



**Division of Development Administration and Review**

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning  
200 Ross Street, Third Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of September 2, 2009  
Beginning at 12:30 PM  
200 Ross Street  
First Floor Hearing Room  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
Michael Stern, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Maureen Neary
Noor Ismail		Carole Malakoff
Sergei Matveiev		Jerome Jackson
Joe Serrao		Russ Blaich
Ernie Hogan		Irene Zotis
Linda McClellan		Evelyn Jones
		Steven Nathanson
		Wm. Pricener

Old Business

**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 8<sup>th</sup>. The Paramount Pictures Film Exchange nomination will be sent to briefing at Planning Commission on September 1, 2009, and for action on September 15, 2009.

New Business

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the August 2009 minutes. In regards to the August minutes, Mr. Hogan motioned to approve with corrections, Mr. Serrao seconded, all voted to approve. On page 7, the minutes show Mr. Serrao as making a motion and seconding it, when in reality, Ms. McClellan seconded the motion.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the August 2009 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Hogan moved to approve, Mr. Serrao seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

**Applications for Economic Hardship:** None

**Internal Discussion:** The HRC spoke briefly about the possibility of creating a local historic district downtown along the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue National Register district. There was discussion about the feasibility of doing that type of nomination, and what the process would be.

Upcoming Demolitions:

- None

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

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

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

**Discussion:**

- Ms. Molnar drew the HRC's attention to the packet, and reminded them that this was at the HRC previously, where they approved the restoration of the storefront according to drawings, but tabled a decision on the replacement of the roof, the removal of the chimneys, and the installation of a window on the Galveston Street façade. We asked for more information about work that had already happened, and what permits were issued. We have since found out that the contractors had an interior cleaning/demolition permit, and a roof replacement permit. That permit was not accompanied by drawings. Molnar had found an earlier drawing of the roof from 1992. Molnar found the angle and slope of the roof were nearly identical in the earlier drawing and the current drawing. Molnar said that modern roofing rafters are a different size than historic roofing members, which could create a slightly wider fascia board. Also new this month, the property owner is interested in replacing the glass block windows with plate glass so there would be better visibility into the building.
- Mr. Stern asked what the date of the building is. Ms. Molnar did not know. Mr. Stern said that plate glass would make the building a better building, functionally. Stern wondered if plate glass would compromise the value of the building architecturally.
- Mr. Hogan said that the plate glass would make the building function better.
- Mr. Serrao said that he thought the glass block was original.
- Ms. Irene Zotis** addressed the HRC and said that the Modern Café was built in 1933, and that she thought the glass block was original to the building. She would like to open up the building to increase transparency. Mr. Stern said that he thought the existing building would have changed a lot over time, but Ms. Zotis said that the building looked basically the same in the 1940s as it does now.
- Molnar said that there is still the question as to whether the Galveston elevation window was appropriate – that the window could be painted, but that the proportions might not be true.
- There was some discussion regarding the comparative drawings of the roof, and what portions of it have changed.
- Mr. Matveiev said that on the existing exterior renovation permit, it says, “to replace roof of existing two story structure.” Matveiev said it was a bit strange that BBI didn't require drawings for something this substantial. He wondered if the project wasn't clearly explained to whoever received this application at BBI. He is concerned about this happening.
- Mr. Stern called for public comment. **Ms. Carole Malakoff** introduced herself as a member of the Local Review Committee. She said that the local LRC, who are not generally particularly in favor of glass block in Allegheny West, in this case the glass block was so integral to the building's style, that it should not be removed. As far as the dormer window, we would like to see it replaced with a double hung window with wood framing and wood trim, and with a wooden sill. The LRC concerns are the same as Mr. Matveiev's concerns, that the Building Inspector who took the application did not refer the project to Molnar first to get a CofA.

10. Ms. Zotis said that the contractor had plans made, and she thought he would have presented those to BBI when applying for permits.
11. Mr. Stern said he thinks the window should be replaced with a window that matches the original configuration. The new window should match the original proportions and the same silhouette. Mr. Serrao agrees with Mr. Stern.
12. Molnar said that the PA SHPO would not consider the removal of the chimneys, due to fire, an adverse effect.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to accept the maintenance or reinstallation of glass block into existing façade.

Mr. Hogan.....Seconded the motion.

Mr. Matveiev.....Abstained from voting

**Mr. Stern, Ms. Ismail, Mr. Serrao, Mr. Hogan, and Ms. McClellan voted in favor.. Motion passes.**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the modification of 860-862 Western Avenue, with the existing rooflines to remain intact, with the removal of the chimneys, and for a new window to be installed in the Galveston elevation to match the older drawings, with the installation of a wood sill, and to match the proportions of the historic window. That new drawings need to be submitted to HRC and BBI prior to the new window's installation.

Mr. Hogan.....Seconded the motion.

All voted in favor.....**Motion passes.**

OWNER:	WARD:.....22 <sup>nd</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
WAHEED MUHAMMAD	LOT & BLOCK:.....077-D-187		00/00/00
1421 GREAT OAK DR	INSPECTOR:.....Jack McGoogan	SITE VISITS:	
PITTSBURGH, PA 15220	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		00/00/00
APPLICANT:	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....LNC	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	
WAHEED MUHAMMAD	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical		00-000
1421 GREAT OAK DR			
PITTSBURGH, PA 15220			
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE.....	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application saying that she had received photos and reports from local neighbors saying the building was being painted (August 2, 2009). Apparently someone in the neighborhood told the owner and painter that they need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness. They came to the office on the following Monday. Molnar and the owner came to an agreement that day that he could paint the side elevations of the building that had previously been painted a brick-color. The front of the building had not previously been painted. Looking through the file, the owner did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint the storefront and storefront steps bright blue and white.
2. Mr. Stern said that it seemed like a theme that property owners in historic districts are not aware that they're in an historic area, or they are ignoring the property regulations. Mr. Stern invited the property owner to the table.
3. **Ms. Rubina Waheed**, introduced herself as the resident of 947 Western Avenue. **Mr. Inez Accel (??)** introduced himself. Ms. Waheed said that when they bought the building the front steps had already been painted, and it looked like the front had already been painted. Ms. Waheed said that they knew the building is in a historic district, and she had read the guidelines for the district before. That's why she decided to paint the front, because it appeared as though the front had already been painted previously. Ms. Waheed said that she purchased the building 3 years ago.
4. Mr. Accel (?) said that on the McDonald's side of the building had been painted before, and that the front of the building had been painted before too. He said they were not changing any woodwork, window openings, or anything like that. They're just trying to beautify the building to get the attention of people walking by to come in to the business. He doesn't think that paint would hurt anything, because it would look nice and neat. He would like to take his wife out to eat at a nice place, not at somewhere that doesn't look nice. He said he was licensed in Pittsburgh, but he hadn't heard anything about the historic guidelines.
5. Mr. Stern said he appreciates their efforts to make the building look nice, but that the HRC has to stick to the guidelines. Mr. Stern said that Accel (?) contradicted Waheed's testimony that the building had been painted.
6. Mr. Hogan wanted to know if the property owner had spoken with the URA to get assistance in doing the restoration and repair work.
7. **Ms. Carole Malakoff** said that the experts she sent over informed the LRC that the upper two stories of the façade had never been painted. What we would like to see is the paint removed in the gentlest means possible.
8. Mr. Stern said that there are removable papers that probably would take the paint off.

9. Mr. Hogan asked what the process is for the HRC in cases like this. Molnar said that they could deny the applicant's request to paint the façade, but that the HRC could not mandate that the applicant do specific work. If denied, since the applicant cannot have painted masonry, they would have to apply to remove the paint. If they do not, then they will be in violation of the code, as they did not have a CofA to paint.

10. Mr. Stern asked for public comment.

11. *The audio cassette recording of this HRC hearing cut-out, so accurate minutes are not available. Motions and decisions are accurate based on hand-recorded notes.*

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to deny the application to paint the building.

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

ALL VOTE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSES.

OWNER: YMCA OF PGH 304 WOOD ST PITTSBURGH, PA 15222	WARD:.....22 <sup>nd</sup> LOT & BLOCK:.....023-N-082 INSPECTOR:.....Jack McGoogan COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....RM-3 ARCH. RATING:.....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: Allegheny YMCA 600 W North Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15212		
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

1. *There was much discussion on the possibility of running the wiring under the sidewalk to the new location. The applicants indicated that they would look in to this option.*
2. *The audio cassette recording of this HRC hearing cut-out, so accurate minutes are not available. Motions and decisions are accurate based on hand-recorded notes.*

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to deny the application.

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded the motion.

ALL VOTE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSES.

**1832 E Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

OWNER: 1832 ASSOCIATES INC 79 S 23RD ST PITTSBURGH, PA 15203	WARD:.....17th LOT & BLOCK:.....012-E-387 INSPECTOR:.....Bob Molyneaux	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: 1832 ASSOCIATES INC 79 S 23RD ST PITTSBURGH, PA 15203	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....LNC ARCH. RATING:.....	
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

1. *The audio cassette recording of this HRC hearing cut-out, so accurate minutes are not available. Motions and decisions are accurate based on hand-recorded notes.*

**MOTION:**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the application for 1832 E Carson with the modified submission of a narrower entry and storefront to align with the existing window pattern on the second and third floor.

*No one seconded the motion, so it died.*

- Mr. Matveiev asked for discussion and said that he thinks that motion opens the door too wide. He said hierarchically, this application has to be treated differently because this is not the main façade on Carson Street, and that it reads too much like a primary entrance. It has too many characteristics of the front entrance. Mr. Matveiev suggests denying the application, and asking the applicant to redesign.

Mr. Matveiev.....Moved to table the application for another month

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

ALL VOTE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSES.

2. Mr. Stern said told Mr. Kratsas that some of the recommendations discussed today include narrowing the width to fit within the two window bays. He said that some HRC members have stated that the new design is a little too prominent architecturally, and that it should be given less emphasis. Mr. Matveiev said that new drawings are necessary because the new construction really has to be studied and “worked out.”

3. Ms. Molnar reminded Mr. Kratsas that he could work through the design process with the ECS LRC, so that when he comes back to HRC, the project will be better resolved.

**Demolitions**

*Manchester Historic District*

**Discussion:**

1. 1414 Nixon Street

- a. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. She said that the HRC first saw this application in January 2009, but tabled the demolition because the HRC decided it wanted to hold off on demolitions until a neighborhood plan could be put in place. The HRC found out that it couldn't really do that legally, so it started reviewing demolitions again in March, or so. Now the building has come back to the HRC, still standing.
- b. There were no public comments

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to approve the demolition.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded the motion.

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

2. 1316 Juniata Street

- a. Ms. Molnar indicated that this application was only for the rear garage structure.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to approve the demolition.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded the motion.

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

3. 1318 Juniata Street

- a. Ms. Molnar indicated that this application was only for the rear garage structure.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to approve the demolition.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded the motion.

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

4. 1218 N Franklin Street

- a. Ms. Molnar indicated that she provided a timeline (DCP) outlining events associated with this address. The address was first considered in 2007, when the CofA was issued. Molnar said that this address has been tabled at least three times for more information. Last month, the HRC voted that by September, MCC and PHLF would come back with detailed plans on how they can secure and stabilize the structure, including a timeline on when that would happen.

- b. **Mr. Jerome Jackson**, MCC, said that their plan for this building is to clean it out, get all the debris out, repair the roof and any leaks in the building, and then board it up and secure it, to save it, and possibly to sell it. MCC was either looking for volunteers to help clean out the building, or they would hire someone to do that. They plan to hire someone to fix the roof. Jerome Jackson said that they could get all of this done in 45-60 days.

**Demolitions**

**Manchester Historic District**

- c. Molnar asked how MCC was going to do this work to a building that it does not own.
- d. Mr. Jackson said that they will talk with family members, and get the approvals they need prior to starting work. Jackson said that they would get some kind of legal document giving MCC permission the ability to work on the house. Mr. Stern said that the HRC needs to see that document by the next HRC hearing (October). Even though the property owner is deceased, Jackson said, Mr. Lowe spoke with someone who said they owned it. MCC’s intent is to save the building, so they are going to put forth their efforts to do that with their board, the Manchester Review Committee, etc.
- e. Mr. Stern said that the HRC is happy to hear him say those things. Mr. Hogan asked if there was a timeline or a strategy on how this renovation would proceed. Ms. Molnar read some of the things that MCC had promised us in the past, in addition to general plans presented for the building.
- f. Mr. Matveiev said he had spoken with Stanley Lowe last week, and he had promised Lowe that he could have more time because there was a tragedy in Lowe’s family. He said that by the next meeting, he would like to see a document giving MCC the authority to carry out this work; an itemized work list provided and signed by same person/owner; a timeline for the work to commence; and an estimated date of completion.
- g. Molnar said that some of the work would not have to go to the Historic Review Commission for approval. Some of it could come for a staff review and could commence early.
- h. Ms. Ismail asked about the status of the larger community / neighborhood plan that MCC was working on. Mr. Jerome Jackson said that they could not take the plan to the August meeting, so they would be taking it to the September meeting. The demolition planning committee has already approved the progress up to this point, but the MCC meeting would be on September 21<sup>st</sup> for the general community. MCC would then present these findings to the HRC at the October HRC meeting.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to table the application with the condition that MCC would bring the following information at the next meeting: A document giving MCC the authority to carry out this work; an itemized work list provided and signed by same person/owner; a timeline for the work to commence; and an estimated date of completion.

Mr. Serrao.....Seconded the motion.

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