use for the Paramount lot, even as a parking lot. Mr. Shlaunk said that the high traffic on the Boulevard would make the building very difficult to market. If there was historic designation, the consequences would be that it would be almost impossible to sell. They're open to options, such as a moratorium on the demolition process for a certain amount of months as they try to sell the property. The historic designation would not be working for this building's future; it would fall into worse repair.

q. Mr. Levine said that they have attached the Federal designation guidelines for the HRC's reference. In the National Register Criteria, page 4 of 16, exhibit 5, it talks about significance of association. It says that mere association with historic events or trends is not enough for the building to fall under Criterion A. The property's specific association must be considered important as well. Mr. Levine appreciates the "fine line" between association and true significance.

r. Mr. Levine said that the reality of all of this, given the building's condition and its location, the building will fall into disrepair and become a home for vagrants. If there was a 180 day delay on demolition, but no historic designation hearings, then perhaps UPMC would have a better chance at selling the building.

15. Mr. Tellers reminded everyone that the purpose of the public hearing was to gather all of the facts about the proposed designation. If there are any questions about "fact" for any of the parties, do any of the Commissioners have questions? Since we are asking questions of each other, please limit your questions to points of fact.

16. Mr. Holland said "to set the record straight," it was YPA's intent to complement what was happening in uptown. There is a decreasing buffer in the neighborhood. The community residents he talked to were not really happy with the amount of increasing vacant lots. There really is a noise factor happening. The fact is, this building is the best complement to the community plan, though it is not specifically addressed in the plan. Finally, a developer

***Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange***

has been identified to rehab the building for medical uses, but Dan cannot disclose his name without the person's consent. Dan said he did not realize the building was even for sale. Mr. Levine said again that the building is for sale. Lastly, Mr. Holland said there would no better way to promote a building than to say it is historic. Mr. Holland said that though he has heard the argument against historic designation before, that argument has never played out.

17. Mr. Tellers asked why YPA was targeting only one of the Film Exchange buildings if there are three left. Mr. Holland said that it was the one that was brought to our attention, but really, we could have brought all three before the HRC. They only had research and documentation for one of the buildings. With respect to the interior of the building, the HRC code does not cover the interiors of buildings. The point is, there is common ground here. He does not want to see the various commissions go back-and-forth on this. On the other hand, he thinks it is worthy of designation.

18. Ms. Drescher said she thinks we need to clarify the process. We are not taking any action today. If the Commission votes to continue the process, it would stop the building from being torn down through the remainder of the process.

19. Mr. Levine said that they have a slightly different view now, because the moratorium on demolition will remain with the building until the nomination process has been completed. He repeated his willingness to consider all option.