



HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH

Minutes of the Meeting of July 2, 2008
Beginning at 12:00 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	Tom Earhart
Paul Tellers, Vice Chair		Rich Cupka
Jill Joyce		Chris Voltz
Daniel Cipriani		Henry Hanson
Noor Ismail		Steven Paul
		Sean C Luther
		Anne Nelson
		Mike Edwards
		Jerome Jackson

Old Business

Nominations Report: There are three buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Workingmen's Savings Bank building was scheduled for public comment at City Council on May 20th. Molnar indicated that an agreement might be reached between all parties to extend the public comment period for 90 days. Stay tuned. The Malta Temple went to City Council for public comment on June 25, 2008. The Council members will vote on the legislation in the next week, or so. Saint Mary's Academy building in Lawrenceville will have a public comment period at HRC today.

Update from February:

- 1020 E Carson Street – The tenant is in the process of being evicted. The building owner's attorney has been in contact w/ Ms. Molnar to discuss options to amend the historic ordinance violation. The owner has seven days from the date of eviction to correct the paint scheme.
- 1005 E Carson – Murdoch's Piano Bar – This violation is "on hold" until the new owner can be tracked down. The building inspector indicated a need to re-file the violation.
- 960 Penn Avenue – Rolling Rock Sign – The update is that there is no update. After the previous HRC hearing this issue was discussed, staff turned the case over to the City's legal department. The legal department will take the next step, if necessary.
- 4100 Bigelow – Islamic Playground Center – Schenley Farms – The applicants will appear before the zoning board of appeals to determine if the proposed use will be permitted on July 24th, 2008.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the April 2008 minutes. Ms. Joyce motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion. Mr. Tellers abstained from the vote.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the June Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Tellers moved to approve, Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

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

Adjourn: Mr. Tellers moved to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Joyce seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Attachments

2312 East Carson Street

OWNER: Richard and Stephanie Cupka 57 S. 28 th Street Murrysville, PA 15203	WARD: 16 th LOT & BLOCK: 012-L-229 INSPECTOR: Bob Molyneaux COUNCIL DISTRICT:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: June 2008 SITE VISITS: June 25, 2008 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 06-090
APPLICANT: Richard and Stephanie Cupka 57 S. 28 th Street Murrysville, PA 15203	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: LNC ARCH. RATING:	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Changes:

Is seeking HRC approval to construct a side-patio as a suitable replacement for the approved new construction.

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by giving some background on the property. She indicated that she first heard of this address when she found out that a building was being demolished at 2312 E Carson Street. The building owner had a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition. The CofA approved the demolition and also the construction of a new two-story masonry building. In June, Ms. Molnar received an application from the building's owner, Mr. Cupka, for the construction of an outdoor patio to be built instead of the two-story masonry structure.
2. In 2006, the HRC indicated that the demolished building was a non-contributing structure. Ms. Molnar said that the HRC was to decide whether the proposed patio/deck area would be a suitable replacement for the approved two-story masonry building. Ms. Molnar indicated that Cupka and his attorney were present to describe the new plans for construction.
3. Molnar continued to describe the context of the building by showing images of the property, streetscape, and aerial images. She showed an image of the existing vacant lot (demolished building) and the adjacent parking lot, which will continue to be a parking lot.
4. Mr. Cipriani asked if Molnar had the original drawings that were approved with the demolition. Molnar replied that she did have those drawings.
5. On June 12, 2006, the HRC first received an application for this property. In August, the HRC approved the demolition of the existing structure, but asked that the plans for reconstruction be revised and resubmitted.
6. Ms. Molnar read the demolition/reconstruction CofA, out loud, verbatim, to the HRC.
7. Ms. Molnar indicated that she talked with the City's legal department to find out if the demolition mentioned on the CofA was contingent upon the reconstruction of the new structure. The legal department thought that the demolition was contingent upon the new construction, but also indicated that the applicant had the right to submit an application to revise their plans (as they did). The HRC should consider whether the new proposal is a suitable replacement for the approved CofA.
8. Molnar indicated that if the HRC voted that the patio proposal was a suitable replacement for the approved new construction, then a new CofA would be issued and the review would be over. If the HRC does not approve the

- plan for the patio, then the HRC should tell the applicant what it would approve. The applicant would then have to resubmit, or somehow take the next step legally.
9. Mr. Stern wanted to know if the issuance of a demolition permit was contingent upon the applicant pulling a construction permit for the new construction. Mr. Cipriani said ordinarily you could get a demolition permit without a new construction permit.
 10. Ms. Molnar passed around the approved drawings. She said that construction on the new patio area has commenced to some extent, but was stopped by the Bureau of Building Inspection.
 11. Tom Earhart, Cupka’s representative, came to the table and introduced himself. Earhart indicated that the Cupka’s bar/restaurant received an award from the HRC for its renovation. Earhart said that Cupka had no outstanding violations with the City. Henry Hansen, architect, is present if necessary. Earhart wanted to make several points:
 - a. The structure that was demolished was approved for demolition by the HRC
 - b. The use of that structure was non-conforming, as residential, but the outdoor café would conform to the commercial zoning of that district. Mr. Stern asked why the residential use would be nonconforming. Earhart said that residential use is a non-conforming use because it does not fit the use as zoned.
 - c. Earhart indicated that several other addresses on Carson had outdoor cafés.
 - d. Mr. Cipriani asked if there was work going on already. Earhart replied that the sidewalk permit permitted the repair of the sidewalk. Earhart said that according to the pictures shown by Molnar, the construction of the outdoor patio had commenced. Stern asked if there was a building permit for that work, and Earhart replied that the work probably commenced pursuant to a building permit.
 12. Henry Hansen introduced himself to the HRC. He commenced to describe the new patio drawings to the HRC. Ms. Molnar had the drawings available on the PowerPoint presentation. He showed the existing building, and then described the new plan.
 - a. Masonry and steel fencing around the lot, with planting areas.
 - b. There would be a service vestibule to connect the patio and the existing building.
 - c. The intent would be to maintain a “storefront” street-elevation to look something like a building. The streetscape would then step-down from a three-story building adjacent to Chupkas, the two-story building that is Chupka’s, the one-story proposed patio wall, and the ground-level of the parking lot.
 - d. Hansen described the materials, the plantings, the furniture, the siding, etc.
 - e. Mr. Stern asked why the HRC was seeing this application now, now that the project is halfway through construction. Mr. Cipriani asked about the stairway that existed onto the patio. He also wanted to know how many occupants the patio would carry. Hansen did not know.
 13. Mr. Tellers indicated that he was present during the original deliberations in 2006. He recalled that the rendering of the proposed new building weighed heavily into his consideration of the demolition. He said that at the time, the building owner made a persuasive argument that the building did not contribute because of its residential character. Because of the need for expansion, Chupka’s asked for the demolition. The expansion was needed for the success

- of the existing business, according to Tellers' recollection of the argument, and that the new building would be a part of the restoration of the streetscape. Mr. Tellers said that today, the HRC is being asked to throw-out the old rationale, and accept a new and completely opposite rationale.
14. Pointing at the approved and the newly proposed drawings, Ms. Joyce agreed with Mr. Tellers saying, the new scheme is a far-cry from what was approved two years ago. She said she was a little baffled why the new patio was/is not following proper procedure. Because the owner and applicant were involved in this process two years ago, they should know better what the process is.
 15. Mr. Hansen replied that the conditions that existed at that time (2006), the argument was thoughtfully prepared to "not persuade the HRC, but to find what makes sense." Things changed since that time. It was always the intention of the owner to implement that design. Some things have changed since that design was prepared, and since the CofA was issued. Hansen wanted to let the owner explain those things.
 16. Mr. Rich Chupka, 57 S. 28th Street, came to the table and introduced himself. Stern asked him what had changed in the last two years, and Mr. Chupka replied.
 - a. The first thing that changed is the smoking ban. When it is passed, it will affect business.
 - b. An outside patio at Fat-Heads, with the roof and canvas that come down, to be used all year around, "that's my reasonings."
 - c. Mr. Stern asked why this revision wasn't brought to the HRC before they began construction. Chupka replied that "as far as this construction, we had to do that regardless." Chupka continued that once the building was demolished, they had to make the site safe, and so made some improvements to the parcel. Mr. Stern asked when the building was demolished. Ms. Molnar replied that she thought it was in early to mid May, 2008.
 - d. Tellers and Cipriani confirmed that there are no building permits for the new patio.
 17. Mr. Stern asked if Mr. Chupka would like to add anything to his statement, and when Chupka said he did not, Stern opened it up for public discussion.
 18. Henry Hansen added that when the façade design was prepared for the approved building, the intention was to apply for and obtain a façade grant. The SSLDC did not want to support the application to the URA because "they didn't like the fact that we were able to tear down the building, therefore they weren't going to support the application with a grant." Ms. Joyce asked for the timeline on this... and Hansen replied that it took two or three months after the 2006 HRC meeting for the SSLDC to give their decision.
 19. Mr. Tellers said that his own feeling was that the rationale involved in approving the demolition of a noncontributing structure to the ECS district, and the demolition of that building was contingent upon the construction of a new building that would begin to restore the streetface of the block, is a rationale that still holds. He is not inclined to argue for the new proposal that would make permanent the missing teeth of the block.
 20. Jill Joyce agreed with Paul.
 21. Mr. Stern said that though he was not at the previous discussion in 2006, he is not encouraged by the "good faith" of the applicant who demolished the building knowing that the approved designs were not feasible, and who starting working without a building permit, and who did not seek approval from the Commission before beginning

work. Whether or not it was intended, those actions give the impression that the applicant was trying to mislead the HRC. That is problematic. Mr. Stern said that he is open to a motion.

22. Mr. Tellers suggested a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Tellersmoved to deny the approval of the application for a patio adjacent to Chupka’s 2, as proposed.

SECOND: Ms. Joyceseconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: *All.....* ***PASSED***

OPPOSED: *None*

OWNER: Frank Michael	WARD: 17 TH	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 05/2008
	LOT & BLOCK: 012-E-382	SITE VISITS: 05/23/2008
APPLICANT: Chris Theoret 1622 East Carson St. Pittsburgh, PA 15203	INSPECTOR: Bob Molyneaux	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:
	COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: LNC	
	ARCH. RATING:	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE <input type="checkbox"/>

Current Violations:

Exterior paint scheme is in violation of Historic Preservation Ordinance.

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by giving some background on the property. She indicated that the HRC had seen the non-conforming paint scheme at the HRC in the past months. The applicant is at the HRC today to gain approval for a new paint scheme.
2. Chris Theoret, owner, introduced himself.
3. Ms. Molnar described the new paint scheme – as approved by the Local Review Committee on E. Carson Street.
4. Mr. Theoret discussed the gooseneck lamps, and the awnings. There was some discussion about the various stripes on the building, the blue, red, white on the building – and the green awning with white stripes. The baseboard is green. Mr. Tellers said that the band of red/white/and blue as seen on the LRC sketch was a good idea. That way the stripes would become part of the sign. Mr. Theoret was not amicable to that solution. He said that the design of the stripes was too subjective, and historically, there shouldn't be a difference between a large stripe and a small stripe.
5. Mr. Tellers suggested a beige-terra-cotta color on the first floor of the building, instead of the existing blue.
6. Mr. Theoret discussed his sign saying that it was non-illuminated. Mr. Cipriani told Theoret that hewould need an electrical permit for the lamps.

MOTION: Ms. Joycemoved to approve the revised paint scheme, as discussed, with the four gooseneck lamps. The first floor should be a beige color, the flower boxes are permissible,

SECOND: Mr. Ciprianiseconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: All..... **PASSED**

OPPOSED:

1427 Juniata Street

OWNER: Melissa Vaughan 408 Hill Street Evans City, PA 16033	WARD: 21 st LOT & BLOCK: 22-K-129 INSPECTOR:R. Freyermuth COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6 th ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:Typical	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 06/03/2008 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.: <i>NONE</i>
APPLICANT: Margo Barr 215 Stanton Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15209		

Proposed Changes:

Installation of vinyl siding and vinyl windows (already installed). Applicant would like to paint the exterior.

DISCUSSION

- Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by giving some background on the property. She said that vinyl siding and windows were installed without a CofA. She said that the siding contractor came in to have the job approved. Aluminum and vinyl siding in Manchester is not prohibited by the guidelines, but Ms. Molnar did not feel comfortable approving the siding and windows after-the-fact.
- The applicant, Ms. Vaughan, came to discuss the proposal. She introduced herself, and presented photographs of the job. Ms. Vaughan said she tried to save the siding, but she had a difficult time getting the paint removed in order to repaint. She repainted according to the original colors she could find on the building. She said it took a month to try to salvage the existing wood clapboard, but gave up on the efforts when she determined it wasn't working. She said she didn't know there was a problem because there are 11 other houses on the street that have vinyl siding. Vaughan said that she preserved the frames around the doors and windows.
- Mr. Stern asked why Ms. Molnar didn't approve it administratively. Molnar replied that it was an after-the-fact approval of something she didn't think was appropriate, though it was permissible.
- Ms. Molnar indicated that the windows were previously 2-over-2, and they are currently 1-over-1.
- Mr. Cipriani told Ms. Vaughan that she would still need to apply for her building permit for the replacement windows and siding.

MOTION: Mr. Tellersmoved to approve the vinyl siding and vinyl windows.

SECOND: Mr. Ciprianiseconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: All..... ***PASSED***

OPPOSED:

OWNER: Manchester Youth Development Center 1214 Liverpool Street Pittsburgh, PA 15233	WARD: 21st LOT & BLOCK:22-L-249 INSPECTOR:Freyermuth /McGoogan COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6 th	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 05/12/2008 SITE VISITS: 05/23/2008 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: K H Design	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING: .. Non-Contributing	

Proposed Changes:

Manchester Youth want to paint a mural selected by the Manchester community during the summer of 2008.

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal, as discussed last month. The hearing was continued because we did not know exactly how big it would be, where, etc.
2. Jerome Jackson from MCC answered those questions, and referred to photographs submitted.

MOTION: Mr. Tellersmoved to approve the proposal as presented, but asked that the details be approved by the staff member when they become available. The final design should be approved by the staff person, who might chose to consult with the art planner.

SECOND: Ms. Joyceseconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: All..... ***PASSED***

OPPOSED:

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

Proposed Changes:

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

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by giving some background on the property. She said that she was confused as to where the siding would be installed – she could not figure out if it would be visible from any public right of way. If it is not visible, there would be no need for review.
2. The applicant, Enrico Novelli, came to the table and introduced himself. He showed photographs, plot-plans, and explained that the project would not be visible from the street or any public right of way.
3. Mr. Tellers asked if we were allowed to consider the application since nothing was visible. The answer is no.
4. Mr. Novelli asked about windows on the front – he was told to apply to the HRC if any exterior changes were being made – interior storm windows would not need an HRC. Ms. Molnar told him to contact her if he had any proposed changes.

MOTION: No motion.

502 – 506 Liberty Avenue

OWNER: Frank Sklar	WARD: 1 st	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00
	LOT & BLOCK: 1-D-117	SITE VISITS: 00/00/00
APPLICANT: Dean Marsico 502-506 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA	INSPECTOR: Ed McAllester	CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
	COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6 th	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:GT	
	ARCH. RATING:	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Changes:

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

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by giving some background on the property, and describing the chronology of previous approvals. She described where the sign would be, and when it was installed. She gave the HRC all of the guidelines for Market Square signage. Ms. Molnar addressed Mr. Marsico.
2. Marsico introduced himself and said that the owner applied to keep that size sign a few years ago. Marsico gave the background information on the sign.
3. Mr. Cipriani discussed the sign’s occupancy permit and its zoning.
4. There was discussion regarding what actually happened at this address regarding the sign.
5. Mr. Tellers said that he would be happy at terminating the approval of the sign now that the four years are up. He said that the agreement was a compromise by multiple parties, and this was the solution; we should follow it.
6. Mr. Marsico said that the sign costs \$15,000 and to have to erect a new sign would be devastating.
7. There was a lot of discussion regarding the size of the sign. There was discussion regarding the decision of the zoning board.
8. Marsico said the sign was in good condition.
9. Mr. Stern said he was inclined to allow the continued use of the sign for the life of THAT sign and the life of THAT establishment. If you change the sign, or the name of the business, or anything regarding the sign, it must then conform to the district guidelines.

MOTION: Mr. Tellersmoved to allow the continued use of the sign for the life of THAT sign and the life of THAT establishment. If you change the sign, or the name of the business, or anything regarding the sign, it must then conform to the district guidelines.

SECOND: Ms. Joyceseconded the motion.

502 – 506 Liberty Avenue

IN FAVOR: *All*..... **PASSED**

OPPOSED:

Market Square Redesign

DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Molnar introduced Ms. Dina Klavon to describe the changes to Market Square.
2. Ms. Klavon introduced herself and described the project. She said she was working with the City, the PDP, the URA, and all interested stakeholders. They came up with priorities – extending walks, improving lighting, address the trees, parking, and busses.
3. Ms. Klavon showed historic images of the square, and how the square progressed and changed over the decades.
4. Mr. Tellers asked if the plan would all be one height and if that was safe. Ms. Klavon said that was the idea. She indicated that they were working toward researching other squares throughout the country to see how one-level paving worked in other spaces. It’s intended to let people move through the square freely.
5. The discussion arose regarding the location of bollards, and where the best location would be to keep the area safe, but not full of bollards.
6. Mr. Tellers asked about trees – a mix of tree types – what the canopies would look like, etc.
7. Mr. Tellers and Mr. Stern said that elegance and classic simplicity would provide the “wow factor.”
8. Mr. Stern asked what the HRC was supposed to do at this hearing. Molnar replied that there should be public comment and that HRC should make a recommendation. Mr. Stern asked for public comment.
 - a. Mr. Ron Gargani asked if the City could help businesses install plumbing for upper-floor sprinkler systems while the square was dug-up.
 - b. Mr. Steven Paul asked if closing McMasters & Gramme was the best decision. He Also thought that moving the parking to the inside of the square would be prudent.
 - c. Ms. Anne Nelson read a statement on behalf of PHLF indicating that PHLF was not happy about the closing of McMasters and Gramme. They would question their investment in the square if the streets are closed.
9. Mr. Stern asked Ms. Klavon to return to answer the questions. She said that the civil engineer could help answer Mr. Gargani’s questions – and that “we can deal with that, no problem.” She said that they really feel comfortable with the parking on the outside of the drive, and that this was a big debate.

MOTION: Mr. Tellersmoved to approve as discussed, on the condition that the applicant would have a conversation with PHLF regarding the closing of those streets.

SECOND: Ms. Joyceseconded the motion.

IN FAVOR: All..... ***PASSED***

OPPOSED:

Malta Temple

Extracted from Nomination:

HISTORICAL NAME OF PROPERTY: _____ Saint Mary’s Academy
CURRENT NAME OF PROPERTY: _____ (former) Saint Mary’s Academy

LOCATION

Street _____ 340 46th Street _____
City, State _____ Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania _____
Zip Code _____ 15201 _____

OWNERSHIP

Name _____ Catholic Cemeteries Association of the Diocese of Pittsburgh _____
Street _____ 718 Hazelwood Avenue _____
City, State, Zip Code _____ Pittsburgh PA_15217 _____

NOMINATED BY

Name ___ Keith Cochran _____

Street ___ 805 Kerr Street _____

City, State, Zip Code ___ Pittsburgh PA 15220 _____

DISCUSSION

The following people offered public testimony:

In Opposition:

- Anabell McGannon

In Favor:

- Anne Nelson
- Carol Peterson
- Andrea Martz