



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 February 4, 2015
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	Diane Sacco	Caitlin Bruce
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	John Baker	Adam Lott
Ray Gastil		Dennis Zebelsky	Cynthia Schuler
Ernie Hogan		Brock McCandless	Renee Rosensteel
		Nick Lardas	Grant Scott
		Andrew Reichert	Bruce thompson
		Doug Sipp	Dan Deis
		Kathy Deis	Barbara Talerico
		Glenn Olcerst	Robert Dabney
		Greg Mucha	Kerry Solomon
		Lisa Starr	Carol Peterson
		Mike Angelilli	

Old Business—None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the December 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 December and January 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. Spooner asks if Mr. Harless would like to talk about 1115-1117 Fulton Street.
2. Mr. Harless states that these buildings are vacant and have been broken into, and PLI is looking to secure and stabilize the properties instead of pursuing demolition.
3. Ms. Spooner also states that the nomination for the Winter Homes has been tabled at the request of the nominator.
4. Mr. Hogan states that he received an email from MCC stating that they would like 1415 Lake St. to be tabled until next month.

Adjourn:

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn the meeting.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

900 Cedar Avenue

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Odontological Society
900 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-S-273

Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:

Odontological Society
900 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations including after-the-fact installation of glass-block windows.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Brock McCandless steps to the podium; he is representing the Odontological Society, the owners of the building. He also introduces Dr. Dennis Zabelsky, the president of the society, and Dr. Cynthia Schuler, the secretary of the society. He states that they received a work stoppage notice in December and submitted an application to address that as well as some additional work they would like to do. He shows photos of the works that had been done, including window replacement and HVAC exhaust vents. He states that the lower level windows had been in poor condition and were replaced with glass block for better insulation and security. He states that the owners were not aware that their building was subject to regulations of a historic district. He states that the exhaust vents were existing vents that were replaced and modernized. There is a white PVC pipe that is visible, and he states that the owners are willing to paint it to reduce its visibility.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks if the original windows were single-pane glass.
 3. Mr. McCandless says yes.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if the window with the HVAC vent is the first window around the corner.
 5. Mr. McCandless says there is one there and one on the other side of the side stairs. He explains the other aspects of the project, which involve in-kind repairs and painting.
 6. Mr. Serrao states that they can probably come up with a solution for the HVAC, but the glass block windows will be hard to accept.
 7. Mr. McCandless states that there are properties on the same street that have glass block.
 8. Mr. Hogan says that they could have existed before the historic district, or they could have also been illegally installed.
-
-

-
-
9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 10. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that some of the neighbors saw that they were taking out the original windows and wrought-iron grates, and one of the neighbors did save and store the grates. He states that it looks like they reformed the window sub-sills out of concrete which is acceptable.
 11. Ms. Kathleen Hagan steps to the podium; she lives on the next block. She states that she had often admired the original windows. She was the one that stopped and talked to the workers and saved the metal grates when she found out they were being thrown away.
 12. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He agrees with the previous speakers that the glass block windows are inappropriate and not allowed per the historic guidelines. He states that the HVAC is inappropriate as well. He states that the metal grates should be reinstalled in front of wood windows.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks the neighborhood representatives about the building across the street that has glass block windows.
 14. Mr. Kyriazi said they may have existed prior to the historic district designation in 1997.
 15. Mr. McCandless asks if property owners were notified when the historic district was designated.
 16. Mr. Serrao and Ms. Quinn say yes.
 17. The Commission discusses the louvers and HVAC.
-
-

Motion:

18. Mr. Serrao motions to approve façade renovations, including the HVAC louvers, to be painted black with the existing grates to be reinstalled on top, and with the exception of the after-the fact glass block windows, which are to be removed and replaced with wood windows with the existing metal grates to be reinstalled on top.
 19. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the motion is to approve the general façade improvements, which include the already installed HVAC system modifications, with the modification that the grates be reinstalled on top. All of the glass block is to be removed and replaced with single pane windows with the grates reinstalled on top.
 20. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 21. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 22. Mr. Hogan says they may want to check with the URA to see if there is any assistance available for façade improvements.
 23. Mr. Serrao says he may have a cost-effective solution for them and to speak with Ms. Quinn about it.
-
-

910 Cedar Avenue

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Charles Heidlage
910 Cedar Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-224

Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:

Germaine Gladu
600 Fountain Street
Blawnox, Pa 15238

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 12/6/14

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

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact installation of railings and door.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Germaine Gladu steps to the podium; she represents the custom ironwork company that did the work on the property. The ironwork part of the project has already been done. She presents the spec sheets for the material, which was solid carbon steel and cast iron. They did leave the original post located at the bottom of the entry stairs, which they repainted. She explains that after the railing was installed, there was a stop work notice issued. They had thought the owner had applied to the HRC for approval, but since that was not the case they are applying now. She shows a picture of the original railing, which she says was in complete disrepair. They always check to see if the railing can be restored, but determined that they wouldn't be able to in this case. They then went through a design process with the owners to design the new railing, making sure to use historic material.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks if the two window grates in the first floor windows in the before picture were replaced with one long grate.
 3. Ms. Gladu says yes. Her company had done work on the neighboring property, 912 Cedar, and the owners of 910 liked it and asked them to do something similar, a scaled-down version.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that he understands the deterioration of the original railing, but wonders why the original design wasn't copied in the new railing. He also states that window grates should be in keeping with the rest of the building, and the original designs should be used as well.
 6. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He agrees that the original railing design should have been used, as it is a significant feature of the building. He states that the new railing, although it is a quality product, is not similar to the old one and has changed the look of the building significantly. He agrees that window railings are appropriate, but recommends that the scrollwork be put back in.
 7. Ms. Gladu steps back to the podium to respond. She states that they believed the
-
-

scrollwork was not original and may have dated to the '50s or '60s due to the much thinner material. Instead of replicating it, then, they came up with a design based on the architectural details of the house, such as the dentils and frieze. She also states that water can sit in the scrollwork and cause rust. She speaks about the door, stating that the owner had custom replicas of the original outer doors made, they are wooden and not yet installed.

8. Mr. Kyriazi steps back to the podium to state that since the '50s were a time of disinvestment in the area, he can't imagine that someone would have installed such an ornate railing. He also doesn't believe it would have deteriorated to the degree that it did in that timeframe.
9. Mr. Hogan states that he has a problem with the window grate and feels that it is too big. He states that the height would generally be different and there would be individual grates for each window fitted into the masonry openings.
10. Mr. Serrao asks if the basement windows are glass block.
11. Ms. Gladu says she isn't sure as she wasn't involved in that part of the project.
12. Ms. Quinn reads the application and determines that there is nothing on the application about glass block.
13. Mr. Hogan states that there may not be enough information for them to make a decision. They will need pictures of the new doors.
14. Ms. Gladu asks what they would like to see as far as the window grate. She states that owners often request for the top to fall in the middle of the window for a better visual, and she would like to know for the future if the Commission prefers something else.
15. Mr. Hogan recommends preliminary sketches, because it will be on a case-by-case basis depending on the size and massing of the windows.
16. The Commission discusses whether to deny or table the application. Mr. Gastil suggests if they are okay with aspects of the work they could partially approve the application.
17. Mr. Hogan states that he is not okay with any of it.
18. Mr. Gastil asks about the railings on the steps.
19. Mr. Hogan says that maybe if it was just simple, but he is having a problem with the top ornate piece, because it would never have been a period piece.
20. Mr. Gastil states that since the doors may be appropriate, but they don't have a photo to determine that, they should table the application for incomplete information.
21. Mr. Hogan agrees, and he would also ask them to rework the ironwork to be more appropriate.

Motion:

22. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
 23. Mr. Harless seconds.
 24. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

406-408 Foreland Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominick DeGennaro
211 S. Evaline Street #1
Pittsburgh, Pa 15224

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-S-255, 256

Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominick DeGennaro
211 S. Evaline Street #1
Pittsburgh, Pa 15224

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Change in siding material.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Josiah Achison steps to the podium; he is the contractor for the project. He states that the only change to the project is the material to be used for siding on the front of the house. They had originally intended to save the existing wood siding, but they have since discovered that it's in very poor condition. The solution they would like to go with is Hardie plank, which would have the same profile and be virtually indistinguishable once painted, and it would be a lot more durable.
 2. Mr. Hogan says that he is familiar with the material and uses it frequently. He asks for public comment.
 3. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that if it was him, he would retore what is there. However, he did notice that the right side of the buildings seems to have smaller planks than the left side, implying that they were replaced at some point. He states that he is motivated more by aesthetics than by historic fabric, and the neighborhood group did replace clapboard siding on a house that they restored on Linden Place with Hardie plank because of the poor condition of the clapboard. A concern is that Hardie is not usually as thick as clapboard, so the shadow lines may be off.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the dimensions of the existing siding.
 5. Mr. Kyriazi says it looks like the opposite of what is usually done, with the boards being spaced further apart the higher they are. He is not sure of the logic behind it.
 6. Mr. Serrao says it is because the lower ones are subject to more damage.
 7. Mr. Kyriazi says that the siding has definitely undergone repairs and would not have been built the way it is now, with the different sizes on either side. He can't recall if the second story, which looks more intact, had the larger size/greater exposure than the lower part. In general, he has seen that there is a change in spacing in the siding between the first and second floors in historic buildings.
 8. Ms. Carol Peterson steps to the podium. She states that she hopes that the owners
-
-

will find a way to restore the siding. It looks to her like it is in relatively good shape, having dealt with that type of siding on some of her own properties, and that it can be restored with a few new pieces fit in. She also looked online and couldn't find any historic districts in the country that allow Hardie plank.

9. Mr. Gastil asks about the age of the properties that she restored.
 10. Ms. Peterson says one is 1850s and the other is 1860s.
 11. Mr. Gastil says that to him, looking at it after the fact, the siding on those houses looks better than he thinks this siding could ever be. It also looks larger and more regular.
 12. Ms. Peterson says that she did have to replace some boards, and had acquired some boards from a house that was demolished nearby. She states that part of the reason this siding looks so bad is that it has all of the old gray paint on it, but the quality of the wood looks good, and scraping, caulking, and painting may be able to restore it.
 13. Ms. Renee Rosensteel steps to the podium. She states that she has been inside the house, and can confirm that the wood is rotted.
 14. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He states that he has worked with the owners and has been in the house many times. He states that the lower right side is repaired clapboard that does not have as many layers of paint on it. In order to keep the original house, it would make sense to remove those and replace them with planks that match. He doesn't see a reason why the wood can't be preserved as it is remarkably intact for the age of the house. He expresses concern about trim, detailing, and finishes on the house.
 15. Mr. Hogan states that it was all approved and is off the table at this point.
 16. Mr. Achison steps back to the podium. He states that this is not the first old house he has worked on. He says that some of the siding is indeed in good condition, but there is a lot of damage even on the inside, and has been sitting exposed for a long time. He says that there is a point where any sanding and repairs would destroy the integrity of the wood, and if you can save 40 or 50 percent only, how will that end up looking and performing. He states that the owners are very concerned about conserving the identity of the house as far as all the trim and finishes go as well.
 17. The Commission discusses the application.
 18. Mr. Gastil asks if Hardie plank has come before the Commission on other projects.
 19. Mr. Hogan says yes, for a rear addition not a façade.
 20. Mr. Gastil asks if there is anything in the guidelines regarding Hardie plank.
 21. Mr. Hogan says no, it is a new material. He says this goes back to the larger discussion about how to incorporate today's materials into revised design guidelines.
 22. Mr. Gastil says they can table the application for more information about the wood and Hardie plank.
 23. Mr. Hogan agrees; the property is an important piece of history as there are not many 1830s houses still around. He says this property was originally up for
-
-

demolition, but now has owners willing to invest in it to save it. He suggests a site visit to understand the condition of the wood better and also to try and understand which was the original siding, the smaller or the larger.

24. Mr. Gastil says that the Commission needs to provide a clear direction as to whether or not Hardie plank will be acceptable if there is no option to restore existing siding, or if in-kind replacement with wood would be the only available option. He understands that there are price and maintenance factors to take into consideration.
25. Mr. Serrao agrees that this is an opportunity to look at a longer discussion of new materials that are available.
26. Mr. Gastil states that with that being said, he would ask the applicant to provide more details on the condition of the existing siding, and if it is not salvageable, to provide details on why the alternate material is preferable to in-kind replacement with wood.

Motion:

27. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days, with the intention of developing more information as to the condition of the existing siding, and for the Commission to review the alternatives for acceptable replacement.
 28. Mr. Gastil adds that more research can be done if possible on what the size of the original siding would have been.
 29. Mr. Hogan agrees.
 30. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 31. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1831 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

1831 E. Carson LLC
1831 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-338

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

1831 E. Carson LLC
1831 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 9/15/14

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. The applicant is not present. The Commission determines that the project has been on the agenda for three months without the applicant appearing. They decided at this point to deny the application.
-
-

Motion:

2. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application for an incomplete submission.
 3. Mr. Harless seconds.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

2603 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

PNC Financial Svcs Group
116 Allegheny Center Mall
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 16th

Lot and Block: 12-M-330

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Adam Lott
1 PPG Place 27th Floor
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 1/13/15

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

Proposed Changes: Relocation of ATM.

Discussion:

1. Mr. John Baker from PNC Realty Services steps to the podium. He explains that they are looking to move the existing ATM one bay over to the left on the storefront. The reason for this is that they will be subleasing the space, and in order to have the ATM still be serviced by an outside vendor, they will be installing a door inside the vestibule for access to the room. The ATM also needs to be moved to allow appropriate door swing and clearances for ADA access into the room. He presents the drawings, and states that the owner did go before the local review committee, who said they did not have a problem with moving the ATM but would like to see a redesign of the mullions. They have drawings for option A and B in response to the LRC's concerns.
 2. The Commission discusses the options.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve option A as submitted in the drawings.
 5. Mr. Harless seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1439 Juniata Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

Renee Rosensteel & William O'Driscoll
PO Box 99352
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 22-J-328

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:

Renee Rosensteel & William O'Driscoll
PO Box 99352
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Renee Rosensteel steps to the podium; she is the conservator for the property and also lives adjacent to it. She explains the project, stating that they are trying to restore the property and make it a viable part of the neighborhood again. It was a total mess and was without heat or electricity for two years. She states that they would like to repoint the brick, which has sustained a lot of water damage. The sandstone foundation also needs to be parged due to water damage. They will be repairing the slate roof and the box gutters. They will paint with colors that are close to the original colors. They will need to replace the front door; she shows specs for the one that they like. She also says that they would like to run the front gutter around to the back to a rain barrel on their own property.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He discloses that the organization he works for did help Ms. Rosensteel obtain conservatorship.
 3. Ms. Rosensteel also mentions the windows; they will replace the white aluminum storm windows with black ones.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve façade renovations as submitted.
 5. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1310 W. North Avenue

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

Nivlem Properties, LP
PO Box 23353
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 7-B-370

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:

Arctecon, LLC
3441 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Andrew Reichert steps to the podium; he is representing the owner. He also introduces Grant Scott, who is representing the architecture firm. He states that the project is the renovation of a single-family home. He states that the house had some alterations made to it around the '70s that detract from its historic nature, and they are looking to return it to its original state. They will be removing the aluminum awning, replacing the front railing, and restoring the door opening to its original size with a historically appropriate door. They would like to replace windows with vinyl-clad wood, according the Manchester historic district guidelines. They will also being doing in-kind replacement of some of the wood on the mansard roof. They will also be doing some work in the rear, including closing up a door and replacing it with a window.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for further information on the window material.
 3. Mr. Reichert says that it is a wooden window with vinyl applied to the exterior.
 4. Mr. Scott steps to the podium. He talks about the project and how they are trying to bring the building back to its original condition. He states that the windows are much like aluminum-clad windows in that they have more relief than an extruded vinyl window. He says that the color they are intending to use is black. The door will have its transom restored. He says the building has existing glass block windows in the basement, which they need some direction on. He states that the concrete-block stoop is existing, and they will be replacing the railing, which he hopes will be acceptable. He says that it sounds like the best strategy for the basement windows would be to replace the glass block windows with the vinyl-clad wood windows with security bars on top.
 5. The Commission agrees.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 7. Mr. Hogan recuses himself from the discussion due to a contract he has with the
-
-

architect.

8. Mr. Serrao asks about the rear elevation materials.
9. Mr. Scott says that there is a plaster finish, which they will continue to use on the rear.

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve façade renovations as submitted in the drawings, with the addition of removal of the glass block windows, to be replaced with vinyl-clad wooden windows and metal bars as necessary.
 11. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

24 Market Square

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

Nola Pgh Inc
930 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-D-128

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Sipp Tepe Architects
PO Box 332
N. Lima, Oh 44452

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 12/20/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Canopy addition over sidewalk.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Doug Sipp steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains that the business has been seeing a lot of exterior traffic, and they are trying to enhance the outdoor dining area as well as protect patrons from the sun. He shows their proposal for a permanent awning, which will have a motorized louver system and interior lighting.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if they were able to determine if the building ever had a canopy like this.
 3. Mr. Sipp says as far as he knows it never had one, but the facade has been massively renovated from the original design.
 4. Mr. Hogan says he is concerned about the effect of a permanent structure on the street face.
 5. Mr. Harless mentions encroachment.
 6. Mr. Sipp says they know that they would have to go through the Planning and Art Commissions.
 7. Mr. Gastil asks about precedent.
 8. Ms. Quinn says there are several other outdoor seating areas like this in the district.
 9. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the Commission did approve the Primanti's canopy because they demonstrated that the building had a similar canopy in the '20s. He also says that the Diamond Market canopy was approved because the building is less of a contributing building. The project has neither of those factors.
 10. Mr. Gastil asks how far the canopy extends out from the façade.
 11. Mr. Sipp says about twelve feet.
 12. Mr. Serrao states his concerns that because Market Square has become a
-
-

“restaurant row”, with many restaurants having outdoor seating areas, they will continue to receive these requests for permanent canopy structures. Market Square will become a covered arcade, which good or bad is definitely not historic. He doesn’t see an issue with the design per se, just the precedent.

13. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

14. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application.

15. Mr. Gastil seconds.

16. Mr. Hogan comments that no information was provided that any canopy had existed in the past.

17. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

1417 Sheffield Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

Betsy O'Neill
1417 Sheffield Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 7-B-382

Inspector: Jim King

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Rear renovations including new dormer.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains that they are proposing to add a dormer to the rear-shedding gable on the the house. He states that the dormer will be framed in lumber but clad in painted AZEK. The windows will be wooden with a historic profile and aluminum-clad.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
-
-

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve renovations including a new dormer as submitted.
 4. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1200 Resaca Place

Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Glenn Olcerst
1200 Resaca Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-K-96

Inspector: Jim King

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 12/14/14

Applicant:

Glenn Olcerst
1200 Resaca Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

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

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact installation of artwork on building façade.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Glenn Olcerst steps to the podium; he is the applicant and owner of the property. He explains that his property is the host of one of the 240 words in the “River of Words” art installation, which is a partnership between the City of Asylum and the Pittsburgh Office of public art. He is appearing today on behalf of his word and his neighbors that want to be able to keep their words. He states that in addition to the historic homes, the neighborhood boasts a thriving art community. He states that this art installation has received much favorable press, even internationally, and has seen requests for words in other neighborhoods both historic and not. He states that if a purpose of historic preservation is to “preserve and restore the harmonious outward appearance of structures, which attracts tourists and residents” then the River of Words is helping the city reach this goal. He said that when homeowners were told that the words must be removed by December 27, the commission undermined its mission by conveying a negative message about living in a historic district. He states that in the 2012 public meeting about the proposed expansion of the historic district, Ms. Quinn had stated that being in a historic district does not preclude public art, and that the Commission was working on new guidelines that would include art. Although it has been two and a half years and the guidelines have yet to be published, the December 27th ultimatum was imposed. The deadline results in a loss of almost half of the installation, because residents are unable to take a day off from work to attend a hearing and are unwilling to pay the \$100 fee. A new fee structure for artists and art is necessary because the fees are prohibitive, and the current process precludes art altogether. He states that as historic districts are good for property values of the neighborhood, the city, and its tax base, the city’s approach here is counterproductive. He states that issues like this are why it will be impossible to get neighbors to agree on ever expanding the historic district. He quotes two positive quotes from neighborhood social media about the River of Words installation. He also states that it is perplexing that the Commission already approved his own art installation and the method used to secure it to the mortar
-
-

joints. He states the Mr. Hogan had said that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the art, but just over how it is attached to the historic building. The Commission agreed that artwork is not a sign or a fixture, which sets precedent and agrees with the Mexican War Streets guidelines. The words are all either attached to mortar joints, wood, or the outsides of windows, none of which impair the form or integrity of the historic buildings. He shows an example of the screw that was used. He says removal of the words will not cause any damage. He states that given that there have been no new historic districts or expansions, he hopes that the Commission is not mired in minutia. He states that the line being drawn between temporary and permanent art is also perplexing, as the guidelines state that they apply to both temporary and permanent structures. He states that the community is losing the benefit of permanent, world-class art. He says that nothing else applied to the exterior of building such as flags and window boxes has an expiration date or needs review. He hopes that his application can be an opportunity for the Commission to rethink how it deals with art and artists. He presents a letter of support from the Mexican War Streets Society.

2. Mr. Hogan says that the letter is somewhat ambiguous, as it is speaking to 200+ applications that would require a fee of \$100. It is not placing a value or judgment on the project itself. They are arguing the process rather than supporting the project.
 3. Mr. Olcerst presents several articles about the River of Words installation. He says that according to the guidelines, the Commissioners shall consider first the following factor when reviewing proposed exterior alterations, which is the extent to which the proposal will promote the welfare of the city and its citizens. There is no alteration that meets this criterion more than this world-class artwork. He hopes they take the time to consider how prestigious what they are asking to be taken down really is.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. Dan Deis steps to the podium. He is a neighbor and very strongly supports keeping the installation up. He has one in his window, and he agrees that it is easily removable. He says that if they can keep them up, they will be a highlight of the neighborhood and its home tour.
 6. Ms. Jana Thompson steps to the podium. She is a neighbor and has a word. She says it is not any more intrusive than Christmas decorations, and is secured by two small screws in the wood. She is in support of the installation.
 7. Mr. Greg Mucha steps to the podium. He is a neighbor and the historic chair of the Mexican War Streets Society. He reads the MWSS's letter of support.
 8. Ms. Kathy Deis steps to the podium. She is the green space chair for the neighborhood, and has heard a lot of support from neighbors about the project.
 9. Ms. Barbara Talerico steps to the podium. She is a former president of the Allegheny City Central Association and the MWSS. She states that they are asking for the River of Words installation to remain on their houses indefinitely, and to require only over-the-counter review for new words. She would like to see the Commission, rather than focus on the small stuff, to turn its attention to developing new guidelines and to be an advocate for the neighborhoods and not an adversary.
-
-

-
-
10. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He knows neighbors with words and wanted one of his own. He supports having the words remain up, and is glad that there is a review process for a project this big. He states that a graffiti font rather than a typeface might detract from a structure and be inappropriate.
 11. Mr. Serrao says that entirely depends on your definition of art.
 12. Mr. Gates says that he just thinks that a graffiti script could inspire actual graffiti on buildings.
 13. Mr. Serrao says that from a Commissioner's perspective, if this is approved, they could not prevent someone from putting up a graffiti script work. They could not arbitrate what is art or not.
 14. Mr. Gates says that he is just saying that he is glad there is a review process.
 15. The Commission states that these words did not undergo review, and that is why it is before the Commission today.
 16. Mr. Gates says review would have been appropriate, as something like a graffiti font could be damaging. He states his support for the project.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
 18. Mr. Hogan says this raises an important and very curious discussion, and is new territory for the Commission. He stands by his previous words, that community is a combination of fabric and other components such as the streetscape and possibly public art. He thinks they need to step back and take a longer view of this; as the city evolves, the policies and procedures put into place initially will need to be evaluated. He is not sure about public art in a residential district, but at the same time he thinks that public art in the public realm will become an important part of what the city is and will evolve to be. He thinks this application needs to be postponed for more research and evaluation. The Commission shouldn't be dictating what neighborhoods are; rather, the neighborhoods should be dictating what they are to the Commission. At the same time, they need to make sure they are protecting the historic fabric of the communities.
 19. Mr. Gastil adds that he is well aware of the importance of this project and the City of Asylum itself, and he appreciates that this community and others have embraced the work. He wants to remind everyone, however, that "sweating the small stuff" is part of what the Commission does; the community has asked them to and it is part of their responsibility to do so. When a historic district is created and becomes law, there is a serious process that is followed that requires great attention to detail. He also appreciates that the Commission should also look to the greater good of the city.
 20. Ms. Quinn clarifies that she found less than ten words in the historic district when doing a site visit, so there is minimal impact.
 21. Mr. Serrao says that his concern is precedent. The Art Commission doesn't deal with art on private property, and the Commission is not equipped to determine what art is. Although he likes this art installation, he is concerned what someone else might propose, and if they would then be required to approve it.
 22. Mr. Hogan states that they should table the application for a month or two to understand the breadth of what they are being asked to do, and to confer with colleagues on the Art Commission and others. He states that art is not traditionally
-
-

part of the historic fabric.

23. Mr. Olcerst asks that in the interim they withdraw the December 27th order to remove the words.
24. Ms. Quinn clarified that it was not an order from the city or Commission. It came from the Office of Public Art acknowledging that the installation was officially coming to an end, and informing that after that date it would need to come before the Commission.
25. Mr. Hogan says he appreciates his passion and that he is bringing this issue before the Commission, because it is something they have to figure out. He reiterates that the letter was information from the Office of Public Art indicating the end of an installation and the implications of that.
26. Mr. Olcert states that they did set a precedent by approving his application.
27. Mr. Gastil says that was an individual application that was approved, and part of the issue here is if that whole process is applicable.
28. Mr. Hogan acknowledges the letters of support from the Allegheny City Association and Mexican War Streets Society, as well as the various news articles as submitted.

Motion:

29. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 60 days.
 30. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 31. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

15 Oakland Square

Oakland Square Historic District

Owner:

MAO Realty LLC
1168 Tranter Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-M-133

Inspector: Bob McPherson

Applicant:

MAO Realty LLC
1168 Tranter Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 1/15/15

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

Proposed Changes: Window replacement and installation of rear side porch railing.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Michael Orlando steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He talks about the issues he has with replacement of his front window. He states that the existing window is fixed in the center with two side panels. When the inspector looked at it he said it did not meet the code for egress as there is a bedroom located there. He was originally going to go with a similar layout Trimline aluminum-clad window. The manufacturer declined to install the window because of the egress issue, and the inspector agrees that the same style of window won't work. He shows photos of other buildings in the historic district, many of which have aluminum or vinyl slider windows to meet egress.
 2. Mr. Hogan says he doesn't think the Commission can approve a slider.
 3. Mr. Harless asks is he is also changing use of the building.
 4. Mr. Orlando says no, that has already been done; it is an approved two-unit property.
 5. Mr. Hogan states that it was probably converted from single-family years ago.
 6. Mr. Orlando says it was constructed as a two-unit building. He had also asked if a double-hung window with a center mullion would meet egress and he was told it would not. He is basically stuck and looking for guidance at this point. He says there is another component of his application which is the railing. He would either install one that had all straight pickets or alternating straight and twisted pickets.
 7. Mr. Hogan says he could do a wrought-iron railing with a top that curves down.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 9. Mr. Harless goes back to the window. He states that he probably has options that can meet the building code without having to resort to a vinyl slider. He states that he can look at casement-type windows to give a larger egress size. If he can't find a window with a large enough egress size, there are other code alternatives that they can discuss. He states that with the guardrail, if there is a fall of more than 30
-
-

inches, you do need a guardrail with openings of no more than four inches.

10. Mr. Orlando says he does have a letter from the manufacturer to that effect. He says the material will be black steel.
11. Mr. Hogan says he would prefer a non-twisted, straight railing. He says that the problem he is having with the window is that originally it would have been one giant window, and part of it seems to have been bricked in. He is concerned about proportion.
12. Ms. Quinn asks if it should be over the counter.
13. Mr. Orlando asks if Mr. Harless could give him some guidance.

Motion:

14. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the side and rear porch railings and handrails, to be black and straight, with final drawings to be submitted to staff for review. For the window, after discussion with PLI, the window design is to be resubmitted and reviewed by staff.
 15. Ms. Quinn asks if it should be a single pane.
 16. Mr. Hogan says they wouldn't be able to get a casement window that big. They will just have to look at it.
 17. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

3423 Parkview Avenue

Oakland Square Historic District

Owner:

Theodora DeNim
6303 Archer Ranch Home
Rosenberg, Tx 77473

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-S-102

Inspector: Bob McPherson

Applicant:

Nicholas Lardas
3434 Parkview Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 12/2/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Change in roofing material.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Nick Lardas steps to the podium; he is the contractor for the project. He states that the request is to replace a worn-out slate roof with a shingle roof. The color will be pewter grey, which is basically the same color as the existing slate, and it will be a dimensional shingle.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none
-
-

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the change of roofing material as submitted.
 4. Mr. Harless seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

947 Penn Avenue

Penn-Liberty Historic District

Owner:

Yves Carreau
947 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-135

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

DLA+ Architecture
750 Holiday Drive
Foster Plaza Building 9, Suite 200
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 1/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of operable storefront system.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Kerry Solomon steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they are presenting a street-level renovation of the Sonoma restaurant. He shows pictures of the façade; the restaurant occupies the right two bays of the three. They are proposing an operable storefront system in the center bay. They will be keeping the look of the existing storefront as much as they can, but were unable to find a product without vertical mullions. The height was also too tall for the operable system at twelve feet, so they are proposing a transom at eight feet with a horizontal mullion.
 2. Mr. Hogan says his concern is that the rhythm of the storefronts will be inconsistent.
 3. The Commission discusses the issues with the operable storefront.
 4. Mr. Hogan suggests they do an applied muntin to carry the transom across to the right bay.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

6. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of an operable storefront system, with the addition of a muntin system on the right bay as shown in the drawings. The transom muntin is the only one that needs to be duplicated on the right bay.
 7. Mr. Harless seconds.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

4147 Bigelow Boulevard Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:

Thomas Kamarck
4147 Bigelow Boulevard
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-266

Inspector: Bob McPherson

Applicant:

Greenheart Companies
6001 Southern Boulevard
Boardman, Oh 44512

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 1/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Mike Angeli steps to the podium. He explains the project, stating that his company turns single-paned windows into double-glazed windows. They take out the existing sashes and modify them to accept the glass, and create an applied muntin out of wood to the exterior. The look of the window does not change. He states that there are five or six of these windows on the house, but they are only requesting to do one.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the window replacement as submitted.
 4. Mr. Harless seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

223 Tennyson Avenue

Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:

Mr. & Mrs. Rolf Jacobs
223 Tennyson Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-211

Inspector: Bob McPherson

Applicant:

Robert Dabney

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 1/16/15

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

Proposed Changes: Installation of skylights.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Robert Dabney steps to the podium. He explains that he was approved for a new roof material for this address several months ago, and the owners are now looking to install skylights. They want to go with something very tasteful and unobtrusive. He shows the locations on the roof where the skylights will be located. The skylights will be “sun tunnels”. He says on the one side they would be visible from Parkman, but they are small, and on the other side they would not be visible at all.
 2. Mr. Serrao states that the one that is not visible from the street is no problem, but the other ones are too visible.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the interior skylight opposite the neighboring property, and deny the two skylights facing Parkman Avenue.
 5. Mr. Harless seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

160 43rd Street—Turney House

Historic Nomination

Owner:

Carol Peterson
172 46th Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 9th

Lot and Block: 49-B-791

Inspector: Gabe Mastroberardino

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 1/9/15

Applicant:

Carol Peterson
172 46th Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

National Register Status: Listed:

Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Nomination.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn makes a short presentation on the property. She states that she feels that the property meets two of the criteria for historic designation. The first is “exemplification of a distinctive architectural type, style or design” as it is one of the few remaining examples of Greek Revival architecture in the neighborhood. The second is “exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development” as it was one of the earliest buildings in the neighborhood and represents buildings of the time. She also believes that it meets the standards of integrity.
2. Ms. Peterson steps to the podium to discuss the nomination with the Commission. She is the owner and nominator. She states that she nominated it to ensure that it stays the way it is in a rapidly developing neighborhood. She states that the house is under agreement, and the potential buyer has been notified of the nomination.
3. Mr. Serrao recommends getting something in writing from them.
4. Mr. Hogan says that he is struggling as a Commissioner with the nomination of individual buildings versus districts. He states that it would be easier for a Commissioner to nominate a district than a community group.
5. Mr. Serrao states that this is a general question and not a problem with this nomination per se.

Motion:

6. Mr. Serrao motions to accept the application for historic nomination as it meets criteria 3 and 8.
7. Mr. Harless seconds.
8. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.