



**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 December 2, 2009  
Beginning at 12:30 PM  
200 Ross Street  
First Floor Hearing Room  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i><b>Members</b></i>	<i><b>Staff</b></i>	<i><b>Others</b></i>
Michael Stern	Katherine Molnar	Patrick Mangus
Noor Ismail		Bill Szustak
Erik Harless		Evelyn Jones
Joe Serrao		Jerome Jackson
Ernie Hogan		David Montanez
Linda McClellan		Patricia Washington

**Old Business**

**Nominations Report:** There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Paramount Pictures Film Exchange needed to be rescheduled for a public hearing at City Council. The Iron City Brewery would be heard today for a preliminary determination hearing.

**New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the October and November 2009 HRC minutes, Mr. Serrao moved to approve the minutes, Ms. Ismail seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

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

**Other:** Mr. Stern asked Ms. Molnar for an update on the Manchester Neighborhood plan. Molnar replied that DCP had spent some time making comments and feedback in reference to the plan. MCC, however, was already in the process of printing and finalizing the plan. Ms. Ismail stated that she was careful to tell MCC that neither the HRC, nor the Planning Department, could formally adopt a neighborhood plan. MCC misunderstood Ms. Ismail to mean that the plan was “adopted.” In regards to 1218 N Franklin, MCC is working with the URA to get funding. Mr. Stern said he thought it was a little confusing that the HRC was looking at the neighborhood plan at all. Mr. Hogan said he interpreted MCC’s presentation to the HRC as an informative vision as to how the community would be addressing demolitions. Mr. Stern said that the plan ought to be more useful to the neighborhood than to anyone else.

Molnar said that in regards to the Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (Section 106), the Urban Redevelopment Authority asked for a bit more time to review the document again. There have been so many revisions, it has delayed the signing and approval of the document. However, legislation would be submitted for the approval of the document in January 2010.

Molnar indicated that 1333 Liverpool Street would be postponed until January, or perhaps later, at the request of the property owner.

**Applications for Economic Hardship:** None

---

**Upcoming Demolitions:**

- None

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

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

**436 Market Street**

OWNER:	WARD:.....1 <sup>st</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:
NICHOLAS NICHOLAS G	LOT & BLOCK:.....0001-D-00165	11/12/2009
23 MARKET SQ	INSPECTOR:.....R. Freyermuth	SITE VISITS:
PGH, PA 15222-0000	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	11/12/2009
APPLICANT:	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:
DAVID MONTANEZ, tenant	ARCH. RATING:.....	00-000
23 MARKET SQ		
PGH, PA 15222-0000		
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**

New signs; painting exterior façade

**Discussion:**

- Ms. Molnar introduced the application and said that the new tenant, Mr. David Montanez, was opening a new restaurant. She said the building has two entrances, one facing the Market center, the other facing Market Street. Molnar told the commission that this application is before them because the sign was installed without having first obtained either a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Sign Permit, and because it was questionable whether the sign could meet the Market Square Historic District sign Guidelines. Molnar invited Mr. Montanez to the table.
- Mr. Montanez introduced himself. He said that he felt fortunate to have met Mr. Nicholas, and that he hired a family member to do the interior of the building. He met another family friend, Scott from Borell Borell (sp?) Signs, who said he would take care of the signage at the building. Everyone loved the signs that Scott designed. They painted the building an orange, a mandarin type of color. The color will catch your eyes. A lot of the customers love what he did with the place. When we did all of this, we didn't know that we would need a permit for the painting. He thought that any aesthetic enhancement, such as painting, would not need a permit. They got a letter, and then they found out that there was a historic district.
- Montanez told the HRC that the sign is a two color sign; it matches the color of the building. The sign is exactly how it looks in the pictures. The second sign (not yet installed) will look nearly identical to the one facing Market Square, but will not say "Mexican Restaurant" and instead say "tacos, burritos, etc" (something like that).
- Mr. Stern said that the HRC was very happy to see the tenant making improvements to the district, but the problem is that people come to the HRC after-the-fact so frequently, and it puts the HRC in a difficult position. He said that the tenant was given bad advice, or no advice.
- Ms. Molnar said that both the property owner and the sign contractor have had lots of experience working in historic districts and they should have known better.
- Mr. Stern said that the color was not as much of a problem for him as was the signage that does not meet the guidelines and the Spanish tile awning.
- Mr. Montanez said that the family guy who came in said that he should install the Spanish Tile, because Moe's Restaurant has Spanish Tile. Mr. Stern said that Montanez had received bad advice. Mr. Stern asked whether Molnar knew if the signs met the zoning code for signage in the district. Molnar was not sure.

**436 Market Street**

---

8. Mr. Hogan said that in the drawing, it looks as though there are individually illuminated separate individual letters for the bulk of the sign, but the lower portion reading “Mexican Restaurant” was/is an internally illuminated box sign.
9. Mr. Stern said that the tenant could choose not to illuminate the portion of the sign reading “Mexican Restaurant,” or he could use a source of external illumination for that portion of the sign.
10. Mr. Montanez said that his sign contractor assured him that he knew what he was doing. The sign was supposed to have been ready by October 1<sup>st</sup>, but it wasn’t. Then he was going to do a painted sign and a temporary sign. The second sign has not been fabricated yet. Mr. Montanez said he would be willing to do anything to make this approvable, he just wants a sign.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the signs with the condition that the box portion of the sign not be illuminated (“Mexican Restaurant” portion at the bottom of the sign), and that no Spanish tile cornice be installed.

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

All members.....Voted in favor.

**The National Aviary**

OWNER:	WARD:.....22 <sup>nd</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:
City of Pittsburgh, with leasehold to the National Aviary in Pittsburgh	LOT & BLOCK:.....008-B-150	00/00/00
	INSPECTOR:.....R. Freyermuth	SITE VISITS:
		00/00/00
APPLICANT:	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:
The National Aviary		#01-019
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....P	#02-052
ARCHITECT'S REPRESENTATIVE:	ARCH. RATING:.....Typical	
Bill Szustak, AIA		
Springboard		
24 Terminal Way	REGISTER:.....LISTED	<input type="checkbox"/> .....ELIGIBLE
Pittsburgh, PA 15219	..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Proposed Changes:**

Exterior Renovations to include replacement windows, replacement roof, and front porch repairs.

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application saying that this application had been around for a long time, but is new to many of the Commission members. In the fall of 2008, the HRC moved to approve the Aviary's plans as presented, with the condition that the landscape plan be reviewed, and that the final drawings be submitted to the HRC for final approval. Since that time, the scope of work and the budget have changed to such an extent that they need to be re-approved prior to receiving their Certificate of Appropriateness. Molnar invited Bill Szustak to the table, and asked him to introduce the application. She informed the HRC that they have a separate packet of drawings in front of them.
2. Bill Szustak introduced himself as an architect with Springboard, and Pat Mangus introduced himself as the Executive Director of the National Aviary. Szustak gave some history of the National Aviary, and described some of the major changes to the site through the last several decades since it was built. The majority of the footprint of the building is the same as what was done in 1968. Bill said that many people who have lived in Pittsburgh their entire lives have not been to visit since they were children, and transplants to Pittsburgh do not necessarily know that the Aviary is a public institution.
3. Mr. Szustak said that the original plans were to expand the footprint significantly, but the current plans are to expand the Aviary somewhat less substantially, by only 10,000 square feet. He went through the packet and described the proposed uses of space and locations of those additions. The new theater and bird holding areas will be maintained, in addition to some classroom facility space, and a new café space.
4. Mr. Szustak said that the materials of the original design have not changed, and that he brought samples of the building materials. The building, in addition to attempting LEED certification, should also be bird friendly. Birds do not see glass, so the glazing would have etching to prevent the birds from flying into it. This is not new from what was approved previously. Mr. Szustak continued to describe the materials and landscaping materials. He described the pathways and the feel of the park which wraps around the building.

***The National Aviary***

---

5. Mr. Serrao asked for clarification in the rendering about the two different types of glazing shown. Mr. Szustak said it represented the etching pattern – one would be “holes” and the other “dots.” He said that they hope to get LEED points for innovative lessening of bird strikes against glass.
6. Mr. Mangus said that the Aviary has an agreement with the community that this development would not expand past the footprint established in 2008, and this current plan is less than that. They are lessening the space, lessening the scale, making a more intimate theater space, and preventing the current conversion of the Rose Garden into parking space.
7. Mr. Stern said that he wasn’t sure if it was troubling or not, but the original design had “two wings” on the front elevation, and now the building only has “one wing.” Mr. Szustak said that the second wing is there, but is much shortened. Stern knows that the Aviary would like to do the full expansion, and that it is not possible at this time, but he was not sure if the front elevation worked the same way that it used to.
8. Mangus said that the letters of the sign are fixed to the scrim, they are led letters, set to turn on and off and specific times. There is no exterior pathway lighting, except what is required by code. The soft lighting provided behind the scrim would provide enough illumination.
9. Mr. Stern called for public comment.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved to accept the revised expansion plans for the National Aviary, as submitted.

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

All members.....Voted in favor.

OWNER:	WARD:.....4 <sup>th</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
Enrico Novelli	LOT & BLOCK:.....027-G-058	SITE VISITS:	05/16/2008
4220 Centre Avenue	INSPECTOR:.....Bob McPherson	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	0/0/0000
Pittsburgh, PA 15213	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		00-000
APPLICANT:	ZONING:.....R1D-VL		
Rich Neher	ARCH. RATING:.....1950s		
1239 Revere Drive			
Chalfont, PA 18914			

**Proposed Changes:**

Installation/replacement of windows and clapboard on sides and rear of structure.

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application and said that the applicant had been at the Commission a year ago for the replacement of windows at the rear of the building, and is here today to request permission to replace the remainder of the windows. Molnar said that the Schenley Farms Historic District uses the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation* as its design guidelines. She had copied the relevant section in the Commission members’ packets. The applicant would like to install aluminum replacement windows instead of wood.
2. Mr. Enrico Novelli came to the table and introduced himself. He said his wife and he bought the house three years ago, and they’re trying to do home improvements gradually. The windows are still original, but now they have storm windows covering them. The windows do not work well, there are a number of problems. They want to replace the windows with more wood windows. Pella does make full wood windows, but they recommend having an aluminum cladding on the exterior to protect the investment of the wood windows. Since they are so expensive, the applicants would like to start with replacing just five windows.
3. Mr. Stern asked if the new windows would match the existing window profiles.
4. Jeff, a sales representative from Pella Windows addressed the HRC. Mr. Novelli said it was difficult to take a good picture of his second floor windows to show the HRC what is there currently. Jeff the sales rep, said that the windows they are proposing is from the Architects Series. The new windows would replicate true divided light by the installation of both interior and exterior muntin grids, with an interior shadow/spacer. The wood windows and the aluminum clad wood windows look essentially the same. Mr. Novelli said that they would like to keep the window colors the same as what is existing, a dark color, or black.
5. Mr. Hogan asked if any of the brick molding would be modified with the installation of these windows. Jeff said that they would not touch the brick mold. They are going to be removing the existing sashes, and installing the new windows in the existing frames. The visible light would be reduced only slightly, 1” in height, and they would gain visible glass in width. The applicants can choose from the 7/8” wide muntin, or the 1 ¼” muntin. The current muntins are in between these two measurements. The patterning of the windows, number of lights high and wide will remain the same.
6. Mr. Hogan said the he believes the Department of the Interior allows cladding in some circumstances. Mr. Stern said that he thinks the aluminum cladding makes for a better window. Mr. Serrao said that the key is that the visual appearance remains the same.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the window replacement for 4220 Centre Avenue, as submitted, so that it maintains the existing window appearance.

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

All members.....Voted in favor.

**Iron City Brewery**

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the agenda item, and described the contents of the packet: the historic nomination, a description of the property, the history of the site, and a statement of significance. Toward the end of the packet there is some information about the proposed demolition that the HRC will be considering in a separate motion today. Finally, there are two letters at the end of the packet, one from the Lawrenceville Stakeholders and the other from Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation giving their opinions and position on the proposed demolition.
2. Molnar described the historic nomination process. When the nomination is received, a temporary protection is placed upon the building or site and remains with the building or site until City Council makes a final determination about the nomination. The exception to that, relevant to today's hearing, is that if the HRC decides at today's meeting that the nomination has no potential to meet at least one of the criteria of significance as outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance, then the temporary protection placed upon the building or site would be lifted, though the nomination process would continue.
3. Molnar said that next month we would hold a public hearing to gather testimony. In February, the HRC would make a recommendation to City Council to either designate or not designate the building. After that, it goes to Planning Commission for a briefing, and then again to Planning Commission for hearing/action, and finally to City Council for a public hearing and a vote. The most amount of time this nomination would take is approximately 8 months. Today, our first task is to look at the property and decide if it has the potential to meet our criteria. Molnar directed the HRC to the map showing the parcels under consideration for historic nomination. She showed aerial images and maps of the site, and described some of the buildings.
4. Molnar directed the HRC to the packets to review the history of the property. She reviewed some of the information listed in the nomination in reference to the history of the site. While reviewing the history as described in the nomination, Molnar showed the Commission various sketches and pictures of the site, illustrating the development of the site over time. Molnar said that the complex grew and developed continuously over time, so many of the buildings are from different periods or dates.
5. Molnar said that the nomination itself is for various parcels, which contain quite a few contributing and non contributing structures. The legislation providing for the historic designation of this site would be easily written in reference to parcels, as opposed to specific buildings. There are non contributing buildings as part of this site, and those don't necessarily contribute to the significance of the site. It would be difficult to carve those structures out of the legislation, if we meant to avoid them.
6. Mr. Stern asked how this would work, then, if everything on the parcel is nominated, and we are supposed to be considering the demolition of one of those buildings. Molnar said that was a good question. She directed the Commissioners to the packet, where she pointed out a section of the Historic Ordinance. This section describes what happens to a property once it has been nominated. It stipulates that no changes can happen to that property without the review and approval of the HRC and the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. It does give us the ability to issue Certificates of Appropriateness for buildings that are in the nomination process. The very last part of this section of the code talks about proposed demolitions on nominated properties, so that is something we have to take under consideration.
7. Mr. Stern called for public comment. He asked that they approach the microphone.
8. **Mr. Mike Gwynn**, with Rothschild Doyno Collaborative, addressed the HRC as a representative of the Iron City Brewing Company. He said he had additional information about the buildings, and he would be able to provide that now or later, at the HRC's discretion. Eventually, they would like to illustrate and isolate building F, the 1970s

**Iron City Brewery**

---

era building. Mr. Gwynn said the site was “J shaped,” and he described the uses of some of the buildings, including the office, the boiler house, and the main brewing structures.

9. **Mr. Keith Cochran** addressed the HRC as the writer of the nomination, on behalf of the Lawrenceville Stakeholders. He wanted to stress how iconic this group of buildings is to Lawrenceville and to other neighborhoods. He said there were over 100 letters of support for the nomination thus far.
10. **Mr. Joe Edelstein**, on behalf of Preservation Pittsburgh, asked by fellow board members to speak out on behalf of the nomination. Preservation Pittsburgh looks to use historic preservation as a tool for development. He said that PP would be opposed to the demolition of any contributing structure to the site. He said that the best economic decision for this site would actually tie in very nicely with the historic preservation of significant buildings. The Historic Tax Credit benefit of developing this site would be essential to any potential developer. This is a critical section of the neighborhood, and is part of “no man’s land” between Lawrenceville and the Strip District.
11. **Tim Hickman**, President and CEO of the Iron City Brewing Company introduced himself to the HRC saying that he is here to support the historic designation. We believe that we are good corporate citizens, and we are here to work with the community. We believe in the comments that have already been made. This is a viable piece of property for Lawrenceville and the community. But we are also there to ask... we know that there are buildings on the site that do not have that historic significance, and are not an asset to the Lawrenceville community. So again, Iron City, from the board of directors to Tim Hickman to CEO and President, I am here to support this, and this designation. I also ask that we can talk about the non-contributing buildings. We want to do what is right for the community.
12. Mr. Serrao asked if it would be prudent to leave the tank building from consideration, and nominate the site around it. Molnar replied that she didn’t know if that would be legally possible, but also, perhaps not a wise idea. Stern said that we will have a chance to consider the demolition of the tank building as the next item on the agenda. Molnar said that in addition, the nominators purposefully included this building because if it is torn down, then the HRC would continue to have purview over this portion of the site and its redevelopment and new construction in the future.
13. Mr. Hogan said that he understands that if we move this nomination forward now, there would be nothing to prevent the owners or developers from coming back with a development plan in the future.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Hogan.....Moved that the historic nomination of the Iron City Brewery at 3340 Liberty Avenue is likely to meet at least one of the ten criteria for significance as outlined in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and maintains sufficient integrity to make it worthy of historic preservation.

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

All members.....Voted in favor.

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application as the second portion of the Iron City Brewery consideration. The owners and demolition contractor have provided a detailed description of how they would propose to demolish the 1970s era tank storage building, building “F.” The building, constructed specifically to house massive tanks, sits adjacent to two older tank storage buildings, that would not be damaged or removed during the demolition of building F. Building F does not even have any floors or windows, just catwalks and infrastructure to house the tanks. The adaptive reuse of the building could be difficult, as uses could be limited due to the design and structure of the building. Molnar directed the HRC to look at the scope of work provided by the demolition contractors which described how the building F could be removed without damaging the structures behind it.
2. Mr. Stern asked who would like to make testimony on the application.
3. **Tim Hickman**, president and CEO of Iron City Brewing addressed the HRC. He said he would like to step back and describe the history of the new management. They brought “this” out of bankruptcy in 2007, and from then until today, there were deteriorating economic conditions which brought a deteriorating manufacturing facility. With that, a very painful decision was made to “idle” the plant, and move into a more modern facility in order to keep the business alive. They broke down the next step into phases. Phase I, they needed to find a modern plant. They accomplished that in July 2009. That meant that they needed to decommission the existing plant. They’re doing that today – they’re doing asbestos abatement, environmental issues, ammonia off site, selling old assets they no longer need. They need to get the assets out of the Tank Storage building, so figuring out what to do with that building is really a key part of this. The next phase will be to figure out what to do with the real estate. Our goals, as a good corporate citizen, is to create jobs. Regardless of the designation, which we support as a long term asset to the community, we need to protect the ability to create jobs on this site. Construction jobs are a no brainer. We need to work with the local community, we welcome the local community. Mr. Hickman said he was here today to represent Iron City, in order to get permission to bring down Building F. In doing so, we will better be able to develop the site in the future, and increase the site’s viability from an historic perspective.
4. **Mr. Mike Gwynn** addressed the HRC. He said building F, is shown in the handouts. There is a proposal to demolish that building in a sensitive way in order to preserve the other structures behind it. The building F restricts development of the site because of its limited use and non-pedestrian design. The tanks inside the building are a challenge to remove, and future removal of assets in the building behind it, will also be necessary before the remaining buildings can be developed. In other words, for future considerations, removing building F will help facilitate the development and redesign of other buildings behind. The goal is to remove building F two bays at a time, a limited demolition scope at a time, to minimize potential damage to other buildings.
5. Mr. Stern asked how the Building F would be removed without damaging the buildings behind it. Mr. Gwynn tried to explain this. He said that building F is a steel frame, and at each floor, a steel beam attaches one building to another. Mr. Gwynn said that the wall between the two structures is very thick, and it would be difficult to know exactly what that will look like once the Building F is removed.
6. **Mr. Keith Cochran** told the HRC that he discussed this issue with the Lawrenceville Stakeholders and they all agree that Building F could be removed without compromising the historic integrity of the site, or the significance of the nomination, as long as the adjacent buildings would be left intact. The Stakeholders appreciate the cooperation of the building owners.

***Iron City Brewery – Proposed Demolition***

***Historic Nomination***

---

**MOTION:**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the demolition of the tank storage structure as a non-conforming/  
non-contributing structure to the nominated historic site. The demolition would be  
contingent on the preservation of the adjacent buildings, including the exterior wall of  
the buildings immediately behind Building F. All other buildings to remain protected  
and undamaged.

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

All members.....Voted in favor.