



HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH

Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2008
 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>
	Susan Tymoczko	Major Robert J. Reel, Salvation Army
Michael Stern, Chairman	Katherine Molnar	Kenneth J. Yarsky II
Paul Tellers, Vice Chair		Lawrence Torbitt
Earle Onque		Major Dean Satterlee, Salvation Army
Ruth Drescher		Paul J. Freyder
Noor Ismail		James Roos
Jill Joyce		Wayne Kist
Daniel Cipriani		Angelique Bamberg
		Frank Ruffing
		Sean Kingston
		Carolyn Mazzella
		Andreas Dometakis
		Paul Scanlon
		Bertha Smitha
		Steven Paul
		Tom Armstrong
		Robert Weis
		Jeremy Wilkinson
		Keith C. Romanowski
		David McMunn
		Rebecca Grazier

Old Business

Enforcement: Ms. Molnar presented six items that were given new citations by the BBI. The six items she listed in the Commissioners packets have been in the enforcement system for some time – Molnar hopes they will be resolved soon.

Nominations Report: There are five buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that Workingmens' Savings Bank would be going before the Planning Commission on the 26th of February. National Negro Opera House had been briefed at Planning Commission recently, and will have its briefing before PC on the 12th. The August Wilson House has been in the newspapers recently. Molnar reports a City Council public hearing date on the 18th of February. Simultaneously, City Council hopes to pass a bill that would extend the deliberation time at Council from 90 days to 120 days, thus, the legislation for the August Wilson house might fall under that new bill, and not be a problem for running short on time. Garden Theatre nomination was recommended by Planning Commission. Ms. Molnar sent the HRC and PC's affirmative recommendation to City Council. It needs to be scheduled for a public hearing. Ms. Molnar reported that Malta Temple is on the agenda for today for Public Comment.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar indicated that the Commissioners had a copy of the January minutes in front of them. The HRC members looked over the January minutes. There was no discussion of the minutes. Ms. Drescher moved to approve the minutes; Mr. Tellers seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. Molnar reminded the HRC to approve the December Certificates of Appropriateness, which the HRC looked at during the January hearing, but forgot to approve. In regards to the December Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Tellers moved to approve, Ms. Joyce seconded the motion, all voted in favor. In regards to the January 2008 CofA report, Mr. Tellers moved to approve, Ms. Drescher seconded, all voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: There were no Applications for Economic Hardship.

Consideration of new Local Review Committees: Ms. Molnar reported two requests to form two new Local Review Committees – one from the Allegheny Commons Park neighborhood, and one from the Deutschtown neighborhood. Molnar indicated that the process to form new committees has historically consisted of a call for nominations, review of nominations by the HRC, and a vote by the HRC to approve. Applications/nominations consist of a resume and a cover letter. Molnar indicated that the north side groups had placed notices in various local newsletters asking for applications, and that news of the new committees traveled by word-of-mouth. The request for nominations was first sent-out in November, 2007. Molnar recommended that because there were only two applications for the Deutschtown Local Review Committee, that the group not be formed at this time. There were nine applications for the Allegheny Commons Local Review Committee; Molnar recommended to form the committee. Mr. Tellers asked whether both proposed committees had the same amount of time to accept nominations, Molnar replied that the Deutschtown neighborhood had much more time as the request for nominations went out in November. Mr. Tellers asked whether there was anyone from East Allegheny applying for the Allegheny Commons Local Review Committee, and Ms. Molnar replied that she did not know. Looking back, Mr. Bob Baumbach applied for the ACLRC, and lives in the E.Allegheny neighborhood. Ms. Drescher asked whether there would be value in pursuing the Deutschtown LRC, and if we could be actively recruiting members. Mr. Stern had a parallel question: How many people are there on a given LRC? Ms. Molnar replied that there were only three active LRCs: Allegheny West (apx. 7 members), Southside (3-4 members show up regularly), and Penn-Liberty (only meet once/month if necessary, 7-8 members). Stern replied that there was a lot of interest in the Allegheny Commons Park, and wondered if the ACLRC could be joined with the Deutschtown LRC. Mr. Tellers replied that LRCs are typically formed with members from each respective community, and that the applicants for the ACLRC were mostly from the Allegheny West or Mexican War Streets neighborhoods. Mr. Tellers suggested that in neighborhoods that don't have LRCs, the neighbors and concerned citizens can still come together to review applications on their own, or they can show up at the HRC to give their opinions and suggestions. Ms. Molnar replied that there are neighbors in each community who are especially interested in project applications, who call Ms. Molnar, and who give their input. Molnar, Tellers, Onque and Stern discussed the idea of combining the LRCs or of finding members to serve on the Deutschtown LRC. Molnar indicated that she hesitated to form LRCs in smaller communities because there are so few applications in those neighborhoods that an LRC would have a slow time meeting each month, practice reviewing applications, and gaining proficiency in their responsibilities. Mr. Stern asked if we would be better off without a Deutschtown LRC. Ms. Molnar said she wasn't sure, but was leaning that way. Mr. Tellers said he was inclined to approve the candidates put in front of the Committee for the Allegheny Commons LRC. Ms Drescher indicated that she would like to have both committees, and that the applicants from Deutschtown can come back to the HRC in the future.

Motion: Mr. Tellers moved to approve the slate of ten candidates for the Allegheny Commons Park Local Review Committee (amended as nine). Also, Mr. Tellers added the approval one candidate for the East Carson Street LRC.

Second: Mr. Onque seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Mr. Tellers wanted to ask the Commission whether it would be worthwhile to put something in writing about the formation of LRCs. He would like staff to write a memo of some type, or a guideline, as to how to put together information regarding the Local Review Committee. Mr. Stern seconded what Mr. Tellers said, and asked that something be drafted in the near future. Ms. Molnar agreed.

Mr. Stern asked about the Commission Training session on March 12th. All Commission members discussed the training.

Ms. Molnar brought a zoning issue to the attention of the HRC. The issue is at 960 Penn Avenue, regarding the advertising sign (Rolling Rock), whose applicant received a sign permit (contested) but did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness. This issue has been before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Tymoczko commented briefly on the subject.

Adjourn: No motion to adjourn.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Attachments

600 North Taylor Street

OWNER:	Linsy and Bertha Smith 600 North Taylor Pittsburgh, PA 15212
APPLICANT:	Russell Blaich Bureau of Building Inspection
WARD:	22 nd
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0023-J-00207
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
COUNCIL DISTRICT #:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	R1A-VH
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	(typical)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *To raze the rear secondary structure (aka 1303 Monterey) to the ground*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal, and introduced Mr. Russell Blaich to the discussion. The demolition application is for a building at the rear of the lot. Ms. Molnar also introduced Ms. Smith, the property owner, to the conversation. Ms. Bertha Smith introduced herself, she lives at 1301 Monterey. There are two buildings on the lot. Ms. Smith indicated that she asked the City to tear down the building, but that she did not want to pay to have it demolished.

Mr. Tellers said that he did not think the building had historical significance, that it was too far gone to rehabilitate, and he would advocate to tear it down. The business details are not to be discussed at the HRC table. Ms. Drescher asked if Ms. Smith would have to pay for the demolition, Mr. Blaich

indicated that if the City is forced to tear down a building, they put a lien against the property owner for the cost. Mr. Stern indicated that the HRC’s responsibility was to determine whether the building is significant, and he said that it seemed the consensus was that the building is not significant. He asked for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Tellers moved to approve the demolition of 600 North Taylor,

SECOND: Ms. Joyce seconded the motion

IN FAVOR: All members in favor

OPPOSED:

After the vote, Mr. David McMunn spoke –up in opposition to the demolition, and Mr. Stern asked him to come to the podium to take his comment. Mr. McMunn indicated that some of the neighborhood residents are interested in restoring the house because it is significant as one of the only board-and-batten houses in the neighborhood. He wondered if he could ask the property owner if there could be another solution to abate the problems at the address. Would Ms. Smith be interested in selling the property? Would the property owner be interested in speaking with the Mexican War Streets Society to restore it? Mr McMunn stated that he was speaking on behalf of Jannet (Janna) Thompson who is the person who spoke out interested in the restoration. Mr. Cipriani wondered why the MWSS would want to restore it if the building was not historic in nature? Mr. Stern asked Mr. McMunn to come before the HRC by the April meeting with updates and possible agreement information with the landowner... the vote in favor of the demolition still stands, though the building owner may still ask BBI to postpone or cease demolition because of the potential to repair the structure.

1417 - 21 Rush Street

OWNER:	Theodore Hildenbrand
APPLICANT:	Russell Blaich Bureau of Building Inspection
WARD:	21 st
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	022-K-281
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
COUNCIL DISTRICT #:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	R2-H
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	(typical)

PROPOSAL – To raze the structure to the ground

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal for demolition. Mr. Tellers and Mr. Blaich discussed which property was 1417 Rush Street. Ms. Molnar indicated that the Manchester Real Estate Report recommended demolition for the building.

As indicated at previous HRC meetings, Mr. Tellers again suggested that structures at the rear of lots were secondary to larger houses at the front of each lot. Mr. Tellers supports the removal of secondary buildings as he believes that their removal would enhance the value of the primary structure, and thus make it more desirable to rehabilitate.

- MOTION:** Mr. Tellers moved to approve the demolition of 1417-21 Rush Street.
SECOND: Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion
IN FAVOR: All members voted in favor
OPPOSED: None

1417 Juniata Street

OWNER:	Mary Radick 298 Ames Rd. Bentleyville, PA 15314
APPLICANT:	Russell Blaich Bureau of Building Inspection
WARD:	21 st
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	22-K-00138
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	R1A-VH
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	(typical)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *To raze the garage structure to the ground*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposed demolition. The garage structure at the rear of the property, where the front of the property has no structure (building has already been demolished). Mr. Stern indicated that he didn’t need color pictures to convince him of the need to demolish the structure.

- MOTION:** Mr. Tellers moved to approve the demolition of 1417 Juniata Street
SECOND: Mr. Onque seconded the motion
IN FAVOR: All members voted in favor
OPPOSED: None

1409 Stedman Street

OWNER: Anne A. Moye
1409 Stedman Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

APPLICANT: Russell Blaich
Bureau of Building Inspection

WARD: 21st

BLOCK & LOT NUMBER: 22-P-258

BUILDING INSPECTOR: Ron Freyermuth

COUNCIL DISTRICT #6:

ZONING CLASSIFICATION:

ARCHITECTURAL RATING:

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – *To raze the structure to the ground*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposed demolition. She indicated its location on the map. Mr. Blaich described the buildings condition, including holes, and damage. Ms. Drescher asked the age of the building... Mr. Stern replied that it was probably built in the late 90s [1890s]. Mr. Tellers said he was inclined to approve demolition unless he heard from someone who thought otherwise. Mr. Stern lamented about the “broken record” syndrome of slowly destroying a neighborhood.

- MOTION:** Mr. Tellers moved to approve the demolition of 1409 Steadman Street
SECOND: Mr. Onque seconded the motion
IN FAVOR: All members voted in favor
OPPOSED: None

819 Liberty Avenue

OWNER:	Martin & Judith Berger 819 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	Berger Real Estate Wayne Kist
WARD:	2 nd
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	9-N-66
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ed McAllester
COUNCIL DISTRICT #:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	GT
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	(typical)

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – *Restoration/ rehabilitation of storefront*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposed storefront rehabilitation, which the HRC had reviewed at the January HRC. At the last meeting, the following were conditions for approval:

1. Width and profile of proposed muntins/stiles
2. Color issues
3. Center the front doors
4. Talk with Local Review Committee

Wayne Kist, applicant, and Ms. Molnar went to the LRC who asked for an historic photograph. Ms. Molnar found an historic photograph which shows the storefront with limited detailing showing storefront base, storefront arrangement, signboard arrangement, and cornice. Based on the photo, the LRC was interested in seeing a higher base, a fully extended signboard, and the glass storefront to be set-back a few inches. Mr. Stern interjected that the storefront door looks to be on the side of the building, instead of at the center, as recommended by the HRC. Ms. Molnar said that was correct, but that placing the door at the side would be difficult because it would not fit the applicant's need. She didn't think the LRC had a problem with placing the doors at the center. Mr. Tellers thought that the original architect would not object to center double doors. Ms. Molnar said after walking around the neighborhood, she saw several other approved aluminum frame & glass storefronts. Ms. Molnar said that she recommended approval if the applicant widened the muntins/stiles, and addressed the issue of base height, etc.

Mr. Kist indicated that he would raise the base to either 6" or 8." Ms. Drescher wondered if the base was as high as the lowest portion of the side granite column? Ms. Joyce replied that it was not. Mr. Tellers asked if the muntin style was going to be similar to that of the above stories? Mr. Kist said that the width of the upper window stiles was around 6". Mr. Tellers said he wanted to be careful not to emulate the upper stories too carefully, so as not to make pseudo history, but the widths should be similar. Mr. Tellers thought a 4" width between windows would be appropriate. Mr. Stern asked about colors. Mr. Kist replied that the aluminum comes in dark bronze (near black) and light brushed metallic; he preferred the dark color, so did Mr. Stern.

MOTION: Ms. Joyce moved to approve the application with the following conditions: aluminum base should be 6" high, the vertical stiles next to the door and frame should be 4" wide, the color should be black, and the signboard should extend from outer edge of column to outer edge of column. Amended by Mr. Stern that the clerestory level would be backlight, and amended again by Ms. Joyce that the storefront glass should be set-back 6" from the face of the column.

Ms. Molnar reminded the HRC and Mr. Kist that the sign itself would have to be approved separately once it had been designed.

SECOND: There was no second. Mr. Stern asked who was in favor...?
IN FAVOR: All members voted in favor
OPPOSED: None

2323 Brighton Road – David P. Oliver High School

OWNER:	Pittsburgh Board of Education 341 S BELLEFIELD AVE PITTSBURGH, PA 15213-0000
APPLICANT:	Andreas Dometakis 130 7 th Street, 830 Century Bldg. Pittsburgh, PA
WARD:	27 th
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	45-P-255
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
COUNCIL DISTRICT #6:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	RM-M
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *To replace the existing non-original windows.*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL

Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal. She indicated that she had images of the original windows, which had been replaced in the 1970s, and now need replacement again. The original drawing shows 6 over 6 windows. The proposed windows give a similar appearance to the originals, except that the new windows will have fixed bottom sashes, and hopper uppers.

Molnar hesitated to approve the application over-the-counter because the proposed windows would be aluminum, not steel or wood as the guidelines suggest, and because the new appearance would not match the original exactly. Molnar indicated that the school board wanted

these replacement windows because of safety and cost.

Mr. Romanowski and Mr. Dometakis from the school board were present at the hearing and addressed the commission. Mr. Romanowski said that he has looked at a number of school buildings in attempting to replicate double-hung sashes. He said they have looked at over 50 custom manufacturers to attempt to find someone who could find anyone to certify a window. With that in mind, the school has also had a history of balance failure with monumental windows – causing the windows to become like a guillotine. From a cost and maintenance standpoint, the hoppers are the best. They plan to replicate the profiles, muntins, etc. from the original windows. They would pick a color from an historic palate.

Mr. Tellers said, in the early 20th century we could make wood windows of this size that could operate in the historic school, and he guessed we couldn’t do it today. Mr. Romanowski said we could, but it couldn’t be certified. He wanted to avoid wood because of the maintenance, and double-hung because of safety.

Mr. Cipriani asked about U-Factors. Romanowski replied that everything they put in to the building would be up to code – and better performing than the current windows – but he did not have numbers. Mr. Stern also indicated that the new windows would be doubling the daylight available to the building. Mr. Romanowski said the muntins would be applied. Mr. Stern said he did not feel to strongly about the applied muntins – Ms. Joyce said that the windows were too busy for her liking. Mr. Stern thought that two hoppers in one window would be close to the original in theory – they would both operate to circulate warm air out and cool air in. Mr. Tellers said that if this was our only option for windows, he would be inclined to skip the artificial muntins. Stern said that the design makes sense, but dilutes the verticality of the façade; the applied muntins would help to mitigate that. Mr. Stern said that adding daylight to the upper portions of the window would be a very positive improvement.

Mr. Romanowski brought up the issue of the security grates on the lower windows. He said that everything within 10’ of grade needed a grate. It’s a 2x2” wire grating, operable from the inside, so that you might escape in

2323 Brighton Road – David P. Oliver High School

event of a fire. Where the grates are installed, the hoppers open to the inside. Mr. Stern asked why not use a wire glass – and the answer is that wire glass is not permitted. The vents and louvered areas of the windows will remain until the building upgrades its HVAC – there is currently no air conditioning. Romanowski said it would be awhile before the school board had enough money to upgrade that building’s HVAC.

Mr. Stern called for a motion.

MOTION: Ms. Drescher moved to approve the windows as in drawings submitted by the School Board of Oliver High School.

Mr. Stern asked for information on the colors. Mr. Dometakis indicated that the color would be from an historic palate, but that he would ask the staff members before painting the windows. Ms. Drescher amended her motion to include paint colors to be approved by staff when available.

SECOND: Mr. Onque seconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

100 West North Avenue – Malta Temple

Nomination Information

Owner: Salvation Army
Nominated By: David McMunn
Mexican War Streets Society
Date of Nomination: 11 December 2007

Building Information

Date of Construction: 1927
Architect(s): W. R. Klicker and William K. Beltz
Builder(s): Rose & Fisher
National Register Status: None

Zoning Information

Ward: 22nd
Neighborhood: Central Northside
Block and Lot Number: 0023-K-00411
Zoning: LNC

DISCUSSION OF NOMINATION

Ms. Molnar introduced the nomination, and indicated the hearing today is for Public Comment. Molnar gave the primary points of significance as the building's association with social developments within the City of Pittsburgh, and that the building has some architectural significance because it is a good example of its type (Collegiate Gothic), and that the building has significance as it contributes to the historic streetscape of North Avenue. Mr. Stern asked how many people were planning to comment (show of hands). Those in favor speak first:

1. Steven Paul, executive director, Preservation Pittsburgh
 - a. Reading of Tom Armstrong's letter in favor – believes that reliving the “mistakes” of the Allegheny Center would be a terrible decision.
2. Robert Wise
3. Kirk Birkley
4. Michael Barber, executive director of the Central Northside Neighborhood Council
5. David McMunn, nominator – had a petition signed by 91 Central Northsiders in favor of keeping the building intact.
6. Rebecca Green, Secretary of the Mexican War Streets Society

Those in Opposition

1. Kenneth Yarksy, III – did a councilwoman write a letter of support? Plans to work with URA for redevelopment of area.

– No Motion Necessary –