



HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION OF PITTSBURGH

Minutes of the Meeting of November 7, 2007
 Beginning at 12:30 PM
 200 Ross Street
 First Floor Hearing Room
 Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
	Susan Tymoczko	Greg Mazzei
Paul Tellers, Vice Chair	Katherine Molnar	Mazzei Construction Inc.
Ruth Drescher	Mary Russo	Jerry Speer
Earle Onque		David McMunn
Noor Ismail		Jack Markowitz
Dan Cipriani		Russ Davis
		R. Blaich
		Nick Kyriazi
		Clyde Duffy
		Eric Milliron
		Anne Nelson
		Coleman
		Mark Fatla
		Joseph Lawrence
		Miriam White
		More people attended but didn't sign

Old Business

Enforcement: The HRC was given a list of new and resolved enforcement issues. Ms. Molnar reported that BBI was checking into past enforcement issues to see where they are in the enforcement process. The basic goal to enforcement is compliance – get the offender to comply without taking them to court.

Nominations Report: There are four buildings in the nomination process. Three are on the agenda, the August Wilson is not on the agenda. The August Wilson House legislation has been drafted, and is awaiting Public Comment period at City Council.

New Business

Minutes: Mr. Tellers moved to move to New Business. There was no discussion on the minutes of September; Mr. Onque moved to approve the September minutes, Ms. Drescher seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the minutes of October; Ms. Drescher moved to approve the October minutes, Mr. Onque seconded the motion. All voted to approve the minutes.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Ms. Molnar presented the Certificates of Appropriateness which included several renewals. Mr. Cipriani moved to approve the Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Onque seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Historic Review Report: There were no new Historic Reviews, and no new Applications for Economic Hardship.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Attachments

1419, 1421, 1423 ADAMS STREET – MANCHESTER

1419 ADAMS

OWNER: Urban Redevelopment Authority
1419 Adams St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

APPLICANT: Russell Blaich
Bureau of Building Inspection

WARD: 21st

BLOCK & LOT NUMBER: 22-F-114

BUILDING INSPECTOR: Ron Freyermuth

COUNCIL DISTRICT #6: Tonya Payne

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: R1A-VH

ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Important
(typical)

1421 ADAMS

OWNER: Roland J. Lighty
600 Dauphin Street
Harrisburgh, PA 17102

APPLICANT: Russell Blaich
Bureau of Building Inspection

WARD: 21st

BLOCK & LOT NUMBER: 22-F-113

BUILDING INSPECTOR: Ron Freyermuth

COUNCIL DISTRICT #6: Tonya Payne

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: R1A-VH

ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Important
(typical)

1423 ADAMS

OWNER: Calvin Degrasse
3018 Grace Avenue
Bronx, NY 10469

APPLICANT: Russell Blaich
Bureau of Building Inspection

WARD: 21st

BLOCK & LOT NUMBER: 22-F-112

BUILDING INSPECTOR: Ron Freyermuth

COUNCIL DISTRICT #6: Tonya Payne

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: R1A-VH

ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Important
(typical)

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 16 January 1991 – Building was issued a notice of Condemnation
- 16 October 2007 – Mr. Blaich submitted application for exterior work, proposing to raze three structures (1419-23 Adams) to the ground. A recent, severe fire rendered the buildings non-salvageable.

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

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

Ms. Molnar presented the application for demolition. The buildings suffer from arson damage. Mr. Tellers informed the HRC that the buildings are all attached row houses. Mr. Cipriani commented on the buildings' safety. Ms.

Molnar told the HRC that the Manchester Citizens Council recommended one of the addresses, 1419, for rehabilitation. Mr. Blaich spoke to the buildings' condition. Mr. Tom Hardy from the MCC did not make an appearance.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved to approve demolition of all three buildings.

SECOND: Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion

VOTE: All in favor

960 PENN AVENUE – PENN-LIBERTY

OWNER:	Golden Triangle Management FedEx Kinko's 210 10 th Street Pittsburgh, PA 15222
APPLICANT:	George Wood Accel Sign Group 4600 Harrison Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15202
WARD:	2 nd
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	009-N-122
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ed McAllister
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important (typical)

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- 26 June 2006 – Premier Building Systems applied to restore the building's façade.
- 27 June 2006 – Kent Rockwell was issued CoA #06-055 for reconstruction of damaged façade to match previous.
- 10 September 2007 – Accel Sign Group submitted an application for exterior work to install two FedEx Kinko's signs.
- 14 September 2007 – The Penn-Liberty LRC met to review the above application; they agreed that neither sign would be permissible in the district because one attached to historic materials, and the other was historically inappropriate.
- 7 November 2007 – Accel sign group appeared before HRC to appeal their case.

two signs

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – *Installation of*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

Ms. Molnar presented the application for two signs. She relayed that the LRC did not approve the initial sign for two reasons: that they were historically inappropriate to the building, and their attachment would cause permanent damage to the building. Mr. Mark Wood from Accel Sign addressed the HRC, and presented a new proposal. The new signage would attach to the building with a removable, yet engineered, adhesive (tape). When removed, the beam may need to be repainted. Mr. Cipriani was concerned that the letters could fall off due to weight, but was informed that the letters are quite light. Ms. Molnar raised the concern that the awning lettering was too tall. Lettering should be no more than 8" in height. The entire group discussed the awning-sign height. Mr. Tellers asked if the awnings would be attached to the stone or to the windows – Mr. Wood replied that the awnings would cause no new damage to the building because they are being erected in place of existing awnings which attach to the windows.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved to approve sign and awning installation, on the condition that the applicant comply with the .eight-inch awning-sign regulation.

SECOND: Ms. Drescher seconded the motion

VOTE: All in favor

4338 BIGELOW BOULEVARD – SCHENLEY FARMS

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

OWNER:	Medcano Corporation Dr. Elmer Kano 4338 Bigelow Blvd. Pittsburgh, PA 15213
APPLICANT:	Mazzei Contracting, LLC David M. Hervol, Superintendent P.O. Box 388 Allison Park, PA 15101
WARD:	4 th
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	027-L-246
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Tom Breisinger
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	I-C
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important (typical)

- In December 1997, the Junior League of Pittsburgh was the potential owner of this structure and they submitted an application for the conceptual approval of façade renovations to the building at 4339 Bigelow Boulevard, which included the construction of a brick courtyard and three parking spaces. The HRC approved the application.
- On October 23, 1998, the Staff of the Historic Review Commission received an application for conceptual approval of proposed façade and site renovations.
- 16 November 1998 – Western PA Historical Society was awarded CofA #98-127 for site renovations.
- 15 October 2007 – Mazzei Contracting, LLC applied to remove all existing windows and doors, and replace them with aluminum ones. They also applied to clean the building, repoint and repair masonry, and repair exterior site features

- 18 October 2007 – Medcano Corporation was issued CofA #07-087 to clean masonry façade, repair and repoint masonry features. CofA did not issue approval for window or door replacement.

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL – *Remove historic wood windows and doors and replace with aluminum ones.*

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:

Ms. Molnar presented the application for replacement windows and doors. She informed the HRC that because Schenley Farms does not have its own set of guidelines, architectural review is based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation. The applicant was already approved for general masonry cleaning and small repairs. Mr. Greg Mazzei presented drawings for the proposed aluminum door. Mazzei represents the owner, Mr. Cano, who has owned the building for ten years. They are in phase I of the rehabilitation of the building. Saving money on replacement windows is important to him. Mr. Tellers commented on the great significance of the building, and architects. The owner has advertised the building for rent or purchase, but has no takers. There is no current Certificate of Occupancy, because the building does not meet current standards. Mr. Tellers asked whether there has been a study to refurbish the windows, Mr. Mazzei replied but did not answer the question. There was some discussion on the accuracy of the proposed window muntins. Mr. Tellers asked how the windows will be finished, Mr. Mazzei replied that the windows will have integral color, in bronze. Tellers replied that the current color is white, and would like to retain that color in replacements for the 1912 NeoClassical building. The HRC recommended the applicant research historic color of the windows. Mr. Tellers summarized by saying that the applicant argued the windows were not replaceable due to cost restrictions, and that the proposed windows would be a virtually identical window profile. Mr. Mazzei said the profile would be the same, even though the windows would be fixed, not operable.

Mary McDunnah (sp?) addressed the HRC and commented about the muntins. She asked what the original window design was. Is the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued several years ago still current? Ms. Molnar answered “no,” it would have to be renewed. Ms. McDunnah raised the question, what happens if an applicant begins a project, but does not follow-through with the proposal. She would like to know if the applicant is required to follow-through with projects. Mr. Tellers commented that he didn’t know whether there was a time limit on finishing projects. Mr. Cipriani stated that a work permit would be revoked if no work happened in six months. Mr. Mazzei said that it was a mute point, because he has applied for a new permit, and is planning on following through with improving the property. He indicated that he didn’t understand the issue.

Mr. Tellers brought the Commission back to the point. He was concerned that the bronze color proposed was inappropriate. He also did not like the idea of double-hung windows being replaced with fixed windows. Further, the third concern was that the door stiles in the drawings were smaller (narrower) than they are in actuality.

Another neighbor, Gregory Snow, wanted to follow-up with what ms. McDunnah stated earlier. He was concerned that there would be new retaining walls at the front of the building and new landscaping. He wanted to know if the previous CofA would be followed-through with. Mr. Mazzei responded to the question saying that the retaining wall mentioned currently does exist. He said that his intention was to cover that “eyesore” with limestone veneer and limestone cap. He mentioned the Century Club’s wall and said that the two cannot be compared because the two buildings have vastly different setbacks. Mazzei also stated a need for handicap parking. Mr. Snow also asked about the ramp, but Mazzei said he didn’t know anything about the existing ramps, but that they exist. A side entrance ramp would not be economically feasible because it would be an encroachment on the neighboring property.

Mr. Tellers reminded the Commission that the application was for doors and windows, not site improvements. Mazzei said that the only site improvements they were doing are the limestone veneers and cap, but Tellers thought those issues would be reviewed on a separate application.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved to approve the door and window replacements on three conditions: 1) the color of the paint be checked for historic accuracy (probably white), 2) the windows be operable, and 3) the replacement windows and doors should be the same width as the originals (the replacements look narrower than the originals). He moved the Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued after staff-review of these three conditions.

SECOND: Ms. Drescher seconded the motion

VOTE: All in favor

1502 EAST CARSON STREET – EAST CARSON STREET

OWNER:	Harry & Gunsenin Ablak 1502 E Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA
APPLICANT:	N/A
WARD:	17 th
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	009-N-122
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Bob Molyneaux
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	A-1
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	Important, but altered

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- In June 1994, the tenant installed an internally illuminated awning with signage across the facade of the building, without the review and approval of the Historic Review Commission or a sign permit.
- On March 22, 1995, the Housing Court magistrate held a hearing on this matter, and ordered a review of the awning/sign by the Historic Review Commission before the next scheduled court hearing.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL – N/A

APPLICANT'S OFFENSE – Installation of non-approved sign. NO Certificate of Appropriateness and no Sign Permit was issued.

DISCUSSION OF ENFORCEMENT ISSUE:

Ms. Molnar presented the enforcement issue with slides. She stated that the sign was located incorrectly on the building (too high), was illuminated incorrectly (internal), and projected too far. She asked for the Historic Review Commission's consensus that the installed sign is inappropriate for the district. Mr. Onque, Ms. Drescher, and Mr. Tellers verbally expressed their consensus citing the reasons listed above.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved to disapprove the continuance of this activity (sign existence) and moved to expedite the citation of the offender.

SECOND: Ms. Drescher seconded the motion

VOTE: All in favor

526 AVERY STREET – DEUSCHTOWN

OWNER:	Kareem Gahed 526 Avery Street Pittsburgh, PA 15212
APPLICANT:	
WARD:	23 rd
BLOCK & LOT NUMBER:	0023-S-00081
BUILDING INSPECTOR:	Ron Freyermuth
COUNCIL DISTRICT #	
ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
ARCHITECTURAL RATING:	

BUILDING HISTORY & HRC

- On 5 October 2007, the East Allegheny Community Council reported a violation at the above address – the installation of glass blocks into basement windows. Offender was sent a letter, but did not respond.

APPLICANT’S OFFENSE – the installation of glass blocks into basement windows. Offender was sent a letter, but did not respond.

DISCUSSION OF ENFORCEMENT ISSUE:

Ms. Molnar presented the enforcement issue with slides. Molnar stated that the property owner had been in contact with her regarding the issue. The owner put the glass blocks up as a safety measure for the building tenants. Mr. Nick Kyrazi approached the HRC and stated his views against the glass block windows. Kyrazi stated that the owner is aware of covenants (that the East Allegheny Community Council owns) on the building which protect the building from glass block windows. The owner chose to ignore these covenants.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved that the owner replace the glass block windows with something more appropriate in style and size, to comply with the guidelines.

SECOND: Mr. Cipriani seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in favor

Ms. Molnar recommended that the Commission add a time-frame for replacement. Mr. Onque accepted an amendment to his motion that the building owner be given three months to replace the windows. After three months, the owner will be cited for non-compliance.

12 WEST NORTH – LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION

Garden Theatre

Nomination Information

Owner: Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh
Nominated By: Mexican War Streets Society
Date of Nomination: August 10, 2007

Building Information

Date of Construction: 1915
Architect(s): Thomas H. Scott
National Register Status: None

Zoning Information

Ward: 22nd
Neighborhood: North Side
Block and Lot Number: 023-L-083
Zoning: M-M

DISCUSSION OF NOMINATION:

Ms. Molnar directed commission members to refer to Nomination Procedures listed in their packets. She then proceeded to present the Garden Theatre. The Garden Theatre has been presented to the HRC on two other occasions (preliminary determination and public comment). Ms. Molnar outlined the Garden Theatre's points of significance and integrity. The building is significant for its association with a prominent architect, for the development of the community, and for its architectural value.

Ms. Drescher clarified that this is the third time the HRC reviewed this nomination.

MOTION: Ms. Drescher moved that the HRC move forward in the nomination process by recommending to City Council that 12 West North become a city-designated historic structure.

Mr. Tellers asked for public comment... none.

SECOND: Mr. Onque seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in favor

7101 APPLE STREET – LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION

National Negro Opera Company

Nomination Information

Owner: Miriam White & Jonnet Solomon
Nominated By: Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh
P.O. Box 2669, Pittsburgh, PA 15230
Date of Nomination: 22 October 2007

Building Information

Date of Construction: 1894
Architect(s): unknown
Builder(s):
National Register Status: Not listed
Current Use: Vacant

Zoning Information

Ward: 12th
Neighborhood: Homewood
Block and Lot Number: 0173-N-00087
Zoning: P (Parks)

DISCUSSION OF NOMINATION:

Ms. Molnar presented nomination to the Commission for the first time. She gave information on the building's location and map, followed by background information on the building's history. Molnar pointed to the building's significance as being associated with two people of historic significance: Woogie Harris and Mary Caldwell Dawson. In addition, the building contributed to the developmental patterns of the neighborhood and community. Finally, the building has some architectural significance as a good example of the Queen Anne style.

Dan Holland from the Young Preservationists Association commented on the nomination, and filled-in some of the points that Ms. Molnar left-out. He supports the nomination.

Steven Paul, executive Director of Preservation Pittsburgh spoke to support the nomination.

Mr. Tellers said that he thought the nominated property meets at least three of the ten criteria for designation as set forth in the ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Onque moved that "there is reasonable cause to determine that the nominated structure, 7101 Apple (National Negro Opera House), meets the definitions in Section 1.2 of a Historic Structure."

SECOND: Ms. Drescher seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in favor

800 EAST OHIO STREET – LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION
Workingmen’s Savings Bank Company – ARC House

Nomination Information

Owner: Lou Lammana, Bentley Inc.
Nominated By: East Allegheny Community Council
Allegheny City Society
Date of Nomination: 10 October 2007

Building Information

Date of Construction: 1902, 1921
Architect(s): Giaver and Dinkelberg (1921 addition)
Builder(s): A & S Wilson Company (1902, 1921)
National Register Status: None

Zoning Information

Ward: 23rd
Neighborhood:
Block and Lot Number: 0024-N-00142
Zoning: NDI

DISCUSSION OF NOMINATION:

Ms. Molnar presented nomination to the Commission for the first time. She gave information on the nomination, building’s location and map, followed by background information on the building’s history and construction history. She gave background information on addition architects Giaver and Dinkelberg. Mr. Tellers asked, “could we conclude that Burnham’s firm was the architect for the original building”? Ms. Molnar replied that all of the evidence points toward the conclusion that Burnham designed the building (giving examples). Ms. Molnar showed images of the existing building, showing how the northern elevation has been modified.

Molnar stated that the building is significant for exemplifying an architectural style – Beaux Arts. In addition, the building is significant for its association with significant cultural and social aspects of the City of Pittsburgh, the region, the State, or the Nation. The association with two nationally-known architects and possible connection to Burnham make the building significant on this level. Mr. Tellers asked the nominators to come forward.

Mr. Michael Shealey came forward to present his case in favor of the nomination, which he prepared in collaboration with Tim Zinn. He asked to fill-in some missing information that Ms. Molnar did not cover. He commented that it was typical at the time for building permits not to list the architect. Shealey presented historical information on the building and its background.

Mr. Ed Graffe (sp?) came forward to speak on his own behalf, in favor of the nomination. Mr. Graffe lives in the Deutschtown historic district, and feels that the ARC House building is a landmark in the neighborhood, and exists as an anchor to the business district.

Mr. Steven Paul came forward to support the nomination of the Workingmen’s Savings Bank and Company. He read a letter of support from Preservation Pittsburgh, commenting on the architecture and associated architects.

Mr. Nick Kyrazi came forward to support the nomination. He said he was shocked that the current owner would express an interest in demolishing the building. The builder who constructed Kyrazi's house had some connection to the bank building. Kyrazi expressed a personal interest in the building.

Ms. Anne Nelson, representing Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation, spoke on behalf of Arthur Ziegler. Ms. Nelson read a letter describing the architectural importance of the building and architects.

Mr. Eric Milliron spoke on behalf of the Northside Leadership Conference. At present, he was neither in favor, or opposed. He wanted the Commission to know that the NLC was undecided, and asked if the HRC would consider the NLC's letter of support/opposition tomorrow. Mr. Tellers replied that the HRC would take some action today, without benefit of the NLC's letter.

Mr. Paul Mazeski approached the HRC with handouts, a response to the nomination. Mazeski represents the building's current owners, Bentley Inc., a developer. Mazeski reported that his client is interested in developing the Northside into something more favorable. He stated that the owner inspected the building before purchase, and came to the conclusion that the building could not feasibly be restored in any way. Mazeski and his client indicated shock at the nomination, because they thought the building was in too poor condition to save as an historic structure. Mazeski reminded the HRC that no one knows the original architect. He also erroneously stated that no one knows if Giaver and Dinkelberg were associated with the building's addition (there is proof that they were the architects). Mazeski continued by submitting his arguments to the Commission. Primarily, he argued that there were a lot of modifications made to the building during the time it was owned by ARC House.

Mazeski responded to the two points of significance identified by the staff to the Historic Review Commission. Again, he pointed out that no one knows the original architect. He said, most importantly, that there was no information submitted by the proponents regarding the structure's integrity. He said the modifications done to the building over time have compromised the structure's integrity. Pointing mainly to the back side of the building as highly modified, Mazeski stated that only two walls are left of the original building. He showed that all of the windows have been replaced. He stated that one of the building's walls is "falling in." Inside, Mazeski reminded the HRC that the building's bank-design has been compromised by the insertion of a drop-floor. Mazeski pointed the HRC to look at Exhibit 8, a report from a structural engineer, which Mazeski indicated spoke to the structural stability of the building. Finally, Mazeski pointed-out a letter from Desimone Architects which describes the building as "totally destroyed architecturally."

Pam Mitten (sp?), vice president of the New Hope Council in Deutschtown presented a petition to the HRC signed by neighbors surrounding the ARC House in opposition of nomination. She felt that the building was ignored until recently, when the neighborhood finally got interest from a developer.

Joseph Lawrence addressed the HRC as council for the Allegheny City Society. He pointed out to the Commission that the purpose for the day's hearing was to preliminarily determine whether the nomination was "frivolous or not." He "called to the stand" a witness to comment on the structure's stability. He called Mr. Mark Fatla. Mr. Fatla addressed the HRC, stating that he had seen the interior of the building at the time of the auction. He went through "every inch of the structure" and inspected it all. He said that the bank interior was almost entirely intact. Even though the second interior floor had been added, it was done in such a way as to be easily removed. All of the other original ornamentation remains, according to Fatla. These details include pilasters, moldings, marble countertops, and Mr. Winter's original office. Ms. Drescher asked what Fatla's credentials were. He replied. She also asked if he thought the building could be restored. He replied that he thought it could, and that the northern portion was a non-original expansion for a stairwell.

Mr. Mazeski requested that the opponents "have the last word," as staff told him they would. Mr. Tellers replied that he would like to hear anyone who would like to speak. He did not want to discuss the structural issues, because he did not feel those were in the HRC's purview. Tellers stated that even the letters presented by the opponents did not indicate imminent structural failure. Ms. Drescher and Mr. Tellers reminded everyone that this was just the first stage of the nomination process, and that there would be more opportunities for public comment in the future.

David Lamm from Harry-Davis Real Estate addressed the HRC. He said that the property was on the market for over a year, and no one bought it. He wondered why no one wanted to designate the building when the building first came up for sale. Lamm said he had marketed the building himself to several prospective clients, but none thought the building could be reasonably rehabilitated.

Mr. John DeSantis approached the Commission, with reference to the comments on the building's structural condition. He said the HRC's job was to determine whether the nomination *could* meet one of the ten criteria as listed in the ordinance. He said the nomination should also have integrity, meaning that the building should be minimally architecturally altered (exterior only) and whether the exterior has significant structural stability. Mr. DeSantis said he thought the building had substantial structural integrity, and that it is eminently capable of being preserved and restored. He said structurally, there is no doubt the building will be there "a long long time, unless somebody decides they are going to take a wrecking-ball to it."

Mr. Tellers called a close to public comment.

Ms. Noor Ismail wanted to say, for the record, that she had been in touch with Councilwoman Darlene Harris as well as the "Administration." Both asked for a Continuance on the preliminary determination on this case. The Planning Department had also been in contact with the legal department regarding a continuance. Ms. Molnar explained that a Continuance on the determination might jeopardize the nomination because the Ordinance specifies that a preliminary determination must be made within 45 days of nomination. If the HRC waited until the next hearing, more than 45 days would have passed. Mr. Tellers said that there was no official request for a continuance, and that he already had enough information to make a preliminary determination. Ms. Drescher commented similarly. Ms. Molnar explained that if the Commission determines that the building does not, or could not potentially meet one of the criteria for significance, and does not have integrity, the building would no longer be protected under the Ordinance. Ms. Molnar continued to outline the nomination process for the building.

Mr. Tellers stated that in his opinion, the building meets the two criteria as outlined by staff. He wanted to add to those criteria that the building formed a unique feature to a local Community, and thereby fit more than two criteria for significance.

MOTION: Ms. Drescher moved that there is reasonable cause to determine that the nominated structure, 800 E. Ohio Street (Workingmen's Savings Bank), meets the definitions in Section 1.2 of a Historic Structure. In this way, the structure meets at least one criterion for designation, as outlined in the City's historic preservation ordinance (Section 1.4 of Title Eleven of the City of Pittsburgh Code of Ordinances).

SECOND: Mr. Onque seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Tellers, Mr. Cipriani, Mr. Onque, Ms. Drescher

ABSTAINED: Ms. Ismail