



*HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH*

Minutes of the Meeting of August 6, 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	Stanley Lowe
		Joseph Cheeks
		Cheryl Walker
Earle Onque		Kyle Holbrook
Jill Joyce		Lucas Stock
Daniel Cipriani		Russ Blaich
Noor Ismail		Duncan Horner
		Randy Zotter

Old Business

**Nominations Report:** There are three buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Workingmen’s Savings Bank building is on hold at City Council. Molnar indicated that an agreement had been reached between all parties to extend the public comment period for 90 days. The Malta Temple went to City Council for public comment on June 25, 2008, and the designation was approved. Saint Mary’s Academy building in Lawrenceville will be voted on today.

New Business

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the July 2008 minutes. Ms. Joyce motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the July Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Stern moved to approve, Ms. Joyce seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

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

**Adjourn:** Mr. Onque moved to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Attachments

---

**1108-1114 Warlo Street**

**Manchester Historic District**

OWNER:  
Renaissance Housing FP ILP  
230 Wyoming Avenue  
Wilkes Barre, PA 18704

WARD: ..... 21st  
LOT & BLOCK:022-L-(295A-298A)  
INSPECTOR: ..... Ron Freyermuth

APPLICATION RECEIVED:  
07/08/2008

SITE VISITS:

APPLICANT:  
Russell Blaich  
200 Ross Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....  
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....  
ARCH. RATING: .....

CERTIFICATES OF APP.:

**DISCUSSION:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application for demolition, and informed the HRC members that the property was rehabilitated in 1986, and won an award from the HRC for the efforts. She showed the before and after pictures, and explained that there was a fire this year. She explained that the HRC recently approved the demolition of 1212 Warlo Street, which is immediately adjacent to these properties.
2. Mr. Stern asked who owned the properties, and who rehabbed them. Mr. Russ Blaich answered the questions, and said that PennRose owned the properties, and that they are condemned. Stern and Joyce noticed that the roof was gone, and the interior floors were destroyed.
3. Mr. Stern asked for public comment. Mr. Stanley Lowe, 1407 Sheffield Street, Pgh. Introduced himself and said he was in opposition of the demolitions. He stated that there were many properties in Manchester that needed to be restored. His concern was not only the buildings in front of the HRC today, but the degree of demolitions permitted in Manchester in general. He said, "if we can't fix 'em, let's burn 'em" and that shouldn't be the attitude. Lowe said that he had spoken with PHLF who also opposed the demolitions. He asked that the HRC put a hold on the demolitions, so that Lowe could be part of the solution to fix the buildings. Lowe said, "I will commit \$25,000 of my own personal funds in addition to working with PHLF to raise and additional \$100,000 to \$200,000 to relieve Ralph Falbo and PennRose of all their Manchester properties." He also asked that the City put back in place its Local Review Committee in Manchester.
4. Mr. Cipriani and Mr. Blaich discussed the safety issues with delaying the demolitions.
5. Ms. Ismail applauded Mr. Lowe for his efforts and commitment to help. She recommended LOWE call the Mayor's 311 line in addition to his efforts with the Manchester Citizens Corporation.
6. Mr. Stern invited Carol Wooley to the table; she introduced herself as a resident of the Manchester Historic District. She said she is in support of what Lowe said earlier. Mr. Stern called for a motion.

**MOTION:** Ms. Joyce .....moved to postpone the demolition for 60 days, and that he would come back to the HRC to update them on the progress made with saving the buildings.

**SECOND:** Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

**1339 W. North Avenue**

**Manchester Historic District**

**OWNER:**  
Dean Osterritter and Joseph Rock  
1128 Southside Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212  
Also: 8 Beckfield Street

**WARD:** ..... 21st  
**LOT & BLOCK:** .....007-B-271  
**INSPECTOR:** ..... Ron Freyermuth  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** .....  
**ZONING CLASSIFICATION:** .....  
**ARCH. RATING:** .....

**APPLICATION RECEIVED:**  
06/23/2008  
**SITE VISITS:**  
**CERTIFICATES OF APP.:**

**APPLICANT:**  
Russell Blaich  
200 Ross Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

**Proposed Changes:**  
Raze to Ground.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal for demolition, and indicated that the Manchester Citizens Corporation and that PHLF oppose the demolitions. She showed images of the building.
2. Mr. Blaich showed the HRC his pictures of the building, and described the problems with the structure. This included cracks in the masonry, falling gutter, etc.
3. Mr. Stern asked who owned the building? Mr. Blaich said he had the owners in court on 8-15-07, and they were fined a couple thousand of dollars. Blaich said that if 1339 would be demolished, then there would be a potential buyer for the neighboring structure. That person was present.
4. Linda Hansen introduced herself as the owner of 1337 W North Avenue, and she was interested in purchasing the second house in. She came to the HRC because she wanted to see if the owners showed up. She said that she didn't want to tear down the building because of the historic nature of the neighborhood, but she didn't want to buy an adjacent structure because she didn't think the owners of 1339 W North would be responsible building owners. She also wanted to know what would happen to the empty lot when the building was torn down. She said a delay of demolition would be helpful to figure out the answers to these questions.
5. Mr. Stern asked for more public comment. Mr. Stanley Lowe came back to the stand and said that this corner was a troublesome corner in Manchester. At another property, Lowe and 150 neighbors showed up at the property and demanded the owners to pay attention to the district. He asked that the HRC would delay the demolition.
6. Carol Wooley lives at 1315 W North Avenue and indicated that her family has put lots of money into their property. She said that there have been people "shooting up" at the property, but Wooley couldn't get in touch with the owners to alert them. Wooley is concerned about the children who are walking back from school.
7. Mr. Cipriani said that this building is an eminent hazard, and that he would not like to put anyone in danger.

**MOTION:** Mr. Cipriani .....moved to revisit the demolition proposal in 30 days.

**SECOND:** Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

OWNER: Manchester Youth Dev. Center 1214 Liverpool Street Pittsburgh, PA 15233	WARD: ..... 21st LOT & BLOCK: .....22-L-249 INSPECTOR:Freyermuth /McGoogan COUNCIL DISTRICT: ..... 6 <sup>th</sup> ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .. Non-Contributing	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 07/08/2008 SITE VISITS: 05/23/2008 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 08-086
APPLICANT: Stefani Danes Perkins Eastman 1100 Liberty Avenue		

**Proposed Changes:**

Replacement of awning and repair brick façade.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal – and indicated that the property was the same parcel as the application for a mural, recently before the HRC. The current application is for façade improvements, which Molnar thought someone in the audience could speak to. Molnar indicated that metal/aluminum awnings are not permitted in the historic district.
2. Ms. Cheryl Walker came to the table and introduced herself as the executive director of the Manchester Youth’s Center. She brought her own photographs and drawings of the proposed awning. She said that the proposed awning fits in with the “continuity” of the street.
3. Ms. Joyce asked where the proposed awning would go. Molnar and Walker helped to describe the setting, and the location of the previously approved mural.
4. Mr. Stern said that the renderings of the submitted drawings are not clear enough to describe what the awning actually looks like. He said he couldn’t tell if the proposed awning was industrial, and if so, he would be inclined to be okay with a metal awning.
5. Ms. Joyce asked if there were other repairs going on. Ms. Walker said that the windows would not be replaced, but that the use of the building, for children, would remain the same. Walker said that the existing awning would have been a health and safety hazard, and that is why they removed it.
6. Mr. Onque said that the applicant should go back to Perkins Eastman and do a more thorough study of the canopy to represent an awning that would work. He said that the awning presented was not a very thought out approach. Ms. Walker asked for clarification, and Mr. Onque said that he needed to see something that worked for the entire façade, not just for the marquee. He said the whole thing has to be better thought-out, and that’s not clear at this point. Stern said that the HRC needed better clarification of what’s happening on the entire façade. He also pointed out that the photo-montage rendering and the sketch did not show the same awning, and that the HRC would be more inclined to approve an awning like the sketch. Ms. Joyce said that she would like to see a rendering of the entire building with a picture of the awning. Ms. Walker said that because of their funding, there wouldn’t be a lot more work going on that she hadn’t described.
7. Mr. Stern recommended that the awning be approved at an administrative approval next time. If the applicant could meet the conditions that the HRC described, then they would be inclined to let the staff person approve the awning. Molnar asked the HRC to vote on the approval of metal, versus cloth awning.

**1214 Liverpool Street**

---

**MOTION:** Mr. Onque .....moved to approve the concept of a metal awning along with a sketch that could better inform the HRC about the treatment of the entire façade and how the awning would be installed. Mr. Stern and Onque both added that a condition to the approval is that staff review the application.

**SECOND:** Ms. Joyce .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

OWNER:  
MRC ACQUISITION CORP #5

WARD: ..... 21st

APPLICATION RECEIVED:

LOT & BLOCK: ..... 22-G-234

SITE VISITS:

APPLICANT:  
Timothy Morgan

INSPECTOR: .....R. Freyermuth

CERTIFICATES OF APP.:

COUNCIL DISTRICT: ..... 6<sup>th</sup>

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....

ARCH. RATING: .....Typical

NATIONAL REGISTER:

LISTED .....

ELIGIBLE .....

**Proposed Changes:**

Construction of a mixed-use building.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal by asking for a clarification of the address. Mr. Cipriani looked up the lot and block in his computer and confirmed the address. Ms. Molnar asked if the applicant was present.
2. Mr. Tim Morgan introduced himself as the architect for the project. He said that the property is surrounded by historic structures, and a softball field, near the school. He said the proposed construction would be a mixed use building with office space, first floor commercial, and 2 bedroom apartments on the second and third floors. He indicated the reason for being at the HRC was to get conceptual approval for the construction at the site, before proceeding to the next level of planning. The zoning is single family attached, according to Morgan. Morgan said he was in the process of getting zoning approval.
3. Molnar said that she and Tim Morgan had talked about the notion of doing a preliminary approval at HRC, and then coming back to the HRC with final details and formal drawings when they become available at a later date.
4. Mr. Stern asked for comments and questions. Mr. Onque said he had some concerns about the zoning issues, because it would have implications in other parts of the neighborhood. Onque thought that the zoning approval might be difficult.
5. Linda Hansen, resident of Manchester, said that her only comment was that she was concerned about what the building was going to look like.
6. Mr. Stern asked if there should be a motion? Ms. Joyce moved to approve the concept of the 3 story mixed use building. Stern said that he was ready to add more comments. Joyce added that she was going to bring up those issues. The building should be subject to review of the scaling, massing, window fenestrations, materials, zoning approval, etc.
7. Stern added that he thought that new buildings in Historic Districts could be a challenge. He said you could either try to be as contextual as possible by replicating the character of the historic neighborhood, or you could try to contrast that in a sympathetic way. He said that both were acceptable approaches. But that those questions should be worked out. He said, scale, massing, materials and fenestrations, were the main things he was concerned with.
8. Morgan said that following the contextual setbacks was one of the most important aspects in his mind.

- 9. Stern said that you couldn't take a townhouse and simply enlarge it to make a successful residential/ commercial space in an historic area.
- 10. Stern asked for more comments – Carol Wooley addressed the commission. She said that she wasn't in opposition, but that she was concerned about the process involved in approving something like this. Stern answered that 1) that's why the HRC exists, and 2) the zoning process would be a parallel process, in which case the property owners receive notices. Molnar told Wooley that she would put her on the mailing list for the HRC.

**MOTION:** Ms. Joyce .....moved to approve the concept of the 3 story mixed use building, with the constraints that the HRC is able to comment and review the scale, massing, fenestration, materials, and that it is subject to the HRC approvals and the zoning approvals. It should come back to HRC after it receives zoning approvals.

**SECOND:** Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

OWNER: Jason Peng 909 Western Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15233	WARD: .....22 <sup>nd</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 07-D-168 INSPECTOR: ..... Ron Freyermuth COUNCIL DISTRICT: ..... 6 <sup>th</sup> ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:  #07-089
APPLICANT: B & R Construction		

**Proposed Changes:**

Addition to the carriage house and façade rehabilitation.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application, and described the work that had previously taken place at that address. She described the proposed work items. She also indicated that the applicants were available to talk about the building.
2. Henry Hansen, from Hansen Design group introduced himself. He described the drawings that he provided – and indicated that he had met with the Local Review Committee . Hansen said that he incorporated comments from the LRC into the drawings. He said the proposed use would be an art gallery on the first floor, and an apartment on the upper floor.
3. Mr. Stern asked if the stair on the outside would be similar to that of the next door neighbor, and whether there would be an encroachment permit needed for that. Hansen said that he was working with Eric Milliron from BBI to figure out those questions, and to address the ADA issues. Hansen said that the front of the building (restoration) was part of the project, and the other part of the project would be to rehabilitate the rear-facing garage/carriage house. Hansen said the intent would be to add a residential unit in the garage – and that posed another zoning issue.
4. Hansen said that he intended to maintain the dormer and the hoist/lift, as per the LRC’s recommendations, but that the exterior shutters would have to be made into interior shutters. Hansen said that there were several schemes for the rear of the garage, because he didn’t know what the zoning office would provide for – i.e. residential or commercial space. That would determine what the exterior of the garage would look like.

**MOTION:** Mr. Stern .....moved to approve the drawings as submitted for the conceptual design of 909 Western Avenue, and that colors and materials be reviewed by staff.

**SECOND:** Ms. Joyce .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

1506 E Carson Street

East Carson Historic District

OWNER: Karen and Sean Conley	WARD: ..... 17 <sup>TH</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED:
APPLICANT: Ryson Construction, Howard Ericksen	LOT & BLOCK: ..... 3-H-074	SITE VISITS:
	INSPECTOR: ..... Bob Molyneaux	CERTIFICATES OF APP.: #95-130
	COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... LNC	
	ARCH. RATING: .....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED ..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**  
Façade Renovation

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Molnar introduced the project as another storefront renovation at 1506 E Carson Street. She indicated that the Southside Local Development Corporation and the East Carson Street Local Review Committee had seen the proposed project, and were generally in support. Molnar couldn't find the digital images of the project on the PowerPoint presentation. She passed around hard-copies of the drawings.
- Mr. Howard Erikson from Ryson Construction addressed the HRC and indicated that the second floor would be the yoga studio, and the first floor would be for retail. He described the condition of the building and indicated some of the questions that he had in reference to removing the tile on the front of the building. He indicated that he had met with the LRC, and that they had made recommendations that the owners chose to follow. The owners planned to change the configuration of the upper windows, for example, as per recommendations from the HRC.
- There was some discussion (Stern & others) regarding the difficulty of using infill brick, and trying to make that match the original. Erikson agreed that this could be a problem, and said that they intended to try to find a matching brick. Stern suggested that if that becomes an issue, then perhaps he could infill with the same materials as the storefront. Joyce agreed. Stern said that if the upper window configuration changes, then he would bring the new design back to Katie for final approval.
- Mr. Onque asked if there was enough egress routes in the building? Erikson said that there was, and indicated where the doors were. There was some more discussion as to the ventilation of the building, but Erikson said that the yoga studio "likes it hot" because it was hot yoga.

**MOTION:** Mr. Onque .....moved to approve the concept, and as the applicant got the brick off, the final approval could come from staff.

**SECOND:** Mr. Stern .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

2417 East Carson Street

East Carson Historic District

OWNER: Veteren’s Leadership Program of Western PA 2417 East Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	WARD: ..... 16 <sup>TH</sup> LOT & BLOCK: .....012-M-003 INSPECTOR: .....Bob Molyneaux COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:  #06-061
APPLICANT: K H Design	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....LNC ARCH. RATING: .....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED ..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**  
Installation of a mural.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the proposal. She said that the proposed mural would be on the Veteran’s building on East Carson. She invited the applicants to the table.
2. Kyle Holbrook, director of the MLK mural project came to the table to describe the project. He said that there were two community forums in March and April. He said that they selected a sketch by Lucas Stock, and that there would be southside kids working on the project. There are negative spaces in the sketch that will be filled in by individual children. He passed around a copy of the sketch.
3. Molnar indicated that the SSLDC and the LRC were in favor of the project.
4. Stern asked if the photographic images on the sketch would be applied to the wall as photographs? Holbrook said that those were the photos that the kids would reference in their efforts, but that the final project would look like a painting, not a photograph.
5. Joyce said it sounded like the project had gone through a lengthy review process. Molnar indicated that she did not have letters of support. Molnar said that at the LRC meeting, there were two primary concerns. Those are that the guidelines don’t recommend painting unpainted masonry. Second, the LRC wondered how to regulate mural projects in the district. Is every empty wall eligible to be painted in the district? She said that the LRC basically decided that if a wall was never meant to be exposed (like a party wall), then it could be considered for a mural. If the wall is part of the exterior envelope of a building (historically), or is a corner property, then a mural probably isn’t appropriate.

**MOTION:** Ms. Joyce .....moved to approve the proposed sketch for the mural at the side of the building 2417 E Carson Street.

**SECOND:** Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

**1812 East Carson Street**

**East Carson Historic District**

OWNER:  
United American Savings & Loan  
Association  
1812 East Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15203

WARD: ..... 17<sup>TH</sup>

LOT & BLOCK: ..... 012-E-357

INSPECTOR: ..... Bob Molyneaux

COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... LNC

ARCH. RATING: .....

APPLICATION RECEIVED:

SITE VISITS:

CERTIFICATES OF APP.:

APPLICANT:  
The Sprout Fund

NATIONAL REGISTER:

LISTED .....

ELIGIBLE .....

**Proposed Changes:**  
Installation of a mural.

DISCUSSION:

1. Molnar introduced the second mural project for the day and asked the applicants to come forward.
2. Matt Hannigan introduced himself, and then introduced Kurt Getman, project manager for the Sprout Public Art program. Hannigan gave some background information on what the SPROUT fund does, and where its projects are located. He described the program.
3. Kurt Getman expanded the information that Matt provided – and described why they selected that site. He said that SPROUT was a competitive process, and that artists and communities apply for the project. The Southside Local Development Committee applied for this mural at 1812 E Carson Street, the location of a parking lot and a farmers market. They had a brainstorming session at Heinz foundation to come up with ideas. Getman showed photographs of the site, and the adjacent wall. Getman described the public process of polling southsiders to see what design they preferred. The selected design is a classic image of a woman, slightly abstracted, holding a cornucopia of fruit and vegetables.
4. Mr. Stern asked if there was significance to the bird in the picture, and the “smokestacks.” Mr. Getman wasn’t sure, but said he could ask Carolyn, the artist.
5. Ms. Ismail said that because it wasn’t on a public wall, the project did not need to go to the art commission. Hannigan said that they presented their entire projects for the year to the art commission anyway. Getman told the HRC that they had an agreement with the building owner for upkeep of the mural, etc.

**MOTION:** Ms. Joyce .....moved to approve the mural at 1812 East Carson Street

**SECOND:** Mr. Onque.....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

**402 West North Avenue**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

**OWNER:**  
David and Laurie Charlton  
402 W. North Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

**WARD:** .....22<sup>nd</sup>

**APPLICATION RECEIVED:**  
04/21/2007

**LOT & BLOCK:** .....23-P-027

**SITE VISITS:**

**INSPECTOR:** ..... Ron Freyermuth

**CERTIFICATES OF APP.:**  
08-058

**APPLICANT:**  
David and Laurie Charlton  
402 W. North Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** .....

**ZONING CLASSIFICATION:** .....

**ARCH. RATING:** .....

**Proposed Changes:**

Construction of a 2-car garage.

DISCUSSION:

1. Molnar introduced 402 West North Avenue by telling the HRC that they had already discussed this issue in May 2008, but the HRC didn't approve the construction of the garage due to questions relating the zoning issues.
2. Laurie Charlton introduced herself. She said that since they were at HRC in May, they built the approved porch at the back of the house, and now they need to build the 2 car garage, spanning their property line. They want to treat the façade of the garage identically to that of the garage next door – split-face block. She said it would be as historically appropriate as a garage could get these days. She passed around drawings of the proposed garage.
3. The members of the HRC took a few minutes to orient themselves to the drawings.
4. Mr. Stern asked why there was a parking pad behind the garage, and Ms. Charlton replied that it was for their vintage car. Stern said that because there was precedent in the other garage. Charlton indicated that the door they wanted to install had panes in the arched windows. There was some discussion as to the proposed materials, and Ms. Charlton indicated that they would not use the Concrete Masonry Units, as indicated in her drawings. Stern asked if they would plant vines on the garage, and said he wanted it to be a condition of approval.

**MOTION:** Mr. Tellers .....moved to accept the design as proposed with the condition that it be split-faced block, with trellis and vines, in the style of the adjacent property.

**SECOND:** Mr. Cipriani .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

508 N Taylor Avenue

Mexican War Streets Historic District

OWNER: Lagom, LLC 508 N. Taylor Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15212	WARD: .....22 <sup>nd</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 23-J-217 INSPECTOR: ..... Ron Freyermuth COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 07/08/2008 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.: <i>NONE</i>
APPLICANT: Lagom, LLC 508 N. Taylor Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15212	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....	
	ARCH. RATING: .....	

**Proposed Changes:**  
Renovation of the façade and rear

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the next property and told the HRC that she had made some administrative approvals for the renovation of this property because the building had collapsed, and work needed to commence immediately. She said that the design details were not finalized. Molnar asked for the architect, but he was not present.
2. Molnar tried to present the proposal to the HRC. She showed the proposed rear elevation of the building, and she showed the front proposed elevations.
3. There was some questions about zoning issues – Molnar had a difficult time describing what was happening currently at the property, and also she did not know what the proposed use would be.
4. Mr. Duncan Horner spoke up from the audience to help try to answer some of the questions.
5. Molnar said that the applicant is flexible as to what the design of the façade would be – regardless of what the use will be. Mr. Horner introduced himself for the record, said he was a contractor in the neighborhood, and said that there were a lot of residential uses in the neighborhood. He thought that keeping the original storefront would be a good idea.
6. Mr. Stern said that he wanted the applicant to come back when the applicant knew exactly what he wanted to do with the project. Stern said he did not want to tell the applicant what he should be doing with his own building.

**MOTION:** Ms. Joyce .....moved to table the application until the applicant could come back to help answer some of the questions – and until the applicant could meet with zoning and BBI staff to work through some of the issues.

**SECOND:** Mr. Cipriani .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** *None*

7. Mr. Paul Johnson appeared toward the end of the hearing, and made an effort to answer some of the questions that the HRC had. He said that he wanted to present a number of options to the HRC, and then he would follow the HRC’s direction regarding design. Johnson agreed to come back to the HRC with updated design.

**1242 Palo Alto Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

OWNER:  
STEINLE PROPERTIES LLC  
1242 Palo Alto Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

WARD: .....22<sup>nd</sup>  
LOT & BLOCK: .....23-K-129  
INSPECTOR: ..... Ron Freyermuth  
COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....  
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....  
ARCH. RATING: .....

APPLICATION RECEIVED:  
SITE VISITS:  
CERTIFICATES OF APP.: #91-084

APPLICANT:  
Joe Cheeks

**Proposed Changes:**

Installation of French rear doors and a parking pad.

DISCUSSION:

1. Ms. Molnar said that she does not know a lot about the application, so she hoped that someone was present to describe their proposal.
2. Mr. Joe Cheeks introduced himself as the project manager for Steinle Properties. He said he proposed to install a fence to conceal the rear of the property, and the installation of French doors at the rear of the building. Mr. Cheeks provided a rough sketch showing the proposed location of the door. He proposed to infill another door at the rear of the property.
3. Molnar passed around an historic image of the building. Ms. Joyce said that she would like to see the fence design, but Molnar said that a wooden stockade fence would be commonly approvable in all of the districts, as would the flagstone patio. The applicant told the HRC he was no longer planning to install the parking pad.
4. Mr. Duncan Horner said he had some concerns about the height of the fence, and if the fence had to be lower, then he did not want to see a totally inappropriate door in the back.

**MOTION:** Mr. Stern .....moved to approve the design based on the ability to install a 6’ fence to screen the back from public view.

**SECOND:** Ms. Joyce .....seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** None

OWNER: Tabernacle Cosmopolitan Baptist Church 1240 Buena Vista Street Pittsburgh, PA	WARD: .....22 <sup>nd</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 23-J-299 INSPECTOR: ..... Ron Freyermuth COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 05/23/2007 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 07-044
APPLICANT: Same as above	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .....	

**Proposed Changes:**

Addition of a parking lot to the rear of the property.

DISCUSSION:

1. Molnar introduced the application as a proposal for the parking lot. She said that the applicants presented material immediately before the HRC hearing, so she could not include it in the HRC packets, though she thought the
2. Anthony Polli (Sp?) was present to represent the Klauscher (sp?) Architects. He said that the church had some approvals in the past from HRC, but he wasn't sure what they were for. Molnar said that there was an approval for the extension of the existing concrete pad from the existing gate to the existing walk, but she did not understand what that meant, exactly. The CofA indicated that the applicant should return to the HRC with plans for the drive and repair of the existing masonry. He described the ADA issues, and what the parking lot would look like.
3. There was some discussion as to the fence and the vines growing along the fence, and whether the parking lot would have to be screened. Stern said he did not see why the parking area could not be screened. Anthony said that he talked with the zoning staff about these issues.
4. Stern said that he would like to see screening plants along the alley side as well. Cipriani asked if a stockade fence would be better than a chain link fence with vegetation.
5. Randy Zotter, 1239 Monterey Street, said he had no objection to the chain link fence, with the vines growing on it. He said that the vines were adequate screening, as long as the applicant did not cut them down. He wanted to know if the pavement would be asphalt. The applicant did not yet know. Zotter also wanted to know how the applicant planned to deal with all the water running into the alley. The answer was that there would really not be that much water. Stern said he preferred porous paving.
6. Duncan Horner addressed the HRC to say that he can see the lot from his house. He had several comments regarding the fencing and screening, and what was appropriate. He wanted to know what would happen to the dumpster, and how to screen that. He thought that the applicant would be required to plant trees if they wanted a parking lot. He said the church had cut down trees in the past. He said that ongoing maintenance has been a problem. He said that the chain link fence was in deplorable condition, and it should be replaced.
7. Mr. Stern said that there were too many unanswered questions from a zoning perspective for the HRC to even consider the application. He said that the HRC might be willing to approve it in concept, but with conditions.

**MOTION:** Mr. Onque .....moved to approve the general approach and concept, but asked that the following issues be addressed before final approval is given: Fencing, Screening, Dumpster, Drainage. If these issues are resolved and zoning can act, then the HRC will approve the application as well.

***1240 Buena Vista Street***

***Mexican War Streets Historic District***

---

**SECOND:** Ms. Joyce .....seconded the motion (Stern clarified that after those issues are resolved, the item still has to come back to HRC for final approval).

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

**OPPOSED:** *None*

DISCUSSION:

1. Mr. Dennis Smith addressed the HRC and said that the property owners' verbal and written testament to the HRC was given in July. In addition, he argued that the nomination was in violation of the historic preservation ordinance, because as a religious structure, the property could only be nominated by the owner of record. Second, the owner does not have the financial resources to rehabilitate or restore or upkeep the property. Ultimately the property will fall into such disrepair that it will ultimately have to be demolished. Finally, he stated that the owner was committed to preserving the character and historicity of the most important building on the site – the cathedral/ church structure. For these reasons, he requests that the HRC not recommend approval of the designation to City Council.
  
2. Ms. Carol Peterson addressed the HRC in support of the nomination. She attested that the most recent use of the building was residential, as the property was included in the Lawrenceville Historic House Tour in 1996. She also said that there is a striking lack of Greek Revival buildings in Pittsburgh, and for that reason, this building should be preserved.
  
3. Mr. Keith Cochran addressed the HRC in support of the nomination.

**MOTION:** Mr. Stern ..... moved to recommend the historic designation of Saint Mary's Academy to the City Council.

**SECOND:** Ms. Joyce ..... seconded the motion.

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

**OPPOSED:** *None*

---