



**Division of Development Administration and Review**  
 City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning  
 200 Ross Street, Third Floor  
 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

*HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH*

Minutes of the Meeting of November 5, 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>
		Steven Paul
Michael Stern, Chair	Katherine Molnar	Mark Belko
Paul Tellers		Andrew Dash
Ruth Drescher		Duncan Horner
Earle Onque		Beverly Morrow-Jones
		Brenda Miller
Sergei Matveiev		Glen Walsh
Noor Ismail		Martha Helmreich
		John Francona
		Alida Baker
		Anne Nelson
		Henry Hanson
		Rich Cupka
		Thomas J. Gmitter
		Gloria Rayman
		John DeSantis
		Michael Kratsas
		Douglas Sarch (Sp?)
		Jared Pohl
		Amy Jackson
		Brenda Simpson
		Rev. David P. Lee
		Gregory Ross

Old Business

**Nominations Report:** There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Workingmen’s Savings Bank building is on hold at City Council. Saint Mary’s Academy building in Lawrenceville is waiting to be scheduled for Public Comment at City Council.

New Business

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Molnar asked for approval for the September and October 2008 minutes. The HRC voted to approve the minutes.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the October Certificates of Appropriateness, the HRC voted to approve them.

**Applications for Economic Hardship:** 2312 E Carson Street – an application that might become pertinent at the end of this hearing.

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

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

---

**ATTACHMENTS**

---

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

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED .....  ELIGIBLE .....

**Proposed Changes:**

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

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the project saying that last month there was a briefing before the HRC, and this month the applicant was available to present the proposal in more detail. Mr. Stern called the applicant to the table.
2. Mr. Pat Mangus introduced himself as the chief operating officer at the Aviary, and Paul Rosenblatt introduced himself as principal at Springboard Architecture. Mangus presented his Powerpoint presentation to the HRC by starting with the history and background of developments at the Aviary, including past Master Plans. He discussed the Aviary’s impetus for expansion. Mangus stated that the Allegheny Commons Initiative formed a sub-committee to work directly with the Aviary & Springboard to develop plans. That subcommittee was comprised of three architects: John Francona, Jeff King, and Bob Baumbach. One of the primary goals of the ACI would be that the footprint of the Aviary should not expand more than necessary. The ACI worked with the applicant to define where and how much the Aviary should expand. Parking was an issue with the ACI – they wanted to minimize the amount of new traffic and cars. Other requests involved openness of the Aviary exhibits (free flight zone), and if possible, public restrooms.
3. Paul Rosenblatt continued to describe the existing conditions of the Aviary and its grounds. He then described the proposed expansion of the Aviary, and the uses of each space. He described the major impacts of the expansion, and the major changes, including proposed materials. Rosenblatt presented a schematic landscape plan showing existing walls being maintained, and Rosenblatt indicated that Springboard was working with the ACI landscape architecture team, Pashek and Associates, to develop the landscape plan more fully.

4. Rosenblatt said that it was difficult for daily visitors to find the entrance to the Aviary, and that the new design would try to remedy that issue. Rosenblatt continued to describe the proposed building, elevation by elevation, and answered the Commission members' questions.
5. Mr. Stern called for public comment:
  - a. Alida Baker, project director for Allegheny Commons Initiative, talked about the process they have used to get to this point in the Allegheny Commons redesign. She reports to the Steering Committee, comprised of representatives of neighborhood groups and surrounding institutions. Given their mission, and the nature of the Aviary institution, their Master Plan is helpful. While we've been trying to keep pace with the Aviary's fast schedule, the ACI is not ready to stand before the HRC in total support of the project. The ACI had not had an opportunity to look at the elevations that the HRC had available. Baker asked the HRC to please give the ACI more time to look at the proposed Aviary expansion.
  - b. John Francona, chair of the Allegheny Commons committee, wanted to give the points that that committee was in support of: non-expanding footprint, free-zone, architectural façade on Sherman Avenue, that the Aviary would follow established guidelines, that the Aviary would provide new landscaping disturbed by new construction. The ACI wanted various trees to be preserved, they did not want the automobile drop-off zone. The Aviary would design and build a new garden, the Aviary would build and maintain a public patio and café. The entrance gate would be reopened. The ACI wanted the new lease to be accurate and describe the expanded footprint, and describe that it not ever be enlarged again. He wanted the City's arborist to work with mitigation for lost trees. Regarding the new design of the building, the ACI wanted more time to look at the drawings.
  - c. Anne Nelson, PHLF. Landmarks is generally in favor of the expansion plans. They support some of the comments that Francona had stated. PHLF did not think that the entrance design was very impressive, but that it should rather relate more to the Children's Museum across the street.
  - d. Gloria Rayman, president Allegheny West Civic Council. AWCC urges the HRC to review the Aviary only as a complete submission (more drawings, material submissions, etc), and only after the various subcommittees have the opportunity to comment on the proposal.
  - e. John DeSantis – wanted to echo some of the previous comments – that none of the neighborhood groups have had the opportunity to see the full plans. He advocates to the HRC, and all other commissions, that this project only be considered after all of the other groups have seen the project. He also mentioned that the HRC created a LRC earlier in the year, and that the LRC had not yet had an opportunity to review the project. He said that the proposed building did not fit in with the context of the surrounding buildings and their traditional materials. He thought that the design of the building and its proposed materials were out of context.
6. Mr. Tellers said that he had not attended any of the ACI Steering Committee meetings, even though he is a member, so that he could review the project at the HRC instead. He said that the HRC should look at tabling the application to give the neighborhood groups a better opportunity to look at the plans. He asked about the LRC. Ms. Molnar replied that after the HRC held a meeting to accept the local review committees, there has been a hands-off approach to the LRC process from the City's perspective. Thus, the LRC would be welcome to meet and review applications on its own accord, but it would not be directed by the City or HRC staff.

7. Mr. Stern recommend that the HRC give the Aviary some kind of preliminary approval, so that the Aviary could continue with its process but also so that the neighborhood groups would have the opportunity to look at the plans.
8. Mr. Matveiev said that the plans were too preliminary to have final copies of the landscaping plan, etc. Matveiev said that the massing of the building was great, and that in general, he thought the materials were right. He thought that the entry was very diagrammatic, and the articulation of the entry should be studied a bit more carefully.
9. Mr. Stern said that he didn't think there ought to be a motion at this point, but that he would leave it to the Aviary as to when they were going to come back to the HRC with some of the things that they had asked for: community recommendations, materials, and landscaping information.

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

**Proposed Changes:**

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

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application by saying that the HRC had met on this proposal in the past, but had a lot of zoning questions. The HRC postponed the approval until the zoning board of appeals could look at the project.
2. Pastor David Lee introduced himself.
3. Brenda Simpson introduced herself.
4. Mr. Lee said that they went to the zoning board, that the zoning board approved their project. The ZBA approved the drawings for the parking lot.
5. Mr. Stern called for public comment.
  - a. Mr. Duncan Horner addressed the HRC, and indicated that he has no objections to the application. He said that the plan and design were vastly improved.

Ms. Drescher ..... moved that the plan which has been presented for the changes at 1240 Buena Vista Street, as presented, in the rear, be approved.

Mr. Onque ..... seconded the motion.

*ALL..... voted in favor..... Motion Passes*

**200-210 Fifth Avenue – Buhl Building**

**Market Square Historic District**

OWNER: N&P Properties, LLC 79 S 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	WARD: .....2 <sup>nd</sup>	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 10/21/08
	LOT & BLOCK: .....001-D-169	SITE VISITS: 00/00/00
	INSPECTOR: ..... Ed McAllester	CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: Michael P. Kratsas 79 S 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....GT	
	ARCH. RATING: .....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**

Restoration of Buhl Building Storefront – Demolition of two smaller buildings on Market Street (438 and 440 Market Street).

**Discussion:**

- Ms. Molnar introduced the application and described all parts of the application: restoration, demolition, new construction. She said that the project would also have to be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (tax credit project) and by PHLF because they have an easement on the address.
- Mr. Mike Kratsas introduced himself, and described the building and a minimal history of the structure. He intends to restore the structure. Mr. Kratsas described his proposed project by giving some information about the drawings and images presented to the HRC.
- Douglas Sipt (Sp?) introduced himself as the architect. He addressed questions about restoring the terra cotta on the first floor, saying that they did not want to try to replicate the missing terra cotta, because they knew they would not be able to match the historic terra cotta.
- Mr. Stern asked if the architect and applicant have information that lead them to believe that they are restoring the first floor to an original appearance. Mr. Sipt said that they had historic photographs of the building, and that one of the elevations (east) maintained its original terra cotta. They used the photographs and the existing terra cotta as a reference point for the redesign.
- Mr. Stern asked what the period of significance would be for the building. He clarified that because they were not planning to restore to its original appearance, perhaps it would be better to keep the historically significant non-original storefront (c. 1940s Moderne) with the granite. Mr. Sipt said that when talking with the SHPO, they could either restore the existing modern-looking storefront, or try to restore to the original appearance. They chose to restore to the original appearance, but knowing that they couldn't do it exactly, the SHPO told them not to try, but to rather get the scaling, rhythm, and materials to be appropriate.
- Mr. Tellers said that you have to choose which time period to restore to, and the applicant chose to go back to the original appearance. Tellers supports the decision to restore to the earlier period because the building will get more natural daylight, and will be more open. He could understand how trying to imitate the exactness of the terra cotta could be difficult, and even frowned upon by the SHPO.
- Mr. Stern said that his personal feeling was that trying to do faux historical buildings, as opposed to contemporary buildings, would be less successful as infill where Mr. Kratsas planned to demolish the two

**200-210 Fifth Avenue – Buhl Building**

---

other buildings. He wondered why there would be a five story building as opposed to a six story building. Kratsas said it had more to do with the foundation and how much weight the structure could bear.

- 8. Mr. Tellers said that the second building was better, as infill, because it was simple. The simplicity of the red brick infill would really complement the Buhl Building because it would help the Buhl Building stand-out by contrast. The infill is background to the featured building. Perhaps there should not even have the arched entrance, and definitely not the window grating.
- 9. Mr. Stern asked about why the cornice line did not extend across both buildings. The architect and applicant have had many discussions on that subject. Mr. Tellers thought that the window fenestration of the new building was appropriate, because they tried to elongate the windows in the new construction.
- 10. Mr. Onque was curious about the top of the building. Mr. Sipt said they were proposing to install an open air deck on the top, and it would also provide egress. The deck would not be visible because it is so far set back.

Mr. Tellers.....moved to approve the application as presented, with the condition that the applicant come back to the HRC with the final drawings as they are developed. The drawings can come back to staff, and if staff thinks they need to go back to the HRC, then they will.

Mr. Onque ..... seconded the motion

*ALL*..... voted in favor..... ***Motion Passes***

OWNER: United American Savings Bank 1812 East Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	WARD: ..... 17 <sup>th</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 0012-E-00356 INSPECTOR: ..... Bob Molyneaux COUNCIL DISTRICT: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 09/15/08 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: Hansen Design Group Ltd. 2331 E Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... LNC ARCH. RATING: .....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**

Rehabilitation of masonry façade, reconstruction of storefront, inclusion of ATM in the lobby.

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application.
2. Mr. Rich Cupka introduced himself as vice chairman of the bank.
3. Henry Hansen introduced himself as the architect for the project. Mr. Hansen began to describe the drawings that he provided. He described the use of the building as banking uses. He said that there would need to be a new at-grade accessible entrance. Accessibility would be an important factor in the façade rehab. The new pattern of the façade would be consistent with the building next to it. They are looking at restoring the windows of the upper floors.
4. Mr. Matveiev was interested in the mosaic entranceways, and wondered how much of that was original to the building? Mr. Hansen said that he knew the stone sill at the front of the building was original, and he could determine where the entrances probably were, based on wear patterns.
5. Mr. Stern said that he understood there were a whole series of 19-teens, 1920s storefronts done on Carson Street, and he wondered if they had gained their own significance. Mr. Hansen said that he was looking at the rehabilitation in context of the adjacent building.
6. Mr. Hansen said he had spoken with the LRC on the subject at the site of the building. Ms. Molnar said that the LRC did not form a single recommendation, but that there was a lot of discussion regarding the historic significance of the existing building.
7. Mr. Tellers said that like the last project, it would be important to pick a time period to restore the building to. Mr. Hansen explained why he did not want to restore the building to its 1920s-30s time frame.
8. Ms. Molnar said that she contacted the SHPO to see if the building was contributing to the National Register District. The SHPO does consider it as a contributing structure. Their recommendation is that if there is going to be a restoration of the façade, then it should be based on historic documentation of what the façade looked like originally. In this way, we would not be creating a faux-history when removing an actual historic

storefront. Mr. Hansen said that in absence of that factual information, he tried his best to determine what the original building would be.

Mr. Tellers..... moved to approve the application.

Ms. Drescher ..... seconded the motion.

*ALL*..... voted in favor..... ***Motion Passes***

OWNER: Richard and Stephanie Cupka 57 S. 28 <sup>th</sup> Street Murrysville, PA 15203	WARD: ..... 16 <sup>TH</sup> 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 <sup>th</sup> Street Murrysville, PA 15203	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... LNC ARCH. RATING: .....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED ..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

**Proposed Changes:**

Seeking HRC approval to construct a side-patio as a suitable replacement for the approved new construction. The hearing on September 3, 2008 will be a briefing and a public hearing for the Application for a Certificate of Economic Hardship.

**Discussion:**

- Ms. Molnar introduced the application as the patio design that we have been reviewing for quite a few months. She has no new information to provide the Commission.
- Mr. Hansen and Mr. Cupka introduced themselves. They passed out new drawings, which reflect some of the changes that the commission was interested in seeing at the last HRC meeting. Hansen provided two front elevations. One is the front elevation, exactly how it was approved originally. There is a rear elevation drawing to show what will be visible from the alley; the side elevation is now depicted entirely in brick. The building is enclosed with doors on both front and back elevations, and it has a roof. The doors are accordion style, and open as an operable storefront. The side elevation shows two blind fenestrations – where the storefront wraps around and where the upper window would be. According to zoning code, there cannot be fenestrations at those locations.
- Mr. Tellers asked if all the windows would be glazed. Hansen replied that they would be. There is no second floor.
- Mr. Onque asked where the entrance door would be, as the elevation and plan drawings are not consistent. Mr. Hansen said the door was correct on Elevation #1, and therefore the plan view is backwards.
- Mr. Stern asked if the intent would be to use the space year-round. Hansen replied that the patio is the primary area of occupancy, and the construction was mainly to satisfy the requests of the HRC. The only way to get to the new construction is through the front door, or through the patio. There is no direct connection to the adjacent building.
- Ms. Molnar said that there have been quite a few Nana wall systems in districts. Most of the time, the approvals are for operable windows, not for operable doors. In other words, the knee-wall would remain fixed, and the storefront windows would open. Mr. Stern said that they approved a similar operable storefront at Buon Giorno in Market Square.
- Mr. Geof Commings addressed the HRC and asked that they consider the East Carson Street CDC letter when making their decision. Commings asked that the knee-wall remain fixed at this storefront. He could not think of any other accordion-style doors along Carson Street. Hansen replied that the front elevation #1 was previously reviewed and approved by the HRC.

**2312 East Carson Street**

- 8. Mr. Stern said that this application meets the HRC’s previous letter requiring a new building be constructed on this site. He is inclined to say that this building meets the HRC’s requirement, and that the building as proposed is a defensible solution to the question. He said that even though the building may not make sense from a functional perspective to the HRC members, those questions should not preclude the HRC from approving the design.
- 9. Mr. Cupka asked that in the event that the building owner wanted to move the wall between the new construction and the existing building (by lengthening the rear elevation) to make the connection between the two buildings stronger, could the applicant do that? All commission members agreed that that would make sense.

Ms. Drescher .....moved to accept the plans for 2312 East Carson Street, as presented, with the possibility that the structure could be lengthened to connect the new structure to the existing building. Drawings would need to be submitted for Staff review.

Mr. Onque .....seconded the motion

*ALL*..... voted in favor..... **Motion Passes**

