



HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH

Minutes of the Meeting of October 3, 2007
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

Table with 3 columns: Members, Staff, Others. Lists names of attendees under each category.

Old Business

Enforcement: There was a complete enforcement report, though the status of some of the outstanding issues is still unknown. The biggest concern of many Local Review Committees is the lack of enforcement of the district complaints.

Nominations Report: There were two nomination reports: The Garden Theatre (up for public comment on Oct. 3) and August Wilson. Ms. Molnar is in the process of creating legislation for the August Wilson nomination.

## **New Business**

**Minutes:** Members of the HRC had not yet read their copies of the minutes from August and September – thus Mr. Stern initially proposed to delay the approval of the minutes. He then recommended that the members of the HRC read the August minutes during the hearing. The members did, and later proceeded to approve them.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** Ms. Molnar presented the September Certificates of Appropriateness. Ms. Drescher did not recall seeing all of the non-asterisk items at the last hearing, though the other members did recall approving them. There was some discussion on the C of A approval, no problems. Ms. Drescher made the motion to approve the minutes; all members voted to approve.

**Historic Review Report:** Ms. Molnar presented the historic review report. The Historic Review Report lists all projects reviewed by staff for the Section 106 process. Ms. Molnar explained that any time federal money is used (in our case, mainly from the URA) in any “undertaking,” there has to be a 106 review of the project to determine whether there is an “adverse affect” on any property listed in the National Register, or any property eligible for the National Register. The City is permitted to review projects within in boundaries, unless they involve demolition or substantial addition. If there is an adverse affect, the agency (URA typically) has to complete the process of mitigation and form a memorandum of agreement to make-up-for any damages it causes to the building/property. *If an “adverse affect” is found with a URA project, the URA often uses other, non-federal money to pay for the project.*

For more information on the Section 106 Process: <http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.pdf>

There were no Economic Hardship Demolition Applications in the month of September.

Before the Public Hearing at 1pm, the HRC had some discussion on the Elmhurst Affair. Ms. Ismail advised the HRC that the staff would meet with the law department to discuss the issue. Mr. Tellers suggested that because of the Sunshine Law, the HRC could probably not meet as a group, to make an official action or just to go bowling. Ms. Ismail informed the group that until the applicant comes back to HRC, we do not know their future intentions, and do not know how to proceed until there is an official application.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Attachments

---

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**12 WEST NORTH AVENUE – GARDEN THEATRE NOMINATION**

Ms. Molnar presented the Garden Theatre in a few sentences...

The following people spoke on behalf of the building's nomination:

1. Greg Mucha (Mexican War Streets Society) – thinks it's a “no-brainer” that the building should be saved. Commented on potential of area development.
2. Steven Paul (Executive Director Preservation Pittsburgh) – Sees the economic development as a positive in the neighborhood. He would like to see North Avenue become a district in its own right someday in the future.
3. Dan Holland (Young Preservationist Association of Pittsburgh) – Garden Theatre should be covered by a protective legislation.
4. Glen Walsh - Wanted to tell a story about how the building was acquired by the city. He supports the designation.

**MOTION:**        THERE WAS NO MOTION.

**ACTION OF THE COMMISSION:**

IN FAVOR:	N/A
OPPOSED:	N/A
ABSTAINED:	N/A

## ***1212 and 1214 N. Franklin Street***

OWNER:	City of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15219
APPLICANT:	Russell Blaich Bureau of Building Inspection
WARD:	21 <sup>st</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	22-L-98 (&101)
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Pat Brown
COUNCIL DISTRICT #6:	Tonya Payne
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	R1A-VH
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	

### BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 15 May 2007 – Staff received an application from the Bureau of Building Inspection for the demolition of 1212 N. Franklin Street.
- 6 June 2007 – Demolition was postponed 30 days.
- 11 July 2007 – Demolition was postponed for an additional 30 days
- 1 August 2007 – Demolition was postponed for an additional 30 days
- 5 September 2007 – Demolition was postponed for an additional 30 days
- 3 October 2007 – The HRC voted to approve demolitions

### **APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – *To raze the structures to the ground***

#### RELEVANT ORDINANCE REFERENCE

1.5(c) – *Failure on the part of the HRC to take action within sixty (60) days of the monthly meeting where the HRC first considers the application shall be deemed to be a determination of approval of the appropriateness of the request.*

#### DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Mr. Hardy commented that though Manchester Citizens Corp. hates to see buildings demolished, these two properties are in such bad repair, they would be very difficult to save.
- Ms. Molnar inquired to the structural stability of the houses. Various members answered that the buildings were not structurally stable, were completely stripped of all important architectural character, and were infested by various vermin, etc.
- Ms. Joyce commented that after being in one of the properties, she did not think it could be easily saved.
- Mr. Blaich commented that homeowners next to condemned properties cannot get homeowner's insurance until the adjacent building is demolished.
- Mr. Blaich commented that the demos could not happen until the spring, when the party-wall repair could take place.

MOTION: MS. JOYCE MOVED TO DEMOLISH 1212 AND 1214 N. FRANKLIN.  
MR. TELLERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*

OPPOSED: *NONE*

ABSTAINED: *NONE*

## 2026 East Carson Street

OWNER:	Gregory Development One Atlantic Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15202
APPLICANT:	David Morgan, AIA 74 South 12 <sup>th</sup> Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203
WARD:	17 <sup>th</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	012-K-025
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Bob Molyneaux
COUNCIL DISTRICT #3	Jeffrey Koch
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important (typical)

### BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- In June 3, 2005, the Staff of the Historic Review Commission approved an application for replacement of windows on the front façade with new wood windows to match existing.
- On June 20, 2005, Staff of the Historic Review Commission approved an application to reopen blocked window openings on side façade and install new double-hung wood windows to match originals on front.
- On March 8, 2006, Staff of the Historic Review Commission approved an application for the installation of signage on the building.
- On November 21, 2006, Staff received an application for the replacement of the storefront.
- 27 August 2007 – Staff received an application for the addition of a Handicap accessible ramp, and for the addition of windows (new fenestrations) on the side elevation (21<sup>st</sup> Street).
- 3 October 2007 – The HRC voted to approve

application dated 27 August 2007.

**APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *Install new concrete Handicap ramp and exit stair on eastern elevation; open new fenestrations (windows and door) on eastern elevation.***

### DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Mr. Morgan presented his application to the HRC by presenting elevation drawings.
- Mr. Tellers inquired whether applicant would be cleaning façade and/or making changes. Morgan is going to clean the façade
- Mr. Morgan agreed to add pickets to railings all along East elevation
- Ms. Molnar asked the Commission to consider whether the side elevation was “architecturally significant.” They agreed it was not.

MOTION: MR. TELLERS MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AS PROPOSED.  
MS. DRESCHER SECONDED THE MOTION.

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*

## 123 University Place

OWNER:	University of Pittsburgh 3400 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	Landmarks Design Associates 33 Terminal Way, Suite 317 Pittsburgh, PA
WARD:	4 <sup>th</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0027-R-00033
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Tom Breisinger
COUNCIL DISTRICT #	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

### BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 23 September 1997 – Staff to the HRC issued a C of A for exterior renovations in accordance with drawings submitted by David J. Vater, including replacement doors and windows on the 1963 addition, and replacement cornice on the 1963 addition.
- 12 July 2004 – The Trammell Crow Company gave the HRC a Hotel Concept Sketch, which more than doubled the size of the University Club. This idea was never officially proposed or built.
- 13 September 2007 – Landmarks Design Associates submitted an application for exterior work to modify the south-elevation stair tower, including addition of 1<sup>st</sup> floor entrance; demolition of non-original fabric and reconstruction of rear entrance on west-elevation; other modifications.
- 3 October 2007 – The HRC voted to approve the 13 September drawings with a condition

that the roofline be modified.

**APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – *Proposed modification of south-elevation stair tower, including addition of 1<sup>st</sup> floor entrance; demolition of non-original fabric and reconstruction of rear entrance on west-elevation; other modifications.***

### DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Before the Commission discussed this proposal, they introduced themselves to the new Acting Chief of BBI – Dan Sipriani. They also congratulated Ms. Molnar on the PowerPoint presentation.
- The applicant did not show up when the Commission was ready to start this proposal, so Ms. Molnar introduced it without the applicant. She showed the building and its changes elevation-by-elevation.
- Mr. Schmidlapp (Landmarks Design Associates) appeared after Ms. Molnar was finished introducing the project, and began to answer some questions.
- There was some general discussion on the various methods of egress from the building, including the new fire-exit from the roof-top terrace. The new exit will require the modification of an upper-floor window.
- Mr. Onque wanted to know where the front drive was being moved; it is not being moved, but eliminated.
- Ms. Drescher inquired to the strange rectangle shapes on the side of the south tower; they are 1960s design features – round openings in the masonry.

- Mr. Tellers voiced concern over the turret roof on the tower – he said that from some angles it looked good, but wanted to know if the additional height was necessary. Mr. Schmidlapp did not know exactly. Mr. Tellers thought that the pyramidal roof was inappropriate and awkward to the rest of the roofline. All agree that it doesn't relate to original roof.
- Mr. Stern suggested the architects raise the ridgeline of the roof to match the existing roof – raise the eave also, but not the lower band-course (for continuity).
- Mr. Tellers wanted an explanation as to why the original piers were changed... There was considerable discussion on the size and placement of the original entrance piers. Mr. Schmidlapp said the proposed shortening of the piers was to make them pedestrian-friendly. Currently, they are vehicular in scale. Mr. Tellers originally suggested the applicant move the piers to a new location, but keep their height intact. It was later realized that the piers are currently as far away from each other as they are high; moving them together would create an awkward proportion. It might be important to maintain the original height-width ratio.
- Mr. Stern said that the piers are original historic artifacts – and he would like a compelling reason for changing them. He has not yet been convinced of a reason to change them. Should their historic significance be altered/modified? It's a judgment call – but he was not convinced. The piers will exist in the same plane they currently do.
- Mr. Tellers asked regarding the 1960s front-elevation arched entrance.
- Mr. Stern summarized the outstanding design issue being the turret-roof issue, and Ms. Molnar brought up the issue of wooden doors. Mr. Schmidlapp said he would “get back to us” on the doors. Mr. Stern suggested the applicant bring more studies on

MOTION: MR. TELLERS MOVED TO APPROVE ON THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT RETURN WITH A CHANGED ELEVATOR-TOWER-ROOFLINE, AND SOME DETAIL ON THE DOORS.

SECOND: THERE WAS NO REQUEST FOR SECOND, AND NO SECOND

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*

*LATER –*

- Ellis revised his drawings to raise the tower roofline.
- Regarding the doors – Ellis indicated that the would use high-quality aluminum doors. The doors will get a lot of use, so they must be high quality.

MOTION: MR. TELLERS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REVISED DRAWINGS

SECOND: MR. ONQUE SECONDED THE MOTION

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*

**212 Ninth Street – Catholic Charities**

OWNER:	Catholic Charities 212 Ninth Street Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	Advance Sign – Jason & T.J. 1010 Sawmill Run Blvd. Pittsburgh, PA
WARD:	2 <sup>nd</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0027-R-00033
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ed McAllister
COUNCIL DISTRICT #6	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 10 September 2007 – Advance Sign submitted an application for exterior work to install an awning over the entrance door
- 3 October 2007 – The HRC approved the 10 September application as proposed.

▪ ***APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – Proposed installation of an awning over the entrance door***

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Jason Hampsan from Advance Sign proposed his application.
- The applicant modified a previous proposal; the new awning proposal will not permanently damage historic materials – instead, the awning will affix into pre-existing holes. In addition, the height of the letters is modified to conform to the guidelines.
- Claire Kushma spoke to the HRC regarding the use of the awning as an advertisement
- Mr. Tellers clarified that the awning was canvas, not plastic, not internally illuminated, and there was no bottom soffit.
- Ms. Molnar reminded the HRC that one guideline to consider is whether the awning is covering any historic details.
- Mr. Stern indicated that since the awning was not a permanent structure, and not permanently covering any detail, he did not see a problem with it.

MOTION: MR. ONQUE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL.

SECOND: MS. DRESCHER SECONDED THE MOTION

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*

## 827 N. Lincoln Ave – Allegheny West

OWNER:	Tim Mickus & Lucy Houlihan 827 North Lincoln Pittsburgh, PA 15233
APPLICANT:	Heidi Lawrence <i>Lawrence Restoration &amp; Design Inc.</i> 705 Brighton Road Pittsburgh, PA 15233
WARD:	22 <sup>nd</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	008-A-0130
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
COUNCIL DISTRICT #6	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	R1A-H
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

### BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 9 December 1991 – HRC approved C of A for gable roof construction on rear garage
  - 4 October 2005 – Staff approved C of A for removal of exterior paint
  - 2 December 2005 – Staff approved C of A for replacement windows in carriage house
  - 16 October 2006 – Staff approved a C of A for installation of new wood doors on carriage house balcony
  - On July 17, 2007, the Staff received an application for garage door installation.
  - 6 August 2007 – Staff to the HRC issued a C of A for the garage door
  - 19 September 2007 – Staff received an application to replace asphalt shingles on the front of the house; repair & rebuild box gutters, corbels, fascia, soffit & frieze; replace two chimneys with dormers.
- 3 October 2007 – The HRC approved the 19 September 2007 application.

### ***APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – Proposed replacement of asphalt shingles on the front of the house; repair & rebuild box gutters, corbels, fascia, soffit & frieze; replace two chimneys with dormers.***

#### DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Ms. Molnar presented the proposal to the HRC without the applicant (not present). She reminded the HRC of the relevant design guidelines, mainly, that this applicant proposed to permanently remove historic material with non-original fabric. The proposal was in the rear of the building, and minimally visible from a public right-of-way. Ms. Molnar was also concerned about adding a “false sense of historicity” by adding dormers.
- The general feeling of the HRC was leaning away from accepting the proposal.
- Mr. Tellers and Mr. Stern suggested we HOLD the proposal until the applicant arrived. He made a motion to Table until the next meeting, all members voted in agreement.
- The applicant arrived (time/schedule misunderstanding) at the end of the hearing, and presented her case. At this time (Approximately 4:00PM), Ms. Ismail left the hearing at this time.
- Ms. Lawrence and Ms. Lucy Houlihan (owner) presented their application.

- The HRC, earlier opposed to the project, began to justify the project. Various members offered rationale that the chimneys lacked integrity; that the rear of the building was minimally visible from any right-of-way; and that salvaging the chimneys would mean disassembly and reconstruction to remove the stucco.

MOTION: MS. DRESCHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL ON THE CONDITION THAT THE DORMER WINDOWS BE CENTERED OVER THE SECOND-FLOOR EXISTING WINDOWS.

SECOND: (UNCERTAINTY ON THE SECOND)

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*

## ***3900 Butler Street – Arsenal Middle School***

OWNER:	Pittsburgh Board of Education 1305 Muriel Street Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	Dennis Buirge Apostolou (?) Associates 47 Bailey Avenue Pittsburgh, PA
WARD:	6 <sup>th</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0049-E-00245
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ed McAllister
COUNCIL DISTRICT #6	Jim King
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

### BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- On December 17, 1999, Arsenal Middle School became a City Designated Historic Structure.
- On January 8, 2004 the Historic Review Commission issued Certificate of Appropriateness #04-003 for the installation of doors.
- In December 2005, Staff received an application for the proposed replacement of windows.
- 11 September 2007 – Applicant submitted a proposal to construct a temporary parking lot in the front of the building (front lawn). Applicant also mentioned a permanent exterior elevator at the rear of the building, but did not submit drawings.

### ***APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – Proposed construction of a temporary parking lot in front of building, and erection of permanent exterior elevator shafts at rear of building***

#### DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Mr. Keith Romanowski introduced himself
- Mr. Dennis Buirge from Apostolou Associates introduced himself
- Ms. Molnar introduced the project, including temporary parking lot and permanent rear elevator shaft.
- Mr. Romanowski interjected that he changed his mind, and would now like to propose a permanent parking lot. In regards to the elevator, he was confused as to why it was now an issue – he was under the understanding that it was already approved (it was not).
- Mr. Romanowksi continued to discuss the permanent parking lot, citing a lack of parking in the neighborhood for the need of a lot. He said that the temporary lot, 3 blocks away, was not satisfactory to the teachers.
- Mr. Tellers inquired as to whether there was space behind the building; Mr. Romanowski replied that it was too steep an elevation to build on, and part of it belongs to the City.
- Ms. Molnar asked how the applicant planned to mitigate the affects of permanent parking lot on the historic landscape. Romanowski replied that he was at the HRC just to get some guidance, and he hadn’t worked out all of the details yet, though landscaping would probably hide some of it.
- Mr. Tony Ceoffe – Speaking on behalf of Lawrenceville United. Stated that the field is a historic landmark – especially since Johnny Unidas played on that field, and led the Baltimore Colts to a

National Championship in the 1950s. Ceoffe stated that the community Planners did not have a chance to discuss the proposition, and/or think of the alternatives.

- Mr. Stern wondered what the long-term plan for the school's parking situation is/was...
- Mr. Romanowski replied that the school was just in the beginning stages of figuring out the parking situation. He was looking for direction as to "can he pursue this option"?
- Mr. Ceoffe and Mr. Romanowski exchanged rounds... they began to discuss the proposal outside of the parameters of the HRC – that is, they did not address the impact of the parking lot on the historic structure. They argued mainly about whether the school needed more parking, and what the best solution to the parking shortage is.
- Mr. Stern interrupted to remind them to keep the focus on the historic building and on the historic landscape. He suggested that if the school wanted to take this proposal to the next step then the HRC would need more information on the Master Plan, and the impact on the building.
- Mr. Tellers stated that he thought it was clear that the proposed parking lot was not consistent with the guidelines, and that the parking lot was detrimental to the character of the historic site.
- Ms. Ismail recommended that the proposal should be worked out with the community and with various planning teams in the community and with the city.
- Mr. Stern summarized by saying the HRC's general thoughts were not positive. He did not hear a lot of support for the idea. He argued that the historic landscape was the most important issue for the Commission, and that the parking lot would make a major impact on the building.
- Mr. Stern told the HRC that there would be no motion, since the applicant was just looking for information. He did not feel a motion was appropriate.

MOTION: NO MOTION

SECOND: NO MOTION

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: N/A

**2350 Brownsville Road – Concord Elementary**

OWNER:	Pittsburgh Board of Education 1305 Muriel Street Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	L. Robert Kimball & Associates John Anthony, representative Tom Hartley, representative Frick Building 437 Grant Street, North Mezz.
WARD:	29 <sup>th</sup>
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0095-M-00340
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Jim Seskey
COUNCIL DISTRICT #	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 18 September 2007 – Applicant submitted a proposal to construct a substantial rear addition to existing building

**APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *Proposed construction of a substantial rear addition to existing building***

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

- Ms. Molnar briefly introduced the project
- Mr. Daryl Saunders introduced himself as the project manager of construction for Pittsburgh Public Schools
- Mr. John Anthony introduced himself as

associated with L Robert Kimball and Associates.

- Mr. Anthony gave an overview of the neighborhood and its surroundings.
- Mr. Doug Philp from L Robert Kimball described the new construction and details.
- Mr. Marty Reardon, a neighbor, opposed the project stating that the school addition would destroy the character of the landscape.
- Mr. Stern and Mr. Tellers wanted to know if it would be possible to better integrate the rear retaining wall with the character of the landscape.
- Mr. Tellers asked whether many of the landscape features, or historic trees, would be salvaged; probably not many.

MOTION: MR. TELLERS MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL ON THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT COME BACK IN TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO GET FURTHER STAFF APPROVAL ON MODIFICATIONS TO RETAINING WALL (BETTER SENSITIVITY TO LANDSCAPE), AND MORE COMPREHENSIVE INFORMATION ON THE SITE PLAN.

SECOND: (UNCERTAINTY REGARDING THE SECOND)

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION: IN FAVOR: *ALL*                      OPPOSED: *NONE*:                      ABSTAINED: *NONE*