



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

Minutes of the Meeting of May 6, 2015  
Beginning at 12:30 PM  
200 Ross Street  
First Floor Hearing Room  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<b><i>Members</i></b>	<b><i>Staff</i></b>	<b><i>Others</i></b>	
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	Sarah Sims Erwin	Darren Toth
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Barbara Talerico	Glenn Olcerst
Ray Gastil		Brian Bernard	John Francona
Ernie Hogan		Peter Margittai	Catalina Estrada
Carol Peterson		Greg Mucha	Jorgen Christensen
Matthew Falcone		Adam Stokes	Bob Baumbach
		James Pastorius	Kate Kay
		Andrew Wickesberg	

**Old Business**—None.

### **New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the April meeting 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 April 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 Business:**

1. Ms. Quinn reports that the new visual guidelines are being completed and should be posted on the website for review. She states that it is up to the Commission if they would like to formally adopt them and they can be placed on the agenda for June. She gives updates on current and proposed grant projects including a possible National Register nomination for Lawrenceville and survey work. She gives an update on a current issue with the unapproved demolition of 1224 Monterey Street, which will be on the agenda next month.
2. Mr. Hogan asks about outstanding enforcement issues. Ms. Quinn will research the addresses and provide them to Mr. Harless.
3. Mr. Hogan welcomes the two new Commission members. He notes for the record that the Commission held an executive session prior to the meeting so they could consult with legal counsel.

### **Adjourn:**

Mr. Hogan motions to adjourn the meeting.

**The discussion of the agenda items follows.**

**2006 E. Carson Street**      **East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Caleb Campbell  
2006 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-K-17

Inspector: Jack Heath

**Applicant:**

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

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/17/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations , extension of existing front parapet & addition of rooftop terrace.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Peter Margittai steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that the building was originally a home and is now used as an office on the ground floor with apartments above. He states that the building has most of its original features intact, and the only alteration that has been made to the façade is a parapet wall added to the top of the building. They are proposing to restore the façade by cleaning the brick, repointing, repairing the wood moldings, and adding a new light fixture. They are also proposing to add a twelve-inch extension to the parapet and reface it, as it is currently covered in aluminum. They would face it with cedar and paint it a color that would help it to recede in the elevation. He talks about the proposed roof terrace, stating that it will not be more than 1/3 of the lower floors so it will not be considered a story, but rather a mezzanine. They want to get it as close to the front of the building as possible while hiding it behind the extended parapet. The owner has also requested a pergola to be added, which they have situated as far back as possible; however it will still be visible from the rear alley. The stair is exterior and will connect to a third-floor landing.
  2. Mr. Hogan acknowledges a letter from the LRC. He asks for public testimony; there is none.
  3. Mr. Hogan states that he is uncomfortable with the pergola. He also states that with code requirements, the railing on the deck will be seen from East Carson. He thinks the deck should be pulled back from the parapet wall.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks how far the deck is pulled back from the parapet now.
  5. Mr. Margittai says about four to eight inches; they tried to pull it back far enough to not be visible but not so far that the view would be obscured.
  6. Mr. Harless asks what the height of the parapet to the finished surface of the deck would be.
  7. Mr. Margittai says it was something less than what code requires, less than 30
- 
-

---

---

inches or so. He clarifies that the deck is for residential use only.

8. Mr. Harless asks if they checked how far back the deck would need to be for the existing parapet to meet code.
9. Mr. Margittai says it would be back about three and a half feet.
10. Mr. Hogan states that the parapet is not original, and was probably added when the roof modifications were made. He doesn't know if this was done prior to or after the historic district; regardless, it is already a nonconforming piece of the façade and he doesn't want to exacerbate that. He would prefer the parapet to be kept and the deck to be moved back.
11. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that the pergola is also an issue and would be too visible.

---

---

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations and roof deck with the modification that the pergola be removed, the parapet be left as-is, and the deck is pulled back three feet from the existing parapet.
  13. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**431 Market Street**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Alex LLC  
431 Market Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-D-144

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Richard Machel & Caveman Signs

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/6/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** After-the-fact refenestration and signage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Brian Denard with Caveman Signs steps to the podium. Richard Machel, the owner of the property, also steps to the podium. Mr. Denard explains the sign portion of the application, stating that they are looking for permission to light up the main wall sign. It is currently externally illuminated with gooseneck lamps. He shows photos of other signs in the district that have internally illuminated channel letters. They are also proposing a new blade sign.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification on how the wall sign is lit.
  3. Mr. Denard states that the individual channel letters are internally illuminated.
  4. Ms. Quinn mentions that the awnings were changed, which would have been an over-the-counter approval, and there is also another item on the agenda which is the relocation of the front door over one bay.
  5. Mr. Machel also states they would like to propose cleaning the masonry and repainting the previously-painted areas of the façade.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
  7. The Commission discusses internally illuminated signage in historic districts. Mr. Hogan states that the examples provided are either not in the district or are not permissible. [Noodles & Company’s sign was approved on September 12, 2011; Dibella’s sign was approved on October 11, 2010] Mr. Hogan states that his interpretation of the guidelines is that individual letters of a sign may be halo-lit. Mr. Harless reads the guidelines, which seem to allow individual internally lit letters. [Sign guidelines read as follows: “Back-lighting of signs will not be permitted in the Market Square Historic District, with the following exceptions. Individual letters of a sign may be back-lit. Back-lit marquees advertising changing performance or shows may be permitted for a theater or cinema. All such signs shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.”] Ms. Quinn states that halo-lit signs have to come to Commission as there is nothing in the guidelines regarding them, and as far as internally-lit signs go, internally-lit box signs are not
- 
-

---

---

permitted. Mr. Hogan states that they have required other applicants to black out the faces of the letters and only allow them to glow around the edges, and he feels that this sign should be the same.

8. Mr. Hogan also states that he thinks the after-the-fact façade renovations are fine, as they did not alter the openings, and he also thinks that the masonry cleaning and painting are fine.

---

---

**Motion:**

9. Mr. Harless motions to approve the masonry cleaning and painting, the backlit individual lettered sign on the front façade, the projecting sign on the condition that it not be internally illuminated, but externally illuminated only, and relocation of the front entrance.
  10. Mr. Serrao seconds.
  11. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Harless, Ms. Peterson, Mr. Falcone, and Mr. Gastil are in favor and Mr. Hogan is opposed. Motion carries.
- 
-

**404 N. Taylor Avenue**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Adam Bodenmiller  
404 N. Taylor Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-K-62

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Adam Bodenmiller  
404 N. Taylor Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Closing of rear door.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Adam Bodenmiller steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He explains the project, stating that they are proposing to close in the back door on the rear addition.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks what material they will use to close it off.
  3. Mr. Bodenmiller states that it will be siding to match the existing.
  4. Mr. Harless asks if they will be taking the siding all the way across the rear façade.
  5. Mr. Bodenmiller says yes.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the closing of the rear door as submitted.
  8. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks if they want to add any conditions to the approval.
  10. Mr. Serrao adds that the siding should be replaced the entire length of the wall to match existing siding.
  11. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1220 Monterey Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Lauren Reynolds & Anthony Cabral  
1220 Monterey Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-267

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Bob Baumbach  
900 Middle Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/2/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of rear addition.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that they are proposing a second story addition to the garage. He shows the site plan, explaining that the Victorian townhouse has a later, early 1900s addition in the rear and a garage from the 1980s. The addition would be on top of this garage and would also have a terrace. He shows photos of the property. They are proposing to remove the pitched roof of the garage and construct the addition with a roofline to match that of the 1900s addition. They will be residing the addition with Hardie board and replace the trim with more appropriate trim. One-third of the addition will be a terrace with a storage area. The addition will have French casement windows and a three-quarter-lite door. The addition will also be sided in Hardie board, and will have appropriate trim and half-round gutters. He shows what the railing system will be for the terrace. He also mentions that there will be a skylight in the roof.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for more details on the skylight and if it will be seen from the alley.
  3. Mr. Baumbach says it may be visible from the alley; however there is a fence on the alley, and the roof plane may obscure it from most angles.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  5. Mr. Glenn Olcerst steps to the podium. He states that Day Way, the alley, is very narrow and mainly used by residents. The addition will not be visible from the main streets. He also states that many alleyway houses in the neighborhood have additions on the garages. He is in support of the project.
  6. Mr. Jorgen Christensen steps to the podium. He is a neighbor and expresses his support for the project.
  7. Mr. Greg Mucha steps to the podium. He sees no problem with the proposal and adds that the property has a large tree that will help screen the skylight.
  8. Ms. Kate Kay steps to the podium; she is the president of the Mexican War Streets
- 
-

---

---

Society. She has a concern about the casement window and if it is visible; she feels is it not an appropriate window.

9. Mr. Frank Quinn steps to the podium. He is a neighbor and expresses his support for the project.
10. Mr. Dennis Vodzak steps to the podium; he expresses his support for the project.
11. The Commission asks if the item is a set of French doors or a casement window.
12. Mr. Baumbach states that it is a casement window, which they will do in wood. The balcony outside is just a flower box.

---

---

**Motion:**

13. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a rear addition with a deck and skylight, with final materials to be submitted to staff.
  14. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  15. 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 confirms that the two letters of support from ACCA and the MWSS have been received, as well as all the information and testimony from the previous hearing. He explains the project, stating that the City of Asylum has partnered with exiled writers and artists as well as residents of the historic district to create River of Words. The project's word installations are intended to cultivate cultural connections in the neighborhood, and art and expression are core elements of the neighborhood community plan. Residents have chosen words based on their content, and he feels that this represents the community's choice of the labels to describe itself. The "art" is not any one piece, but the aggregation of the free expression of the community. He states that prior to the December end date of the project, roughly 42% of the words were located in the historic district. The words are secured with one-inch screws attached to mortar joints or wood, or they are displayed in windows. He states that the word installation is fully protected political speech, as it is part of a larger project to provide sanctuary to exiled writers and to encourage political discourse. He states that the First Amendment provides the broadest protection to such political expression in order to ensure the exchange of ideas and the bringing about of political and social change desired by the people. This protection does include art used in a political context. Therefore, he feels that the HRC is very limited as to what it can do, and in this case has not met the heavy burden of proof required to regulate such speech. He states that the HRC previously asked the Pittsburgh Office of Public Art to require residents to remove their words by December 27, pay a fine, or pay \$100 to have a HRC hearing. He states that the HRC has continued to permit other forms of speech such as security signs, for rent signs, flags, etc. He provides examples that have been in the neighborhood for more than six months and thus not considered temporary. He states that restricting River of Words constitutes prohibited content-based regulation. He also states that if the installation is analyzed within the HRC code for signage, it must be permitted; he quotes from the Mexican War
- 
-

---

---

Streets guidelines regarding methods of attachment and location, and finds that the words do pass the test. The attachment will cause no irreversible damage and does not obscure architectural features. The words also meet size and material requirements. He states that at the end of the last hearing the Commission indicated the need for a 60 day hiatus to study First Amendment issues, to consider the publication of new guidelines applicable to art in historic districts, and to consider a streamlining of the process and a lower fee for art, but he states that there has been no opportunity for community input. He states that over 135 neighbors have signed a petition of support for the project. He quotes one of the many comments attached to the petition, indicating that the words could increase cultural literacy. He states that a denial of the application would cause real harm to the neighborhood and a diminishment of its future potential. He states that at the last hearing the HRC indicated an inability to regulate art, and if this is the case, his application should be approved. However, he states that since the HRC has already regulated art in his application last summer, the HRC has a burden of fair regulation and providing due process, and an underlying obligation of obeying the First Amendment. He states that the HRC can't permit commercial speech and signs while denying non-commercial and free political speech. He introduces the first speaker, Professor Caitlin Bruce, who has compiled a transcription of oral histories from word-holders.

2. Mr. Serrao asks if the words were initially approved as temporary and they are asking for them to be permanent.
  3. Mr. Olcerst says that the words were never approved initially. They are now asking for the words to be permitted for however long the residents want to keep them.
  4. Mr. Falcone asks if his word has any historical context to his house.
  5. Mr. Olcerst says no, although he can't speak for the other word-holders. He does say that his word "Poem" relates to a poem he has on a plaque in the ground in front of his house.
  6. Mr. Gastil mentions that the art piece that he did have approved is not on the front façade of his house but rather on the side alley wall.
  7. Mr. Olcerst says yes, but it is fully visible from the main street.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He notes that although the applicant is not limited in their testimony, the public comment will be limited to three minutes each.
  9. Ms. Caitlin Bruce steps to the podium. She wants to explain the effect that the River of Words has had on Northside residents, its political and social importance, and how it relates to both HRC goals and the goals of the city to present itself as diverse and progressive. She says that public art creates spaces for people to interact and engage with each other, which is critical to civic life. She states that River of Words has created such a space. She also states that public art is a draw to neighborhoods that are perceived as being in decline, which has been the case with art and the Northside generally and with this project. She says that River of Words also resonates personally with the word-holders and allows them to share their lives and histories. She talks about the charge that historic districts are only for the wealthy, and states that this project is one way that diverse residents can communicate across differences. She also talks about how the project and public
- 
-

---

---

art contribute to the city's goal of being a global city.

10. Ms. Kate Kay steps to the podium; she is the president of the MWSS. She states that they maintain, as they said in their statement, that they can't comment on the art, they do not have a problem with the way the words are attached. The words do no irreversible damage to the buildings.
  11. Mr. Andrew Wickesburg steps to the podium; he is the president of ACCA. He states that the community is deeply supportive of art and freedom of expression, which this project exemplifies. He states their support for the project, as expressed in their letter.
  12. Mr. Adam Stokes steps to the podium; he is from the City of Asylum. He talks about the mission of his organization. He expresses their support for the application as it is consistent with their mission of freedom of expression and cultural exchange.
  13. Mr. Frank Quinn steps to the podium. He expresses his support for the project. He talks about his experiences with a neighborhood youth group and the positive impact of this project on them.
  14. Ms. Lindsey Morrow steps to the podium. She expresses her support for the project.
  15. Ms. Sarah Sims Erwin steps to the podium. She expresses support for the project. She owns a property in Deutschtown and also has a word that is very meaningful to her.
  16. Ms. Kathy Deis steps to the podium. She addresses the question about the historical significance of the words, stating that the words represent the people that live there, not the buildings.
  17. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
  18. Mr. Hogan acknowledges the letters of support and petitions received. He also clarifies that it was not at the order of the HRC that a letter was sent to uninstall the art; it was at the will of the Office of Public Art. He states that they need to think about whether this issue constitutes a modification of a historic structure. He states that it is not in the code and is not their privy to monitor, sanction, or determine art. It is within their privy to look at alterations to historic artifacts and determine if there is a detrimental effect to the property or community. He states that the application has raised some very interesting points. He addresses the photos that were submitted, and states that they are all temporary installations of signage, and he is not looking at a signage decision on this application, but rather an alteration of the structure. He says they are primarily looking at code sections 1101.5 and 1101.8.
  19. Mr. Gastil agrees that they have to look at those two sections of code. He also says that there should be a solution that meets the goals of the neighborhood and of historic preservation. He states that this is a good opportunity to revise the guidelines to articulate the points that were made in the application.
  20. Mr. Olcerst states that during the proposal to expand the historic district, there was a public hearing in which they were told a historic district and public art are not mutually exclusive, and that new guidelines were being worked on. Years later, they still don't have those guidelines. He feels that the Commission is putting it
- 
-

---

---

back on the neighborhood to do their work for them. He also states that the letter from the Office of Public Art came from a staff visit to the neighborhood where the words were noticed, and the letter was a compromise between staff and the OPA. He states that they are losing the benefit of world-class art by using the temporary label. He also states that the attachments have already been made, whether the installation is temporary or not. He reiterates the community's support and says they are looking for a decision to be made today.

21. Mr. Hogan states that he understands their position. He states that he would like to address the historic district expansion. He says the application was treated as if it would be an additional district, with its own set of guidelines, if approved. Those guidelines would have been established by that district at that time. This does not apply to the existing Mexican War Streets, as the district is already in place and has adopted the guidelines that were created by the community and adopted by the HRC. He states again that the words are not signs, it is an art installation and although they have no privy to discuss art or its content, there has been an alteration to the building that the applicant is applying for approval of. The guidelines show that these are fixtures that have been attached, and the question before the HRC is if the fixtures are detrimental to the artifact, or if they enhance and contribute to the architecture and the fabric. He states that the HRC can offer a solution that he thinks is probably more appropriate. A multi-year process has been completed as part of the city's comprehensive plan to develop new guidelines for historic districts. The guidelines do include a small statement about the possibility of public art. The new guidelines have not been adopted and included in the code as of yet. What he would like to see, which he feels would be helpful for the Commission and the city, is this discussion to be used as an opportunity to define their district. He states that there have been advances in building materials as well as situations where residents wish to express themselves. He asks if they are willing to consider working on modifications to the guidelines for the district.
  22. Mr. Olcerst states that he is perplexed because under the current guidelines, as an alteration, indicate that the installation does not cause irreversible damage, and the benefit of it is clear from the testimony. He doesn't understand why the Commission is struggling with this.
  23. Mr. Serrao states that the issue is not the art or the message, those are irrelevant to the Commission. The concern is how the alteration meshes with the historic fabric of the building. He states that there is no history of this type of alteration in the district.
  24. Mr. Olcerst says there is, as the Commission approved his artwork last July.
  25. Mr. Serrao states again that the difference is that it was not on the primary façade of a building. Without guidance from the guidelines as to what is permissible or not, there is a grey area.
  26. Mr. Olcerst states that if he understands correctly, no one who currently has a word will have to remove it while modifications to guidelines are being considered.
  27. Mr. Gastil states that the HRC can't speak to that, but he will speak for the city and states that it will not be enforced.
  28. Mr. Olcerst states that the two organizations present, the MWS and ACCA, would be the ones to help rewrite the guidelines, and he confers with them. They state that they will consider it but can't give an answer today without a vote from the
- 
-

---

---

board and membership, so they will get back to the HRC, hopefully with new guidelines.

29. Mr. Hogan offers the full support of staff and his own personal time to help. He is willing to let them do what they need to do and get back to staff.
30. Mr. Olcerst states that he would like and research available about how other districts have gone about writing guidelines.
31. Ms. Quinn offers her help and states that this is an opportunity to take a look at all the guidelines. She will provide a copy of the revised guideline to Kate Kay from the MWS.
32. Mr. Harless, as the representative from PLI, the traditional enforcement for the HRC, wants to clarify that none of the word holders have received any notices of violation from PLI. He reiterates that he does not intend to enforce this issue.
33. Mr. Hogan States that at this point they have extended the offer to the Mexican War Streets. Deuschtown has their own guidelines, but he states that their guidelines could also be looked at in the future.
34. Mr. Gastil states that since the organizations have to take a vote, the HRC can't set a timetable. They could say 30 days with the understanding that it can be extended further.

---

---

**Motion:**

35. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
  36. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  37. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**506-508 W. North Avenue**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

James Pastorius  
West North Development Corp.  
506 W. North Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-N-66,69

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

James Pastorius  
West North Development Corp.  
506 W. North Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Building renovations, including rear addition.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He introduces James Pastorius, the owner of the property. He states that there are two buildings; the house was built in the 1880s and the other building is from about the 1920s. He states that there is not much detail left inside the house. The other building was a casket showroom and warehouse. It has been altered over the years; there is an aluminum storefront, some aluminum windows, and some windows that have been bricked in. He states that there is a loading dock on the side of the building, and they are proposing to use that area for parking. He shows photos of the house, stating that there are elaborate doors that they believe are original that they will be restoring. He shows the rear of the property, stating that there are two large garage spaces there now, and they will be using that area for parking as well. He states that they will have an accessible entrance in the front.
  2. Mr. Hogan comments on the rooftop terrace and asks if any of that is existing.
  3. Mr. Francona says it is not, right now it is just a flat roof. They are proposing to add a stair tower and an elevator as well as a third-story bump-up addition in the rear.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks what the alleyway width is.
  5. Mr. Francona says it is very narrow at 20 feet. There is a passage along the side of the building but no public right-of-way there.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials.
  7. Mr. Francona states that the existing building is brick which they are proposing to remove paint from and clean. They will be restoring the windows in the house. The roof of the large building is Spanish tile which they are going to clean, and they will be putting new wood doors in and are proposing new steel casement windows. They want to match the materials of the warehouse building in the addition. In the rear they will be raising the parapet, which will be brick. They will also be doing a
- 
-

---

---

standing seam roof and adding some details from the front such as brackets. He shows where the accessible ramp will be and states that it will be hidden by stone walls.

8. Mr. Hogan asks about the fencing.
  9. Mr. Francona says it will be iron with verticals along the bottom and circles on the top.
  10. Mr. Hogan suggests that they eliminate the circles.
  11. Mr. Francona states that they have pulled the addition back so there will be less impact on the street. He states that there is an existing garage door in the back, which they will be enlarging.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be altering the windows on the front of the house.
  13. Mr. Francona states that he thinks the size of the front window was original, although it would be unusual for it to be that large. It may also have been broken up into multiple windows. They are proposing an operable window system for that opening. They would be looking to have a café in that space. They are also looking to add dormers to the front and rear of the house to match the adjacent houses.
  14. Mr. Serrao says that the dormer next door looks like an addition as well. He asks why they are looking to add dormers.
  15. Mr. Francona says that is so they can use the attic space. In response to questions he also states that the roofing on the house is shingles and the cladding on the elevator tower on the addition will be brick.
  16. Ms. Quinn states that she did have a meeting with the applicants and that they are very willing to work with the Commission and staff on their project.
  17. Ms. Peterson says that she was asked to do a history of these buildings so is recusing herself from the discussion.
  18. Mr. Hogan states that it seems like a row house was torn down for the construction of the warehouse.
  19. Mr. Francona is not sure; from old maps it looks like a small street was closed off to build it.
  20. Mr. Hogan states that the warehouse is existing, so they have to work with it even though it doesn't fit in with the streetscape. He appreciates the window treatments as they would have been appropriate for the time. He states that the front window of the house was clearly altered and that originally it would have been a double window with ornamentation, much like on the second floor. He also says that the doors would have been clear glass leading into the vestibule or a solid wood non-caved door.
  21. Mr. Francona says that the lions-head doors are very popular in the neighborhood. He also states that the interior transom is arched but on the exterior it is square.
  22. Mr. Harless asks about the property line and how much space they have. He also asks about the existing condition of the side elevation of the warehouse.
  23. Mr. Francona goes over the property lines. He states that the side elevation once had windows that have been filled in with cinderblocks.
- 
-

- 
- 
24. Mr. Harless discusses the code issues that would be involved with creating windows. He states that may have to go to the Board of Appeals.
  25. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  26. Ms. Kate Kay steps to the podium; she is the president of the MWSS. She states that they have reviewed the plans and find them acceptable, including the front door of the house and the operable windows. She expresses their support for the project.
  27. Mr. Andrew Wickesburg steps to the podium; he is the president of the ACCA. He expresses their support for the renovation into a commercial space, which they feel is needed in the neighborhood.
  28. Ms. Barbara Talerico steps to the podium. She expresses her support for the project, stating that previous attempts to renovate the space fell through, and the building has been a white elephant in the neighborhood for a long time.
  29. Mr. Glenn Olcerst steps to the podium. He shows pictures and states that his house is one of the closest to the property. He expresses his support for the project and states that it will be a great addition to the neighborhood.
  30. Mr. Frank Quinn steps to the podium. He expresses his support for the project.
  31. Mr. Greg Mucha steps to the podium. He expresses his support for the project.
  32. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
  33. Mr. Hogan states that currently there is nothing in the guidelines about operable windows, and even though the window has been changed this would be changing it further in w way that is not acceptable. He also doesn't think the dormers are appropriate, unless they can prove they were historically there. He commends them for the approach to the project.
  34. Mr. Serrao comments that he would have liked to see the addition clad in different materials to distinguish it from the historic building.
  35. Mr. Quinn met with the applicant and suggested the brick cladding.
  36. Mr. Serrao agrees about the operable window and also reiterates that the railing should be redesigned without circles.
  37. Mr. Hogan comments on the steel garage door, stating that he would prefer a flush door. He says that if they are replacing the doors in-kind it may be permissible. He requests that they submit cut sheets to staff.

---

---

**Motion:**

38. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the building renovation with the rear addition and roof deck, with the conditions that the railing be simplified to match and be more appropriate, that the operable window system be eliminated and a more appropriate window design submitted to staff, and that any major changes be brought back to the Commission. The dormers on the front and rear of the house are also to be eliminated. The side elevation is approved as submitted, with any changes to be submitted to staff.
  39. Mr. Harless seconds.
  40. Mr. Hogan reiterates that the motion is to approve the application as submitted
- 
-

---

---

with the following modifications: the iron railing is to be simplified, the front window is to be fixed and not an operable system, and no dormers are to be installed on the front or rear of the house. The elevator tower, the rooftop terrace, the rear addition, and other elements are acceptable. Final materials and colors are to be submitted to staff.

41. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Gastil, Mr. Harless, and Mr. Falcone are in favor and Ms. Peterson abstains. Motion carries.
- 
-

**3990 Fifth Avenue**

**Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Joseph Fink  
3400 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15260

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-C-23

Inspector: Joe Motznik

**Applicant:**

Bruce Hall  
Barlett Design  
850 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 4/15/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Change to previously-approved façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bruce Hall steps to the podium. He explains that the project was presented and approved by another applicant in 2013; much of it has been completed and they are looking to finish it. They are proposing one alteration to the design, which is to center the off-center entry door and recess it.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

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

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report – May 2015**

<b>Staff Approval</b>	<b>C of A Number</b>	<b>Date Issued</b>	<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Historic District</b>	<b>Work Approved</b>
N	15-046	7-May-15	2006 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Façade renovations and rooftop terrace
N	15-047	7-May-15	431 Market Street	Market Square	After-the-fact refenestration and signage
N	15-048	7-May-15	404 N Taylor Avenue	Mexican War Streets	Closing of rear doorway
N	15-049	7-May-15	3990 Fifth Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	Change to previously approved plans
Y	15-050	12-May-15	909 Liberty Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Signage
Y	15-051	15-May-15	1335 Liverpool Street	Manchester	In-kind window replacement
Y	15-052	26-May-15	1222-24 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
Y	15-053	27-May-15	1222-24 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage