



Division of Development Administration and Review

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning

200 Ross Street, Third Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of December 3, 2014

Beginning at 12:30 PM

200 Ross Street

First Floor Hearing Room

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>	
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	Deborah Hartman	George Germany
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Robert Wilson	Shawntae Spencer
Ray Gastil		April Minech	Lara Sullivan
Ernie Hogan		Michelle Lally	Dan Spanovich
		Mark Ayoub	Ashley Spanovich
		Kerry Solomon	Doug Evans
		Larry Baumiller	Barbara Ross
		Ron Beers	Sim Cha
		Peter Margittai	Ed Shriver
		Dusty Elias Kirk	Michael Kostiew
		Carol Kowall	Mary McDonough
		Barbara Brown	Deborah Walko
		David Zwier	Norman Cleary

Old Business—None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the November 2014 minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Harless seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the November Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Harless seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Other:

1. Ms. Quinn states that she created an index for the applications on the website. She also states that an application for historic nomination has been received for Councilwoman Rudiak's house and the house next door. With the January meeting probably having to be cancelled, there is a question of the timing of the HRC recommendation. She will see if the nominator and owners would be willing to waive the deadline. She states that she is still waiting for a council hearing for the Immanuel Church; that will be scheduled sometime in the new year.

Adjourn:

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn the meeting.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

1324 E. Carson Street *East Carson Street Historic District*

Owner:

Oakdale Development LLC
1324 E Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-44

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

George Germany
432 Burlington Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15221

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 11/14/14

National Register Status: **Listed:** **X** **Eligible:**

Proposed Changes: Renovations including door replacement, HVAC, and non-conforming signage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. George Germany steps to the podium. He explains the project, stating that the first part of the proposal is ductwork for the hood, which will need a new penetration at the rear of the building.
 2. Mr. Harless asks if the ductwork will be enclosed and have a fire rating, and if it will extend all the way to the roof.
 3. Mr. Germany says no, it will be exposed, and it will be extended up to the roof.
 4. Mr. Harless says they will have to enclose it.
 5. Mr. Serrao asks about the door replacement.
 6. Mr. Germany says that is the next part of their proposal. He explains that they already created a new opening in the side of the building, and they are looking to install a door to match the existing door on that side of the building. He shows the specs for the door.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks what the purpose of the door will be.
 8. Mr. Germany says it will be for deliveries.
 9. Mr. Doug Evans with ADM Signs steps to the podium; he is handling the signage proposal for the business. He explains that they altered the signage to conform to the guidelines, but the one that is still an issue is the front wall sign. They had originally wanted to use internally illuminated letters, but are now proposing reverse channel letters that will be halo-lit with white LEDs. He also shows the projecting sign, which was going to be internally illuminated but which they changed to be non-lit. He also goes over the window graphics.
 10. Mr. Hogan states that he has another question about the side door. He asks if it will be recessed and if they will be adding a transom.
 11. Mr. Germany says it will be flush with the wall and will not have a transom.
-
-

-
-
12. Mr. Hogan says that it will not be an exact match with the adjacent door.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He enters an email from the LRC into the record; they felt that the application needed more information and should be denied.
-
-

Motion:

14. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the external, alleyway-mounted exhaust, with the condition that it must also be approved by BBI. He also motions to approve the signage as submitted, to be mounted on the sign board, as well as the projecting sign in the transom section of the façade. He motions to approve the door replacement in the new opening, with door to match existing.
 15. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 16. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1735 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Ron Beers & Sim Cha
1735 E Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-317

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Peter Margittai Architects, LLC
2110 Sarah Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 11/11/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of glass pivot doors for security on storefront.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Peter Margittai steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that the building is a three-story Victorian building which the owners have renovated extensively while staying true to its historic character. The metal storefront, while not original, dates to the early 20th century. The ground floor is rented as a commercial space, and there have been some issues with the recessed vestibule area attracting nuisance behavior and litter after business hours. The owners live above and would like to come up with a creative solution to close off the area during off hours, They are proposing to install frameless glass pivoting door panels, which will only be closed after hours to create a secured area. They will not have any hardware except for the hinges, and they bolt at the bottom. The idea is to make them “disappear” when the vestibule light is turned on. The doors could also be easily removed in the future and would have little effect on the building. He states that the LRC rejected the proposal, stating that there would be no appropriate way to close off the vestibule. He states that the guidelines do not support external security systems, but he thinks that it was probably to prevent roll-down gates.
 2. Mr. Harless asks if the doors are egress doors.
 3. Mr. Margittai says no, there are rear doors for egress. These doors would always be propped open during business hours.
 4. Mr. Ron Beers steps to the podium; he is one of the owners of the property. He states that on the weekends the vestibule turns into a public toilet, and it has been detrimental to the business. They have also had issues with graffiti and broken windows in the vestibule, and it also attracts street performers which has been a noise issue.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He enters an email from the LRC into the record; they felt that the proposal should be denied. He says that he sympathizes with their issue, but is concerned that this would set a precedent for
-
-

all the other business owners that have recessed storefronts on the street.

6. Mr. Serrao agrees about not wanting to set this precedent on the street.
7. Mr. Hogan says that the only thing that is allowed per the guidelines is a security system inside of the building.
8. Mr. Margittai speaks to the precedent issue. He states that there is already a precedent for remodeling storefronts that no longer fit the business, while this is a more delicate and preservation-minded approach to meeting the needs of a business.
9. Mr. Gastil recommends tabling the application for six months to do more research. He states that he appreciates the minimalist approach to this, rather than redoing the whole storefront.
10. Mr. Hogan states that the guidelines definitely need to be looked at and revised, but he feels that the only choice available to the Commission today is denial.

Motion:

11. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application.
 12. Mr. Hogan seconds.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote. Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, and Mr. Gastil are in favor and Mr. Harless abstains. Motion carries.
-
-

2100 E. Carson Street *East Carson Street Historic District*

Owner:

Troy Potteiger
8111 Palomino Drive
Bridgeville, Pa 15017

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-K-27

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Crossfire Hospitality Group, LLC
2100 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 10/17/14

National Register Status: **Listed:** **X** **Eligible:**

Proposed Changes: Storefront renovations and installation of awnings.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Kerry Solomon steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project along with Geoff Lester. He explains that they are presenting the project again after it was tabled last month. He shows pictures of the existing façade and states that the goal is to clean it up a bit. He presents updated drawings for the plan for the façade. He states that the signage, paint colors, and wheelchair ramp railing have all been approved over the counter. He states that their proposed awnings are black canvas awnings, and they will be replacing the windows but keeping the existing knee wall. They are also proposing to recess the entrance door for safety reasons.
 2. Mr. Lester steps to the podium to address some issues. He says they have altered the window plan at the HRC's suggestion to be more appropriate. They also feel that the recessed entrance is more appropriate. He says they are keeping the masonry openings the same. The window frames will be a clear anodized aluminum, and the awnings will be triangular, sloped, and not illuminated. He talks about the new light fixtures, which they feel are more historically appropriate.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks about the dimensions on the operable windows.
 4. Mr. Lester says they are about 2'9". They took the existing bay and divided by four.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He acknowledges a letter from the LRC. They feel that the awning position is inappropriate, and should not be any higher than the white sandstone banning. Mr. Hogan echoes this concern, stating that the awnings should go only over the windows and not above the windows.
 6. The Commission discusses the awnings and how high they have to be for clearance requirements while still meeting the historic guidelines.
 7. Mr. Hogan also feels the historic lights are not appropriate and they should go with
-
-

a simpler, wall-washing light. There is a precedent on the street already for them.

Motion:

8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the storefront renovations as submitted, with the conditions that the awning be redesigned to consider height and location within the existing building line, and a more appropriate light fixture be considered. The redesign shall be submitted to staff for final approval.
 9. Mr. Harless seconds.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

**4101 Bigelow Boulevard
Schenley High School**

Individual Landmark

Owner:

PMC/Schenley HSB Associates LP
1608 Walnut Street, Suite 1400
Philadelphia, Pa 19103

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-320

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Sean Beasley
925 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 8/15/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Rooftop addition and façade renovation.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Hogan acknowledges a letter from Melissa McSwigan expressing concerns about the addition, and another letter from Richard Iland expressing concerns. He states that several of the Commissioners did visit the site to evaluate the visual impact of the addition.
2. Ms. Dusty Elias-Kirk steps to the podium; she is from Reed-Smith, the attorneys for the property owner. She also introduces Michael Kostiew and Ed Shriver. She states that they feel the addition will be inconspicuous and fully in line with the current standard.
3. Mr. Shriver steps to the podium. He shows various views of the building as they exist now and how they would look with the addition. He states that the units will be pulled back 17 feet from the face of the building to minimize its visibility. He shows elevations, stating that the façade facing the outside will be faced with brick to match the rooftop screening and chimney; the back side will be faced in a profiled metal panel. He shows samples of both. He talks about noise issues, specifically how the building tends to reflect helicopter noise into the neighborhood, and states that the materials were chosen to help combat that.
4. Mr. Serrao asks if they took any pictures from Schenley Farms Terrace or the other streets on the hill.
5. Mr. Shriver says they did not.
6. Mr. Hogan asks when the photos were taken.
7. Mr. Shriver says they were taken four or five months ago.
8. Mr. Hogan says that since the leaves have fallen they haven't taken additional photos.
9. Ms. Elias-Kirk says many of the views would be the same.

-
-
10. Mr. Serrao says views from the hill, if they had them, would be very different.
 11. Ms. Elias-Kirk says they have met extensively with the community to try and address their concerns.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 13. Ms. Carol Kowall steps to the podium; she lives across the street from the property. She presents some pictures from the hill, stating that this is the most common view when you Google the building. She says the addition will only clutter the top of the building, and that the materials and windows are inappropriate and don't go with anything. Although she knows that an addition to a historic building doesn't have to emulate it, it shouldn't desecrate it.
 14. Ms. Mary McDonough steps to the podium; she lives in the neighborhood. She states that the issue is that it is not a tall building; it is a simple and very horizontal building and is defined by its strong unbroken horizontal roofline. She requests that the application be denied.
 15. Mr. Norm Cleary steps to the podium; he is the president of the Schenley Farms Civic Association. He talks about the distinctive triangular shape of the building, and states that it is one of the most important buildings in the neighborhood. He states that it has already suffered an inappropriate ground-level addition. He states that the preference of the neighborhood is for no rooftop addition, but if there is to be an addition he states that it needs to be very sensitive to the guidelines. He does state that the brick is a better choice than the metal for the front, and appreciates the consideration of the helicopter noise in the neighborhood. He talks about the long-term economic viability of the adaptive reuse of the building. He talks about the dimensions on the rooftop deck; he feels that they will be visible and there should be restrictions that nothing be placed on them higher than the parapet. He reiterates that he Association is not absolutely opposed to this addition, but they are concerned.
 16. Mr. David Zweir from the Oakland Planning and Development Corporation steps to the podium. He states that the owner and applicant did meet with their group and with the Schenley Farms Civic Association. He states that his group does support the Schenley Farms Civic Association's position.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public testimony; there is none.
 18. Ms. Elias Kirk steps to the podium to clarify that the owner has been working extensively with the National Park Service on their proposal.
 19. Mr. Hogan reflects on everything that has been said, and as has been articulated, the building is a significant piece of Pittsburgh's history. The architect's intent was one of very pure style and technique, and the building has been recognized as a landmark because of that. The question in front of the Commission is if the natural state of the building is being disrupted or compromised; with everything that has been presented, it is clear that there will be a substantial impact. The guidelines say that an addition should not overpower the building, and any changes to the building should respect the historic character of the building, and he is not sure the case has been made that the addition adheres to these guidelines.
 20. Mr. Gastil states that he feels the addition would not overwhelm the existing building. He feels that the applicant has addressed a lot of the concerns about
-
-

visibility; for example, they did provide for a 17 foot setback from the facade.

21. Mr. Serrao agrees with Mr. Hogan that the addition will be too visible.
22. Ms. Elias-Kirk steps back to the podium. She states that they have worked very hard to make the addition not disruptive and to keep the distinctive triangular shape of the building. She asks what, if anything, they can change to make the addition acceptable.
23. Mr. Hogan states that additions need to have a minimal impact on the building, but with the addition occupying more than 50% of the roofline and having multiple views especially the one from the hillside, it will have major impact no matter what they do. He mentions the testimony from the neighborhood opposing the building.
24. Mr. Gastil asks if any particular elevation could handle an addition more than the others.
25. Mr. Serrao says there is a challenge with geography at this site, in that you can look down on the roof of the building. There is nothing you could put on the roof that would not have an impact.
26. Mr. Harless agrees, stating that the building is an object, intended to be viewed as one piece, and the roof is an important part of that.
27. Mr. Hogan agrees, and since this feature is an important part of why it was designated as a landmark, approving the addition could put its historic status in jeopardy. He is sympathetic to the applicant, but states that the only option is to deny.

Motion:

28. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application, based on the reasons stated by the Commission.
 29. Mr. Harless seconds.
 30. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Harless are all in favor and Mr. Gastil is opposed. Motion carries.
-
-

Page Street Dog Park

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

WPA Humane Society
1101 Western Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 7-B-208

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:

WPA Humane Society
1101 Western Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/14/14

National Register Status: **Listed:** **X** **Eligible:**

Proposed Changes: Fencing and rain shelter for a dog park.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Larry Baumiller steps to the podium; he is an attorney and is representing the Western PA Humane Society. He also introduces Deborah Hartman, the acting director, April Minich, the director of adoptions and animal care enrichment and the person who put together the plans for the park, and Barbara Ross, a board member. He explains the project, stating that it is an off-leash dog park area on two parcels, one of which is in the Manchester Historic District. He shows the plans for the park, including the dog runs, the rain/sun shelter for volunteers, a footbridge and mounds for exercising, water fountains, and a small storage shed. The entire park is to be enclosed by a fence, and it is important to the Humane Society that it is not a privacy fence for security reasons; they want to area to be visible. He provides some context, stating that there is already a brick wall between the properties and Chateau Street, and there are some houses across the street in the historic district as well as some vacant lots. Their proposal calls for a chain-link fence with designs on it; they looked into more historically appropriate fencing but the cost is prohibitive. He cites the guidelines, stating that chain-link is discouraged but not prohibited; since the site is in the far corner of the historic district and partly surrounded by non-historical uses, he feels that it would be appropriate. He states that the lots are currently just grass and dirt and what they are proposing would be an improvement.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks about the materials for the shelter.
 3. Mr. Baumiller states that it will be made out of metal.
 4. Mr. Serrao asks about the color.
 5. Mr. Baumiller says the color is not finalized.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks about the other proposed elements such as the benches.
 7. Mr. Baumiller says that they have provided potential designs for the benches and other elements, but they are open to suggestions. He says there will be no need for
-
-

any parking as the volunteers will walk over from the Humane Society.

8. Mr. Serrao agrees that whatever they do to the site will be an improvement, but they need a more specific proposal.
9. Mr. Hogan says they will need materials, textures, colors, manufacturer's information, and so on. He suggests they closely review the historic guidelines. As an example, he states that the bench design is not acceptable per historic guidelines, and they could look at the type of benches being installed in Allegheny Commons as a good example of an acceptable design.
10. Ms. Ross steps to the podium. She asks what is considered to be historic—is it from a certain era or is it something else.
11. Mr. Hogan states they should refer to the guidelines. They are not required to replicate anything from a specific era. He states that any features that are permanently attached are in their purview to review. Staff can also provide guidance.
12. Mr. Serrao says they do have leeway in what they approve, they just have to be very specific in approving a one-off case so they don't set a precedent.
13. Ms. Quinn states that she has a few suggestions. She states that she is a volunteer with the Humane Society and is excited about the project. She states that instead of the proposed graphics, which she felt were not appropriate, they could think of doing something like "famous dogs in history" or something similar. She suggests that they also take a look at the guidelines for Allegheny Commons Park for help in designing their fixtures.
14. Mr. Hogan says they can also work with the neighborhood organization or a local architect.
15. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

16. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application until the next meeting.
 17. Mr. Harless seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

218 Tennyson Avenue

Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:

Clifford R. Rowe III
218 Tennyson Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-216

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Clifford R. Rowe III
218 Tennyson Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 10/30/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact alterations including skylights and HVAC.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Cliff Rowe steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He explains the project, stating that there are many different items to cover. The first item is a window that they replaced to match the original. There was also water damage so they replaced brick around the windows with historic reclaimed brick to match. He states that they also did a lot of roof work, installing new copper gutters and downspouts and lifting and re-laying all the original roof tiles. The roof had been in bad shape and all the skylights were leaking. They also added a scupper to the side of the house so they could tie in the roof drain. They also replaced the garage roof and installed new copper gutters. He states that the old copper gutters were beyond repair per the home inspection report. The next part of the application is fencing. They had originally wanted to put a new fence on the left side of the house where there was a chain-link fence with wood and wire sections. They wanted to install a vinyl fence, but after speaking with neighbors he will think about it and come back with a more appropriate fence. The next part of the application is the skylights. They installed four new skylights and a new roof hatch. He shows pictures of the original skylights, which were cracked and damaged. He states that they also did some painting of the outside of the house.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks if all the skylights were original.
 3. Mr. Rowe says they were all existing and they just replaced them. The roof hatch was there as well. He has heard that the neighbors have some issues with them, and he is willing to work with them and the Commission to come up with something more appropriate. He states that there has also been some concern about some air conditioning units that were added to the house. Originally there was one unit on each one of the small flat roofs. He didn't know about the historic review process at the time, and assumed since they were existing he could add additional units to those roofs. He understands that they are very visible. They did look at central air but the cost was prohibitive. He shows an idea that he had for screening and states that he is open to any other suggestions.
-
-

-
-
4. The Commission discusses possible options and the problems with each. They want to avoid screening because of the issues they have had with cell tower screening; the screening tends to be more obvious than the towers themselves.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 6. Ms. Deb Walko steps to the podium; she lives in the neighborhood and is representing the Schenley Farms Civic Association. She acknowledges the high quality of much of the work that has been done on the property, but says there are some elements that she would like to address. The skylights are an issue; several of the units are much higher than the units they replaced and are quite visible. The aluminum material is also incompatible with the building. She also states that the installation of the mechanical units is contrary to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. There are six units on the first floor and three on the roof and they are very visible and incompatible with the building. The screening does not mitigate the visibility. She also felt that the vinyl fence was inappropriate, but it has already been taken off the table.
 7. Ms. Ellen Detlefson steps to the podium; she lives in the neighborhood. She echoes the statement about the high quality of the work and the three concerns that were already raised.
 8. Ms. Mary McDonough steps to the podium; she is a neighbor across the street. She applauds the work and states that many of her concerns have been addressed. She states that the skylights are inappropriate and still need to be addressed. She talks about the importance of keeping the historic character of the neighborhood intact.
 9. Mr. Norm Cleary steps to the podium; he is speaking as a neighbor. He says that the issues have been spoken about already. He states that the owners have been making an effort to do the right thing and have made a substantial investment in quality materials. He states that the problem is that building permits should have been obtained for everything; there were two separate contractors that did work and evidently no permits were applied for, which is causing the Rowes problems now. He realizes that this is not within the HRC's privy, but believes he believes that the city's attention to this problem would alleviate a lot of problems for homeowners.
 10. Ms. Quinn recommends that the neighbors should not hesitate to call 311 to make sure that permits are being obtained.
 11. Mr. Cleary says this case was difficult as so much of the work was high quality, it was assumed to be permitted.
 12. Mr. Rowe steps back to the podium; he says that some of the air conditioning units were already there.
 13. Mr. Hogan says that they may have existed before the district did. He states that permits should have been obtained. He says that the skylight in the front is a major issue as it sticks up like a greenhouse on the roofline. He is not sure what the answer is; they may have to compromise and accept some of the work today and continue the rest.
 14. Mr. Rowe says he would like more time to come up with more options for the skylights and HVAC.
 15. Mr. Harless suggests that they postpone those elements and approve the rest.
-
-

Motion:

16. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the roof, the gutters, painting, and other general after-the-fact exterior renovations, excluding skylight installation and HVAC/compressor installation. The owner will look for alternate solutions and come back before the Commission.
 17. Mr. Harless seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Certificates of Appropriateness Report - December 2014 and January 2015

Staff Approval	C of A Number	Date Issued	Application Address	Historic District	Work Approved
Y	14-138	2-Dec-14	1413 N Franklin Street	Manchester	In-kind repair and replacement
Y	14-139	5-Dec-14	917-925 Beech Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind window replacement
N	14-140	5-Dec-14	1324 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Door replacement, HVAC, halo-lit sign
N	14-141	5-Dec-14	218 Tennyson Avenue	Schenley Farms	After-the-fact skylights, HVAC, etc
N	14-142	5-Dec-14	827 N Lincoln Avenue	Allegheny West	Façade renovations
Y	14-143	9-Dec-14	1008 Cedar Avenue	Deutschtown	In-kind window replacement
Y	14-144	22-Dec-14	1113 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	In-kind awning replacement
Y	15-001	12-Jan-15	2134 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage

N	15-002	15-Jan-15	406-408 Foreland Street	Deushtown	Replacement of roof and windows, new lighting
Y	15-003	16-Jan-15	800 E Ohio Street	Individual	In-kind window replacement
Y	15-005	29-Jan-15	951 Liberty Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Signage
Y	15-006	30-Jan-15	1409 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage