



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 August 5, 2009

Beginning at 12:30 PM

200 Ross Street

First Floor Hearing Room

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>
Michael Stern, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Karen Glenn
		Audrey Diggs
Sergei Matveiev		Rosemary Pattern
Joe Serrao		Shirley Atkins
Ernie Hogan		Patricia Washington
Linda McClellan		Karea Battle
		Shirley Taylor
		Lore Campbell
		Jeff Friedl
		Susanne Neal
		Mark Mox
		Daphnie Milam
		Debora Simpson
		Jerome Jackson
		Evelyn Jones
		Joe Carone
		Carole Malakoff
		Mary Anne Murphy
		Suzanne Brighton
		Russell Blaich
		Irene Zotis
		Fred Reichl
		John Fleenor
		Anne Nelson
		Dan Holland
		Dave Montgomery
		Breen Masciotra
		Drew Levinson
		Mary Withrow
		Laurel Polanik

Old Business

Ms. Molnar welcomed the new members to the Historic Review Commission: Joe Serrao, Ernie Hogan, and Linda McClellan. Mr. Stern offered a brief word of appreciation to the late Michael Eversmeyer.

Nominations Report: There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Old Stone Tavern nomination is scheduled for City Council on September 9th. The Paramount Pictures Film Exchange nomination will be voted on at the end of today's HRC meeting.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the July 2009 minutes. In regards to the July minutes, Mr. Hogan motioned to approve, Mr. Serrao seconded, all voted to approve (all members had previously received audio recordings of the July hearing, and were able to listen to the hearing to affirm the accuracy of the written minutes, since Serrao, Hogan, Stern, and McClellan were not present at the July meeting) .

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the July 2009 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao moved to approve, Ms. McClellan 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 September 2009 HRC meeting:

- 1414 Nixon Street
- 1316 Juniata Street
- 1318 Juniata Street

Adjourn: Mr. Hogan motioned to adjourn, Mr. Serrao seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

ATTACHMENTS

OWNER:	WARD:.....1st	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
McDonald’s USA, LLC	LOT & BLOCK:.....1-C-224	SITE VISITS:	07/16/09
APPLICANT:	INSPECTOR:.....Ed McALISTER	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
McIlvried, DiDiano & Mox, LLC	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		88-028
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....		93-072
	ARCH. RATING:.....		95-018
			05-106
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. She described the application and the proposed modifications. She invited the applicant to the table to describe the project.
2. Mr. Mark Mox introduced himself as a member of McIlvried, DiDiano & Mox, hired by McDonald’s to complete the project. He introduced Joe Carone (owner/operator), Susanne Neal, and Jeff Friedel with Atlas Neon, the sign company. Mr. Mox said the building was constructed in the late 1970s, but did not describe it as an “historical” building. It is located within the district, but the building is non-contributing. McDonald’s has been going through a transition of changing their business, and rebranding the company. Mox showed “typical prototype” buildings showing what the company image is trying to achieve in recent years. He said that they secured a certificate of appropriateness for some general masonry repairs and cleaning, prior to today’s meeting. Mr. Mox and Ms. Neal distributed drawings, photographs, and renderings of the McDonald’s and the desired new appearance. Mr. Mox continued to describe all of the elements of the project, from lighting, roofing material, awnings, and signage.
3. The HRC asked about existing signage in the windows, and whether it would remain. It will.
4. Mr. Mox described the addition of the accent “awnings” to the windows. He said this would really be the major change/modification to the building... and this would make the most impact. He said there was a silver bar that goes around the awning, that contains an LED light, which lights-up the awning. This is typical of the material that McDonald’s uses at its suburban freestanding buildings. Jeff Friedel said that this was an aluminum awning, and it would be easier to maintain and keep clean.
5. Mr. Matveiev wanted to know why the Forbes Avenue elevation wasn’t receiving awnings, or any other treatment to lessen the austerity of that brick wall. Mox and Carrone said that the windows weren’t high enough to accommodate awnings, though they would love to do that. Matveiev said that the window appeared to be at least 6 feet from the ground at the head.
6. Mr. Hogan said he was concerned about the “mini billboard” signs on the Forbes elevation, and the impact of adding additional advertising to the building.
7. Mr. Hogan asked about the patio and landscaped area, and how that area would be treated.
8. Mr. Mox described pre-cast concrete furniture to be left permanently outdoors at the patio area, where the fencing and landscaping would be removed. Mr. Hogan said he thinks that outdoor activity and usage

would be a good use of that space, but he would be very concerned about how those materials would be treated. The precast materials would be less likely to “move” away from the building site, and less likely to “move” through a window. Mr. Matveiev attested that metal furniture can be bolted to the ground, or kept in a fashion that would not be easily removed from the site. Mr. Stern said that he did not think this type of design and furniture would necessarily be compatible with the remainder of Market Square, the HRC’s purview. If there would be an opportunity to relate contextually to the remainder of Market Square, this would be it. Mr. Stern said that he would like to see this landscaping issue in more detail.

9. Ms. Molnar said that there was a huge issue with the awnings proposed at the Dunkin Donuts, another non-contributing structure, and the HRC decided to deny the use of metal awnings at that location. For the sake of consistency, and at desire to not set a poor precedent, Molnar encouraged the HRC to deny the current request for metal awnings.
10. Mox said that at a long term basis, they think the metal will hold up the best. They even looked at the condition of other awnings in the district, and did not like the appearance of the awnings after time. Friedel said that Dunkin Donuts installed vinyl awnings, not sunbrella or cloth. Molnar replied that if that was the case, then Dunkin Donuts is in violation of what the HRC approved them to do.
11. Mr. Stern said that the awnings, if modified, could potentially be viewed as architectural accents. Mr. Serrao reminded the HRC to be conscientious to the potential to set precedent with our decisions. Mr. Hogan said that a good maintenance program would help protect cloth awnings from looking shabby in the coming years.
12. Mr. Carrone said that if they are not allowed to follow corporate standards, then perhaps the easiest thing would be to not make any changes at all. Mr. Stern said that we often have to work with corporations and their identities, but there are many places throughout the country where corporate businesses have been flexible to fit into the historic districts.
13. Mr. Stern said that if the window treatments could be redesigned, then perhaps the HRC could approve them. But as they exist now, they act as awnings, and cannot be approved based on our guidelines.

MOTION:

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to approve the project based on the staff recommendation [approval of new copper roof; lighting and illumination; operable, cloth awnings; primary identification signage; flat “flag signs”], and in addition, he moved to approve the LED sign with the condition that its content not change more than once per day, and that staff to the HRC review the awning selection and the outdoor seating area, including sidewalk furniture. The billboard signs on the Forbes elevation are not approved.

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded this motion.

All vote in favor. Motion passes.

OWNERS: George and Sofia Bouzos	WARD:.....22nd	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00
	LOT & BLOCK:.....7-D-154	SITE VISITS: 00/00/00
APPLICANT: Dean and Irene Zotis	INSPECTOR:.....	CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 97-003
	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	99-104
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....	
	ARCH. RATING:.....	

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the project to the Commission and described the general background of the project. This is an address that suffered a fire earlier in the year [New Year's Eve] which completely gutted the interiors of 2 buildings and damaged a 3rd building. The property owner started to repair the building without a Certificate of Appropriateness, including the rebuilding a portion of the gable wall on the Galveston elevation [west side of building], rebuilding the roof to match the original roof slope, the removal of the chimneys that were damaged during the fire, and the installation of a small rounded window in the west elevation. The proposal today is an application to approve work items after-the-fact in addition to modifications that have not yet occurred, including restoration of the storefronts along Western Avenue. Molnar invited the property representative to the table.
2. Irene Zotis, daughter of the property owner, introduced herself and Fred from October Development, the contractor. She said that the fire was quite an ordeal for the family, and it has been a difficult experience to restore the building to what it used to be.
3. Molnar said that some of the concerns she's heard from the community are that the it is inappropriate for the chimneys to have been removed, that the roof slope changed since it was repaired, and that the window on the west elevation does not match the original window.
4. Ms. Zotis said that a couple of chimneys fell during the fire, and that a third was so badly damaged during the fire that it had to be removed prior to roof replacement.
5. Mr. Stern invited public comment:
 - a. **Carole Malakoff and Mary Anne Murphy** from the Local Review Committee introduced themselves. They said one of the issues they addressed at the HRC last month was the issue of property owners who complete work without getting the proper approvals, much like this project. Ms. Malakoff said that the architect came to the LRC and described the work plans. The LRC has no problem with the storefront restoration, but does have issue with the 1) the newly installed window, 2) the roof pitch, and 3) the chimney removal. Malakoff described the issues in more detail. She said that the plans shown to the LRC are acceptable, but the work completed does not reflect the plans. Malakoff said the LRC would like to see the three issues remedied by 1) installing a new appropriate window, 2) rebuilding the roof, and 3) rebuilding the chimneys.
6. Molnar informed the new HRC members about the Local Review Committees and their functions.
 - a. **Mary Anne Murphy** said she feels badly for the people who had the fire, but many people told the owners about the proper process for how to deal with the fire, including Katie. She said the building

looks very different now from what it did before. The people in the neighborhood are very concerned that people can go and make major changes to buildings in the district without repercussion.

7. Mr. Stern asked Fred to address the issue of the window and the roof slope. Fred from October development said that they did not change the roof height. As far as the gable, he did not have anything to go from, so he rebuilt it based on the architect's drawings. Regarding the window, Fred said that he worked from where the window sill was, all the brick around it was gone. Without pictures, he had to install whichever arched window he could find that best fit the space. Fred said he followed the architect's drawings in rebuilding the wall. Mr. Stern asked why the window that was installed doesn't match the window in the architect's drawing? Mr. Serrao said that perhaps a narrower window would help.
8. Mr. Stern requested copies of the building permits. Molnar said she thought there were no exterior building permits. Stern asked if drawings were filed, and Fred said he was not sure. Mr. Stern asked if it would be worthwhile to table this approval until we can gather more information about the construction.
9. Ms. Zotis said she received an email from someone in the community saying they would be willing to help them through this. She remembers talking with Ms. Molnar on the phone. She hired an architect and a contractor, and hoped they knew what they were doing, and that they got the proper permits.
10. Stern asked about the replacement of black Carrera glass, and what that would look like. Fred said that he found identical Carrera to replace the broken pieces.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the restoration and repair of the storefront and the installation of the new doors to match the drawing.

Mr. Hogan.....Seconded this motion.

All vote in favor. Motion passes.

1. Mr. Jerome Jackson said that MCC’s opinion on all the agenda demolitions is what it has always been, and that is a temporary cease to all demolitions until a larger plan for stabilization and neighborhood revitalization has been put in place.

1415 & 1417 Allegheny, 1009 Liverpool Street

1. Ms. Molnar said that these are addresses that have been approved in the past (1009 Liverpool, and 1415 Allegheny) and one that is new to the HRC (1417 Allegheny). The reason these are before the HRC is because of the new address, and because the applicant has changed from a private property owner to the Bureau of Building Inspection. The property owner said he was planning to repair one of the buildings on Allegheny, but he never came in to pull the permits.

2. Ms. Barbara Simpson addressed the HRC as the representative of Bidwell Presbyterian Church, as well as neighboring Manchester residents. She wanted to enter in to the record copies of photographs of the building. Eleven people stood behind Ms. Simpson to show their support of her statement and in support of demolition. There is dangerous equipment and materials in the properties, and there are many crimes and drug addicts in the buildings. The property is a fire hazard, an environmental hazard, etc.

3. Mr. Stern asked for any other public comment.

4. Ms. Anne Nelson, PHLF, said that PHLF is not in opposition to the demolition of any buildings on the agenda, except 1218 N Franklin.

5. Ms. Simpson wanted to know the timeline for demolitions; Mr. Matveiev described the process for demolition, and the asbestos survey work, the bid package process, the S106 process, and all of the other time constraints. In essence, the demolition of these properties would not necessarily be first on the priority list for BBI.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the demolition of 1415 & 1417 Allegheny, 1009 Liverpool Street

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded this motion.

All vote in favor. Motion passes.

1508, 1512, 1514 Chateau Street

1. Ms. Molnar described the three properties along Chateau Street as components of a row, but not contiguous. Of the six properties that comprise the row, Mr. Blaich described the three that are being considered for demolition. Blaich said that adjacent property owners are getting a lot of water damage.

2. Ms. Daphne Milam introduced herself as the resident of 1516 Chateau Street. She said that 1506 is occupied, 1508 is condemned, 1510 is occupied but has sustained significant damage. The residents of 1510, an elderly couple, could not be at the HRC today because he husband is undergoing medical treatments, and the wife is disabled. 1512 is condemned, and 1514 is condemned. Ms. Milam lives at 1516 and is sustaining significant damage due to a collapsed roof, causing the building to shift. The excess water goes into her basement. The basement window at 1514 was pried open, and the insides of the building were stripped for copper and other valuables. There have been drug users inside the building at night. Her homeowner’s insurance company told her that the City of Pittsburgh is responsible for the

Demolitions

repairs to the building. She is fearful that both buildings will collapse. Will those buildings be rehabilitated? If so, when? Or, are the buildings going to be demolished? If so, when? She thanked the HRC for their time.

3. Ms. Barbara Simpson also supports the demolition.

4. Mr. Hogan asked how BBI attempts to find property owners and hold them accountable for the condition of condemned properties. Mr. Blaich explained.

5. Mr. Stern said the health and safety of adjacent property owners should be a priority. Stern said that demolitions have been a point of contention for years and years.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the demolition of 1508, 1512, and 1514 Chateau Street

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded this motion.

Mr. Hogan.....Voted in Opposition

Stern, Serrao, McClellan, and Matveiev voted in favor. Motion passes.

1419 Juniata Street

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application, and Mr. Blaich described the condition. It's a City-owned property. Mr. Stern called for public comment. There was none.

MOTION:

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to approve the demolition of 1419 Juniata Street.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded this motion.

All vote in favor. Motion passes.

1218 N Franklin Street

1. Ms. Molnar invited Jerome Jackson to the table, and asked him to describe the handout he had prepared for the HRC members.

2. Jerome Jackson introduced himself as the representative of the Manchester Citizens Corporation. He described the handouts. One of the handouts is the report for 1218 N Franklin Street – the report discussed at the last meeting. They had asked a contractor to estimate costs to shore the property up, and have estimates for costs to rehabilitate the structure. Mr. Jackson said that it is not true that water was entering the adjacent structure, due to deficiencies in 1218 N Franklin. MCC is trying to enter this address into a larger report they are working on to evaluate all condemned and vacant structures in Manchester. One of the handouts is an outline of what this report could possibly look like. As a community, the plan would address how Manchester will address various concerns and needs in the community. The

Demolitions

report will describe which properties can be salvaged, which properties need to be demolished, and which vacant lots need to be developed. MCC had been working on this report / plan for the past 45 days, or so. MCC formed a committee to steer and direct this project. At the July meeting, the committee discussed the outline for the plan. MCC's goal is to have the community approve the completed plan at its August 17th. Jackson was not sure if the plan would be completed by the August meeting, in which case, the approval would have to occur at the neighborhood's September meeting. They would take this plan to the community, collect the community input, and then MCC would present this plan to the City as the direction for revitalization in Manchester. MCC still feels that 1218 N Franklin should not be demolished. MCC thinks that 1218 N Franklin is part of the "Big plan," and does not want to see buildings demolished in a piecemeal fashion.

3. Anne Nelson said that PHLF is working with MCC on the bigger plan for the neighborhood, and that PHLF is opposed to the demolition of this structure as it has been for the last months.

4. Mr. Blaich described the condition of 1218 N Franklin.

5. Mr. Matveiev said that the HRC has been allowing MCC some time to work on their plan but there is another issue. The building is on the verge of structural instability. The adjacent property owner is vulnerable. Originally, this building came to the HRC in February or March. Molnar said that previously the HRC had been tabling the property on a month-by-month basis so that if anything drastic happens at the structure, the HRC could respond.

6. Mr. Hogan said that he is receptive to the idea of a comprehensive plan, but this building poses a more immediate threat. Ms. Nelson said that this address was different, because this is one that MCC, PHLF, and the City have been working toward saving for several months.

7. Mr. Matveiev said that BBI is concerned about the adjacent properties, but he wants to see a specific plan for this building, including an action plan. Mr. Blaich said the initial application for demolition was from 2007. Mr. Serrao said that the building is on the demolition list for a reason. There needs to be some relatively quickly action.

8. Mr. Jackson said he would send information to Ms. Molnar regarding the formation of the Manchester LRC.

MOTION:

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to table the building for one month, with the condition that MCC come back to the HRC with specific plans for securing and stabilizing the structure, so that the building salvation can move forward.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded this motion.

All vote in favor. Motion passes.

Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange

PARAMOUNT PICTURES FILM EXCHANGE – HISTORIC NOMINATION STAFF REPORT

Name of Property.....Paramount Pictures Film Exchange
Address of Property.....1727 Blvd. of the Allies (Aka 1727 Bluff Street), Pittsburgh PA
Property Owner.....UPMC and/or CURRAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Nominated by:.....The Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh
Date Received:.....April 30, 2009
Parcel No.:.....11-J-328
Ward:.....1st
Zoning Classification:.....LNC
Neighborhood.....Bluff
Bldg. Inspector:.....Ed McAllister
Council District:.....

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar directed the HRC members to the staff report in the agenda packets. She informed the public that she has spoken individually with each of the new HRC members. They have also received the staff report, a copy of the historic nomination, minutes from the June and July HRC hearings, audio recording from the July 2009 hearing, written testimony from the Young Preservationists and from UPMC, and copies of all letters of support and opposition. The HRC has had lots of material to review on the nomination. Molnar described the actions required by the HRC in regard to the nomination. She described the next steps of the process, regardless of today’s recommendation, as the nomination progressing to Planning Commission, and to City Council. Molnar said that the information in the packet provides a written description of the building, gives a brief history of the structure, and gives a staff report. Molnar believes that the building meets the criteria as outlined in the historic preservation ordinance, and that the building possesses sufficient integrity to make it worthy of preservation. She said there would be no more public comment at today’s hearing, unless the HRC had questions for the audience, members of the public, the owner, or the nominating party.

2. Mr. Serrao said that he needed to inform his fellow HRC members that he must abstain from voting on this issue, because of a conflict of interest.

3. **Mr. David Montgomery** addressed the HRC from the audience and said in light of the fact that there are three new members of the HRC, UPMC would like the opportunity to summarize the evidence for the commission members. Mr. Stern asked him to wait, because we are not taking any testimony. Molnar reiterated that ALL public comment was presented to all HRC members as part of the record.

4. Mr. Hogan said that he had read all of the testimony presented, and said that he had one question. He said he wanted to know why UPMC decided that historic designation would impair the value of the building, and Hogan also wondered how UPMC “substantiated that decision.”

5. Montgomery said that there was no testimony given in June, so the only real testimony was given in July. At that time, the only testimony given regarding the viability of the building was given by Douglass Shlauk (sp). Shlauk gave his opinion that historic designation would reduce the marketability of the building, and moreover, he described UPMC’s efforts to market the building and perspective buyers thought that historic designation made the building less attractive. So, this was the only real record of the building’s viability. Now, we heard comments from the Young Preservationists saying there was some interest from a New York developer in the building, and UPMC was asking repeatedly for contact information from that developer. Further, UPMC has made it overly clear that they would be willing to sell the structure, and they are open to any offers from the

Local Landmark Nomination – Paramount Pictures Film Exchange

historic preservation community, or any prospective buyer. UPMC actually gave its contact information to the Young Preservationists, but they have heard nothing. This week, Eric Cartwright, VP of UPMC construction and real estate sent a letter to Chairman Stern stating that historic designation hurts the building. Doug Shaluk stated that the highest and best use of the building is for a warehouse. We’ve heard a lot about proposed alternative uses. But if you look at the drawings, the front of this building is on the Boulevard of the Allies. The idea that this building is going to become a frontispiece to the Uptown neighborhood, it is a “pie-in-the-sky” dream that this will become a public destination point. UPMC is willing to put that to the test, by offering to refrain from taking any action to demolish this building for a one year period, if the HRC or Pittsburgh Council denies the historic designation. In other words, if this commission denies the historic designation, then UMPC will not demolish for a year, while actively marketing the building, and UPMC will be happy to get this building off their hands, since it was never a part of their strategic vision.

6. Mr. Stern thanked Mr. Montgomery, and quelled various outbursts from the audience. Mr. Montgomery said he wanted to summarize the evidence. Mr. Stern said no, he did not want to take more public comment, because then he would have to take public comment from everyone. Stern said that since the question was raised about marketability, he wanted to remind everyone that marketability was not the HRC’s purview. The HRC’s job is to determine whether the building meets the criteria of the ordinance, as outlined by Ms. Molnar.

7. Mr. Hogan said that the owner’s premise for not designating the building was based on marketability, and since he had heard no argument to substantiate those claims, he would move to recommend designation, as recommended by staff. Mr. Hogan moved to recommend designation.

8. Mr. Montgomery interrupted the motion from his seat in the audience, saying that UPMC presented a great deal of testimony with our position that “there is no historical nexus here,” and that it wasn’t simply marketability, there was some extensive testimony that...

9. The Young Preservationists interrupted Mr. Montgomery in an outburst claiming that Montgomery was giving testimony. Mr. Stern quelled all voices, he asked the HRC to return to the motion as presented. Ms. McClellan seconded the motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to recommend designation, as articulated by staff, with the clarification that the building meets criteria seven of the ordinance:

“Finding that the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange, located at 1727 Blvd. of the Allies (Aka 1727 Bluff Street), meets one of the City’s criteria for significance, and that the building maintains sufficient integrity to make it worthy of historic preservation, I move to recommend that City Council designate this building as a City Historic Structure.”

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded this motion.

Mr. Serrao.....abstained from the vote.

Mr. Stern, Ms. McClellan, Mr. Matveiev, and Mr. Hogan voted in favor. Motion Passes.