



**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 June 3, 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>		
Matthew Falcone	Sarah Quinn	Sarah Sims Erwin	Norman Cleary	Darren Toth
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Louis Marsico	Dominic DeGennaro	Gary Otto
Raymond Gastil		Margaret Eichner	Kenneth Krukowski	Dan Gilman
Ernie Hogan		Bonnie Hodgdon	Deborah Walko	Rick McClure
Carol Peterson		Mila Abney	Bob Baumbach	Nick McClure
		Annette Green	Nathan Hart	Dave Monk
		Bill Kolano	Lauren Gratchick	Robert Dauer
		Howard Graves	James Roland	John Freyvogel
		William Otto	Scott Bofinger	Carol Kowall
		Mary McDonough	Barbara Brown	Joshua Lavrine
		Susan Warner	Katie LaForest	Carrie Doyle
		Andrew Moss	Carole Malakoff	James Sheehan
		Richard Worl	Melissa McSwigan	Eugene Wilson
		Jason Wirick	Karamagi Rujumba	James Smith
		John Francona	Sally Graubarth	Erik Wagner
		Mary Anne Murphy		

***Old Business***—None.

***New Business***

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

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

**Other Business:**

1. Ms. Quinn talks about the process for adopting the design guidelines, stating that before the last meeting she sent out an email to the HRC mailing list with a link to the design guidelines on the website and requested comments. There were no comments received, and she suggests that the Commission can review the guidelines next month.
2. Mr. Gastil talks about the guidelines.

3. Mr. Serrao states that he had a discussion with two real estate/land-use attorneys, and their concern is that if a design feature is not permitted in the new guidelines, the value of buildings that have that feature will skyrocket.
4. Ms. Quinn talks about an upcoming meeting that some Commissioners will be attending, and advises that they need to be mindful of sunshine laws in determining who will be there. Three commissioners are allowed to attend. She also mentions that the two Lawrenceville nominations are at City Council, and they have requested a public hearing. Once it is scheduled it will be advertised for two weeks. Shae also gives updates on where the Mexican War Streets Society is on developing new guidelines.
5. Mr. Hogan states that he believes ACCA should also be involved in developing guidelines. Mr. Gastil states that generally the LRC would be the ones developing guidelines. Mr. Hogan cites concerns over the expansion district proposal and thinks that the neighborhood organizations should work together on this. The Commission discusses the situation and agrees that about six months will be a reasonable timeframe for the guidelines; the guidelines will be placed on the January 2016 agenda.
6. Ms. Quinn gives an update on the grant for survey.

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Hogan motions to adjourn the meeting.

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

**851 Beech Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Eugene Wilson  
851 Beech Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-29

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/15/15

---

---

**Applicant:**

Eugene Wilson  
851 Beech Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

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

**Proposed Changes:** Replacement of door on garage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Gene Wilson steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He explains the project, stating that he is looking to replace an entrance door on the garage at the rear of the property. The existing door is a cheap hardware store door which was installed with no frame or trim; they are proposing to replace with a vintage six-lite wooden door. The garage is from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, as is the door. They will try to match the trim on the existing windows as best they can.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She comments that the neighborhood has three projects on the agenda; they have worked very hard to raise awareness of the LRC and are pleased that each applicant has worked with them. She states that they are very pleased with this project and recommend approval.
  4. Mr. Hogan acknowledges for the record an email received from the LRC.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve replacement of the person-door in the garage as submitted.
  6. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**954 Beech Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Gary Otto  
954 Beech Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-17

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Lenco Building LLC  
541 Christy Rd  
Eighty Four, Pa 15330

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/4/15

---

---

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

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

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Gary Otto steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He introduces Ken Krakowski, the architect for the project. He explains that they are doing a significant renovation that will require a rear stairwell. They are proposing to construct a stairwell enclosure at the rear of the property where a porch used to be. They will also be replacing an existing rear door.
  2. Mr. Krakowski steps to the podium. He talks about the door replacement, stating that currently there is a metal door that they will be replacing with wood. They will be replicating the surrounding trim. They are also proposing to add a cornice at the top of the addition, similar to what is seen on the house. There will be a hand rail at the basement entrance. He states that the addition is only visible from the alley, as the face of it is stepped back about three inches from the rear elevation. The only thing that will be visible is the hand rail. They are looking to use brick to match the existing, and will extend the limestone or sandstone belt course.
  3. Mr. Otto states that they are also proposing a wrought-iron arch with a light fixture for the rear to enhance the rear entrances of the property and the neighboring property.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  5. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium. She states that they met with the owner and they find that the design, materials, and scale are very appropriate and they recommend approval of the project.
  6. Ms. Carrie Doyle steps to the podium; she is the next door neighbor. She thinks the project will add to the neighborhood and improve security on the alley.
  7. Mr. Hogan acknowledges an email from the LRC.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of the rear addition for the stairwell and construction of an arched gateway.
  9. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**909 Western Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Sally C Graubarth Trust  
1667 N Shadowview Path  
Hernando, FL 34442

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-168

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

John D Francona  
1234 Resaca Place  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Building and garage renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the property is a three-story building with arched windows on the third floor, square windows on the second floor, and a large storefront and residence entrance on the first floor. He states that they are completely renovating the building. He shows historic photos, stating that the lower level is cut stone, which they will be removing the paint from and restoring. The upper levels are also painted and they will be repainting in that area. He points out the paneling on the residence entrance which is still existing and will be restored. They are proposing a wooden storefront that will be close to what was originally there. The residence entrance will be a pair of doors to replicate what was originally there. They will also be replacing windows and cleaning up the façade. He talks about the carriage house in the rear of the building, which is in poor condition. They are proposing to rebuild the dormer and install casement windows. They will also install carriage doors. The sides of the dormer will be Hardie plank and the roof will be asphalt shingles.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium. She states that they have met with the applicant and owner twice to work on the design. They were very pleased with the front façade, and they worked with the applicant to improve the carriage house façade. They are pleased with the project and recommend approval.
  4. Mr. Hogan thanks the Allegheny West LRC for all their hard work this month.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the building and garage renovations as submitted.
  6. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan states that final materials are to be submitted to staff for approval.
- 
-

---

---

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

---

---

**601 Middle Street**

**Deushtown Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Jane Harter  
605 Middle Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 24-N-222

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Bob Baumbach  
900 Middle St  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/24/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of a new residence on vacant lot.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains that they are proposing to construct a house on this lot. He shows the site plan and shows the neighboring houses on Middle and Avery Streets. He states **that the house will be 20' x 40' which will leave space** for a walkway and off-street parking. The proposed house will be two and a half stories; it will be frame construction with Hardie board siding, AZEK trim, historic profile Fypon brackets, and dormers clad in synthetic slate. The side entrance will be the primary entrance, and they are modelling it after several houses in the neighborhood. The windows will be two-over-two, and the foundation will be cement block with parging over it, to be stained a buff color.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if there were any efforts to accommodate a door on either of the street sides of the building.
  3. Mr. Baumbach states that they did look at it initially, but the owner is looking to keep the essential living spaces on the first floor, and it would be difficult to incorporate the entrance on either of the streets because of the floor plan. He states the side entrance is unconventional for Pittsburgh, but is common in other cities, such as Charleston.
  4. Mr. Hogan states that the lot would have likely had a much squatter house originally.
  5. Mr. Baumbach says originally there were three small houses on the site, all facing Avery Street.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  7. Ms. Margaret Eichner steps to the podium. She talks about the houses that were originally on the lot and where the entrances were. Her concern with courtyard door is that emergency personnel would not be able to access it. She is also concerned about the safety of the courtyard entrance. She also asks if the brick
- 
-

---

---

sidewalk will be retained and if there will be any glass block.

8. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none. He acknowledges an email of support from **Dennis** and an email from Nick Kyriazi from the East Allegheny Community Council.

---

---

**Motion:**

9. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a new residence with the modification that the brick sidewalk be maintained.
  10. Mr. Gastil seconds in order to move to discussion.
  11. Mr. Hogan states that he thinks it is unusual to not have a door on either street **face. He doesn't have an issue with the materials as it is new** construction.
  12. Mr. Serrao agrees on the materials. **He states that he doesn't have an issue with the door** and thinks it adds something unique to the neighborhood.
  13. Mr. Falcone states that the Avery Street façade looks like it could be two houses, but there is no delineation between the two and no doors. He asks about false doors.
  14. Mr. Hogan states he would rather not add false elements. He also points out the a contemporary house on this lot would pass National Park Service standards as it would not be competing with the historic fabric.
  15. Mr. Gastil states that the Avery Street elevation is difficult to read; it could be read as two houses, or the rear elevation of two houses. He asks about the placement of the windows.
  16. Mr. Falcone agrees that the elevation does look awkward.
  17. Mr. Baumbach states that they originally looked at having four windows evenly **spaced on the façade, but the concern was that it developed a "schoolhouse"** aesthetic. He states that other options would have been five windows across the top with four windows and a door underneath, or a board in the middle to pretend to be two houses.
  18. Mr. Serrao suggests that they add another bay of windows to make five windows on both floors.
  19. Ms. Peterson suggests a door on Middle Street.
  20. Mr. Baumbach says that would be the most logical space for a street entrance. He states that he could look into the different options.
  21. **Mr. Gastil states that since there aren't other houses of this type in the neighborhood or the city, he is inclined to give some leeway to alternate designs as there is no strong precedent to consider.**
  22. The Commission discusses different options for the two elevations. It is decided that the project should be tabled in order to explore one or more options for the Avery Street elevation and come back to Commission next month.
  23. Mr. Hogan asks that the applicant bring contextual photos of the adjoining properties as well.
  24. Mr. Serrao retracts his motion and motions to table for 30 days.
- 
-

---

---

25. Mr. Falcone seconds.

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

---

---

**406 Foreland Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominic DeGennaro  
35 Highland Road #2106  
Bethel Park, Pa 15102

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-S-256

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominic DeGennaro  
35 Highland Road #2106  
Bethel Park, Pa 15102

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/13/15

---

---

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

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

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Peterson recuses herself from the discussion.
  2. Ms. Sarah Sims Erwin and Mr. Dominic DeGennaro step to the podium; they are the owners of the property. Ms. Erwin explains the project, stating that they are proposing an addition in the rear of the house. She states that there is an existing **kitchen “bump-out”** which is not visible from the alley as there is a fence obscuring the view. A small portion of the proposed addition will be visible from the alley. She states that there is a paved area which is not a public way in the rear of the building that gives access to their and another property. The addition will have the same footprint as the existing kitchen. They have already received approval from zoning. They are proposing to clad it in Hardie plank and it will have a standing seam metal roof. The windows will be wooden six-over-one windows. She shows pictures showing the various views of the area where the addition will be; the views show that it will be minimally visible. They are also proposing a gate that will lock from the outside but not the inside, so that the neighboring property can still use it for egress. There have been issues with unauthorized access and illegal activities in the courtyard and the gate will prevent those issues. The gate will be visible from the alley.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks about why they are doing the six-over-one windows.
  4. Ms. Erwin states that they are stuck with those windows from their previous contractor, and they were not permitted to use them in the front so they would like to re-use them in the rear.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  6. Ms. Patricia Cloonan steps to the podium. She states that she is a friend and has **visited the property, and feels that the proposed structure won’t block any of the neighbors’ views or light**, and will be a great addition to the neighborhood.
  7. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium. He states that the addition will be minimally visible, and they have made efforts to keep it historically appropriate
- 
-

---

---

while using appropriate modern materials. He is in support of the project.

8. Ms. Margaret Eichner steps to the podium. She agrees that it is minimally visible, **and she feels that the gate is a great idea for this property and the neighbors' as well.**
9. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none. He acknowledges an email from Nick Kyriazi in support of the project.

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the rear addition.
  11. Mr. Serrao seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, Mr. Gastil and Mr. Falcone are in favor and Ms. Peterson recused herself. Motion carries.
- 
-

**1221 E Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Kevin Evancic  
799 Castle Shannon Boulevard  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15234

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-159

Inspector: Jack Heath

**Applicant:**

Nathan Hart  
3729 Parkview Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/21/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Nathan Hart steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. Mr. Kevin Evancic, the owner, also introduces himself. Mr. Hart shows a picture of the existing building, which has been significantly altered with closed-up windows and a quasi-colonial storefront. He states that they are concentrating on the storefront itself in the renovation. They are proposing to remove the faux historic storefront and construct a more traditional storefront with a large glazed area. They are proposing a traditional storefront glazed door for the apartment entrance as well. The storefront will be aluminum with a transom above, and the trim and brackets will be wood composite to emulate the look of wood. They are also proposing a stone base for the storefront. He talks a little bit about the proposed sign, which **will be illuminated by gooseneck lamps. They don't know what the building looked** like originally, but they would like to locate the storefront door in the center for aesthetics and also in order to create an accessible entrance. They will build the sidewalk up toward the door to eliminate the step. He states that they did meet with the LRC, and they liked how the cornice at the top of the building is not right at the top, so it reduces the top-heavy look of the building. They did suggest that they put a break metal cap on the top, which they have included in the drawings. They are not proposing to alter the upper windows at this time.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks about what looks to be asphalt shingles on the lower elevation.
  3. Mr. Hart says there are currently asphalt shingles, but they can remove them and replace them with a break metal cap.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks about the single bracket in the signboard area on the new drawings.
  5. Mr. Hart says that they can change it back to double so they will match the brackets above.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations with the condition that the applicant resubmit drawings consistent with the comments made by the Commission to staff for final approval. If there are any large changes they should come back before the Commission.
  8. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the approval includes removal of the asphalt shingles, a metal cornice in the signboard area, double brackets on the two flanking signboards, a granite or stone kick base, and the articulation of the metal cap at the cornice.
  9. Ms. Quinn asks about the door.
  10. Mr. Hogan states he is fine with what was submitted.
  11. [Second is inaudible]
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and Motion carries.
- 
-

**2529 E Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

South Pittsburgh LLC  
10 Allegheny Center  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 16th

Lot and Block: 12-M-304

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Kolano Design  
6026 Centre Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/24/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of new awnings and signage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bill Kolano from Kolano Design steps to the podium. He states that the property is unique as it is in the specially planned district of the South Side as well as the city historic district of East Carson Street. They are keeping their proposal within what is allowed per the historic guidelines. He states that this building is one building with different façade fronts. He states that the blinds are drawn almost all the time against the sun, so they are looking for an option that would eliminate the need for blinds and would create a connection between the interior space and the street. The existing blind is black and tends to separate the spaces, and they are looking to unify the spaces and make a grander statement. They will be removing the existing awnings, neon signage, banners, and lighting. They will be adding two new flanking awnings and one center awning as well as new banners. The new canopies will match the canopies on the apartment buildings behind. **They are proposing to add signage to read “Carson Street Commons” above the central canopy with “Apartment Leasing Office” below. The front white faces of the letter will not be illuminated, only the side orange returns will be illuminated. They will be replacing the lighting to be positioned with the vertical elements of the building; there will be an up light and a down light. At the corners of the building, they will be adding “corner stone” navigational signage.**
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of new signage, awnings, and lighting as submitted, as this building is newer construction in the district.
  4. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1221 E Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Kevin Evancic  
799 Castle Shannon Boulevard  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15234

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-159

Inspector: Jack Heath

**Applicant:**

Nathan Hart  
3729 Parkview Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/21/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Nathan Hart steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. Mr. Kevin Evancic, the owner, also introduces himself. Mr. Hart shows a picture of the existing building, which has been significantly altered with closed-up windows and a quasi-colonial storefront. He states that they are concentrating on the storefront itself in the renovation. They are proposing to remove the faux historic storefront and construct a more traditional storefront with a large glazed area. They are proposing a traditional storefront glazed door for the apartment entrance as well. The storefront will be aluminum with a transom above, and the trim and brackets will be wood composite to emulate the look of wood. They are also proposing a stone base for the storefront. He talks a little bit about the proposed sign, which **will be illuminated by gooseneck lamps. They don't know what the building looked** like originally, but they would like to locate the storefront door in the center for aesthetics and also in order to create an accessible entrance. They will build the sidewalk up toward the door to eliminate the step. He states that they did meet with the LRC, and they liked how the cornice at the top of the building is not right at the top, so it reduces the top-heavy look of the building. They did suggest that they put a break metal cap on the top, which they have included in the drawings. They are not proposing to alter the upper windows at this time.
  2. Mr. Serrao asks about what looks to be asphalt shingles on the lower elevation.
  3. Mr. Hart says there are currently asphalt shingles, but they can remove them and replace them with a break metal cap.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks about the single bracket in the signboard area on the new drawings.
  5. Mr. Hart says that they can change it back to double so they will match the brackets above.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations with the condition that the applicant resubmit drawings consistent with the comments made by the Commission to staff for final approval. If there are any large changes they should come back before the Commission.
  8. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the approval includes removal of the asphalt shingles, a metal cornice in the signboard area, double brackets on the two flanking signboards, a granite or stone kick base, and the articulation of the metal cap at the cornice.
  9. Ms. Quinn asks about the door.
  10. Mr. Hogan states he is fine with what was submitted.
  11. [Second is inaudible]
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and Motion carries.
- 
-

**2409 Shady Avenue  
Taylor Allderdice**

**Individual Landmark**

**Owner:**

Pittsburgh Public Schools  
1305 Muriel St  
Pittsburgh, PA 15203

Ward: 14th

Lot and Block: 87-H-250

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

Robert Daniels  
Graves Design Group  
223 4<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District:

Application Received: 5/15/15

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

**Proposed Changes:** Replacement of first-floor window with door.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Howard Graves steps to the podium; he is representing Graves Design Group on behalf of Pittsburgh Public Schools. He explains the project, stating that they are looking to install a new door on the first floor for accessibility and egress for the day care. This will be at the rear of the building. They will be eliminating two windows and the parking along that edge of the building to add the door. The door will be oversized, and they are keeping the openings above to serve as a divided transom. The door will have two lites for security and visibility. They will be matching the detailing around the windows such as the brick mold. They will be repaving the area in front with concrete. The door will be similar to another that is already on the façade.
2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

**Motion:**

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve, somewhat reluctantly, the replacement of the existing window with a door as shown in the documents.
4. Ms. Peterson seconds.
5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Hogan, and Ms. Peterson are in favor and Mr. Falcone abstains. Motion carries.

**221 Fourth Avenue**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

William Benter  
2901 Smallman Street, Apt 5D  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-181

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Stephen Casey  
40 24<sup>th</sup> Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/15/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Renovations including extension of parapet wall.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Stephen Casey steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they are proposing some changes to the previously approved plans. He states that they are keeping the same anti-reflective glass railing, although they have changed the arrangement slightly. Instead of the previously approved GFRC panels, they are proposing to use RheinZink metal panels. They are also proposing a new parapet wall above the existing parapet, in order to increase the ceiling height indoors and provide screening for mechanical equipment on the roof as well as provide the required parapet height to meet code. The deck is in mostly the same configuration; they have made some alterations in order to provide wheelchair access and make it accessible. He states that the deck is pulled back from the parapet exactly the same amount as what was previously approved. The **other change they have made is to move the “bridge” portion of the deck** to the front façade, so that the glass railing will keep a continuous line along the front. The square footage of the deck will remain the same. He talks in more detail about the new parapet wall. He states that the wall will be invisible or minimally visible from most angles. He talks about how the deck is mounted, which has not changed from the previous approval. He talks about the wheelchair lift and states that the railings will be made out of the same material and will blend with the rest of the glass railing. He talks about the issue of windows on the building. He states that the current windows were installed 20 to 30 years ago and are aluminum; they are proposing, as a demonstration project for the whole building, to replace their windows with aluminum-clad wood windows with a more historic profile.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that aluminum-clad wood windows are not acceptable per the design guidelines. He states that they are concerned about setting a precedent for the district.
  3. Mr. Casey says they could replace the windows in-kind with aluminum, but they want the wood finish on the interior. He talks about the **“pilot program” concept, stating that they would work with the building owner’s association to set a**
- 
-

---

---

standard for window replacement in the whole building. The association actually owns the windows.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
5. Mr. Hogan states that he is concerned about how they are able to hold all of the owners to the same type of window if approved.
6. Mr. Lou Marsico steps to the podium representing the owner. He states that the association did request them to install these windows so they can adopt them as the standard.
7. Mr. Howard Graves steps to the podium; he is on the association. He states that they are looking to adopt an appropriate standard and would hold to it if approved.
8. Mr. Hogan states that the association should come to the HRC under a separate application for these windows as the first phase of a multi-phase project.

---

---

**Motion:**

9. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion to approve modifications to the roof deck, roofline, and HVAC system for the 19<sup>th</sup> floor of the Benedum Trees building, and deny the window replacement as part of this application.
  10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve.
  11. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**410 W. North Avenue**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Mary Anne Murphy  
721 Brighton Rd  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-P-20

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

**Applicant:**

Mary Anne Murphy  
721 Brighton Rd  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/15/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Alterations to garage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Mary Anne Murphy steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She shows images of the front of the building and the garage. She explains the project, stating that the early 1900s garage is clay tile covered by stucco and is in poor condition. The windows have been boarded up for at least 20 years, and the steel lintels above the windows and garage door have rusted and have shifted the stucco and mortar joints. She is proposing to remove the lintels from above the windows, infill the windows, remortar the joints, and re-stucco over everything with concrete stucco dyed to match the original. She is also proposing to remove the lintel above the garage door and replace it with a new one, and rebuild the parapet and stucco **to match. She states that she doesn't know if the openings had windows in them at one point, but she is proposing to close the openings so the walls will be all stucco.**
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

3. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve the replacement of the lintels and repairs.
  4. Mr. Serrao makes the motion.
  5. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**810-814 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

PBH2 LLC  
761 Osage Road  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15243

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-81

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/15/15

---

---

**Applicant:**

Katie LaForest  
Moss Architects  
181 42<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Changes to previously approved HVAC scheme.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Andrew Moss steps to the podium. He states that they are just updating their previously approved application from a year ago. They have had to adjust where the units and their platforms are located on the rear of the building. They have moved one existing unit that was on the face of the building to one of the existing openings in the rear.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there are none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the changes to the HVAC scheme as submitted.
  4. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**4215 Fifth Avenue**

**Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Oakland Fifth Ave Hotel Assoc  
409 Broad Street Suite 203  
Sewickley, Pa 15153

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-R-110

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

Oakland Fifth Ave Hotel Assoc  
409 Broad Street Suite 203  
Sewickley, Pa 15153

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of a 10-story hotel.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Clarence Vincen steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they will be presenting their updated plan for a hotel to be constructed behind the Pittsburgh Athletic Association. He shows photos of the existing conditions at the site. He states that the hotel will connect to the PAA both at basement and street levels. He shows drawings and explains that they have carefully modelled the PAA to provide accurate comparisons of the massing of the two buildings. He shows photos with the hotel superimposed to show how the neighborhood will be affected. He states that since the last time they presented, they have made quite a few changes based on comments from the neighborhood, civic organizations, and the university. One of the major changes is setting the building back about 15 feet on each side; they have also taken one story off the building to make it 10 stories. He shows the proposed floor plans. He states that another change that was made is a two-lane rather the three-lane entrance to the parking deck. He states that they have enhanced the front entrance to make it more human scale, and they are planning on having a restaurant and coffee shop on the ground floor. He state that they have closed off what was going to be an open space on the top floor lobby including the space facing the neighborhood, which was one of the neighborhood concerns. He shows elevations and talks about the materials including a limestone-look product and brick. He states that they have created a very strong architrave cap to the garage element that relates to the historic details on the PAA. They are also trying to pick up the rhythm of the PAA with the tall columns and vertical windows. He states that they also wanted to break down the mass of the building, which they have done with the large glass corners. In response to comments they have added some detail to the base of the building and chosen a less reflective glass on the whole building.
  2. Ms. Quinn asks about the signage.
  3. Mr. Vincen states that they will be postponing the signage and applying for it under a separate application.
- 
-

- 
- 
4. Mr. Hogan states that the design has come a long way.
  5. Mr. Vincen states that another thing they changed is the modern projecting roof; they minimized it quite a bit. They also greatly reduced the amount of glass. He states that they would like to at this point go through the criteria for evaluation. As to the extent to which the proposal promotes the general welfare of the city and its citizens, he says that this type of hotel will be a great addition to the community. They are enhancing the contextual fabric with the quality of materials, and they will support the façade easement for the PAA to protect it forever. As to the extent to which the proposal will preserve or protect the historic architectural nature of the defined district, structure, or site, he states that since they are connecting to the PAA it is in their interest to protect it in perpetuity. Exterior architectural features, general design and arrangement, texture, material and color were all covered in the presentation. As for the relation of these factors to similar features of buildings or structures in the immediate surroundings, they primarily focused on the PAA, and they made sure they were compatible, consistent, and sensitive to the historic nature of that building. They used the proportions and rhythm to make sure the buildings work together. As for the appropriateness of the proposal when reviewed in light of the guidelines, they have followed the Oakland Civic Center Guidelines for new construction. In terms of visual compatibility, they have respected the historic nature, including proportions, classical elements, and vertical rhythm, of the PAA, while incorporating a modern design. They have been consistent with the materials in regards to what is seen in the surrounding district by using simulated limestone. In terms of scale, massing, rhythm, and siting, he states that they are appropriately sized for the property and the surrounding for two or three blocks, and they are making a connection to the PAA not unlike some of the buildings to the east, including the former Masonic temple with the hotel connecting to the back of it, and Clapp Hall, with buildings connecting to it. As far as detailing, he feels that they have shown in their presentation how the detailing is appropriate.
  6. [Inaudible commissioner] asks about rooftop elements.
  7. Mr. Vincen states that they will be screening rooftop elements with an acoustical sound wall so the noise will travel up and not horizontally.
  8. Mr. Bill Sidick steps to the podium; he is representing the applicant. He states that he just wants to add a few things to the presentation. He states that Mr. Vincen **didn't specifically refer to the map of the historic district but he did allude** to the blocks to the east, specifically the former Masonic temple and the hotel and office building behind it. He states that these are connected but were approved as a single building so there is some precedent for that. The height, massing, and setbacks are the same, and the university buildings are connected all the way back to the Schenley Farms neighborhood. He states that they presented to the Commission a few months ago and have made changes based on the feedback; they have also gone through an extensive six month community process involving the PAA, the Schenley Farms Civic Association, PHLF, the Oakland Task Force, the Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, UPMC, and the University of Pittsburgh. The changes they have made were based both on **the HRC's feedback** as well as community feedback. He believes that they have met the criteria to the **letter to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness, and he asks for the HRC's support.** He states that they have a hearing scheduled with the Planning
- 
-

---

---

Commission and asks for a prompt decision.

9. Mr. Hogan asks for additional testimony on behalf of the applicant; there is none. He asks for public testimony.
  10. Mr. Mike Abney steps to the podium. He states that he appreciates the willingness of the PAA and Callay Capital and Concorde to actively engage with the community on this development. He states that the initial plan was not well received, and he and his neighbors were nearly unanimous in voting against the hotel as originally designed. However, the Schenley Farms Civic Association made recommendations about the setback from Lytton and Bigelow, the size of the garage openings and the height of the building. The developers listened and made the changes that Schenley Farms requested. He states that he supports this project because it offers the best scenario for preserving the PAA building. He says that the PAA Club is the best steward of the PAA building. He appreciates the history of the club, which has been a part of the social fabric of Oakland for over 100 years. He knows that in order to survive, the PAA Club needs to find additional sources of revenue. The proposed hotel brings significant income from rent and offers the benefit of being **a business that compliments the PAA Club's banquet and restaurant business**; he doubts that the PAA Club will find another tenant as beneficial to them. This is a tremendous opportunity for a symbolic business relationship. If the hotel is not built, the PAA Club may find something else to go into that space, and if they cannot find another use for the space, the PAA Club may be forced to close which jeopardizes the PAA building. He feels that the hotel will be a tremendous addition to the community for several reasons—Oakland needs an upscale hotel, the architecture of the hotel fits well with the PAA building, an upscale restaurant and street-side coffee shop will be a great addition to the neighborhood, and jobs will be created and property taxes preserved. He agrees with the PHLF that a preservation easement for the PAA Building should be included in the approval of the hotel. His support of the hotel is contingent on the preservation easement. He states that the developers **have honored the community's wishes on the changes to the design of the hotel**. The hotel will be a significant addition to the community and allow for the preservation of the PAA building, which is one of the crown jewels of Pittsburgh. He supports this project because it offers the best scenario for preserving the PAA building, creating jobs and preserving property taxes.
  11. Ms. Deborah Walko steps to the podium. She states that she is opposed to the PAA hotel for two reasons. First, the hotel does not adhere to the Oakland Civic Center Historic District guidelines for new construction. The hotel is too large for the site, and overwhelms the historically significant PAA building. Second, the proposal sets precedent for the Bigelow Lot, and a building with similar setbacks and height of the PAA hotel on the entire Bigelow lot would be unacceptable. She states that she and several members of the board have been to numerous meetings about the PAA hotel. Everyone they have spoken with agrees that the hotel is too large for the lot, including the Pittsburgh & Historic Landmarks Foundation. The developer admits that a smaller building, meaning the right size for the OCCHD, would not fit their business model, and therefore is asking us to endorse squeezing this large building on a site that is too small for it. She asks why they should endorse a plan that doesn't **follow the OCCHD guidelines**. The guidelines should not be set aside **to satisfy the developer's business model**. They have heard other vague justifications, such as bringing in a new revenue stream to the area or saving the PAA, but no specifics or guarantees. She asks at what cost this will be to their
- 
-

---

---

historic neighborhood; it will be a hotel that they **know doesn't fit, and a good** possibility of another equally unfit building on the Bigelow lot. They were quite surprised that the PAA hotel developer has no interest whatsoever in developing the PAA building if the PAA club were to fail. So now they are being asked to tie the endorsement of the hotel plan to getting a façade preservation easement to save the PAA building in case the PAA club fails. The easement is in the best interest of the PAA club in any case and it is disingenuous to treat it as a bargaining chip. She states that their mission is to preserve the character and integrity of their neighborhood, so they should not endorse the PAA hotel development when it is contrary to the OCCHD guidelines and also sets an unacceptable precedent for future construction in the OCCHD adjacent to their community.

12. Ms. Mary McDonough steps to the podium. She states that she is opposed to the hotel, as it is **too big for the site. She doesn't** object to a hotel or development, just this overwhelming structure that should be set back farther from Bigelow, Lytton, and the PAA. She states that the historic district, to great extent, encompasses the civic portion of **Franklin Nicola's plan for the farmland he bought from Mary Schenley's estate in 1905. His plan was inspired by the "City Beautiful" movement** of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. He envisioned development of great monumental buildings, as laid out in his plan of lots with wide streets and sidewalks. Minimum setbacks were prescribed, and builders exceeded them. This created more open spaces and afforded more opportunity for landscaping, both very important to Nicola and City Beautiful planning. Important buildings sprang up, many architecturally significant in their own right, and the PAA is undeniably one of them. But, together, they are significant as a group, as pieces of a plan, a document of early 20<sup>th</sup> Century planning. She says that in the process of designating the City historic district in 1991-1992, the nomination report was prepared by the late Michael Eversmeyer, then staff to the HRC, a, some years **later, Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Eversmeyer's report was a thorough,** scholarly study of the components of the proposed district and their importance, both individually and in the aggregate. She presents a copy of the report. She states that the significance of the Civic Center, as well as the Schenley Farms residential neighborhood, has already been recognized by its listing on the National Register, which she also submits a copy of for the record. She states that **upon the City's** designation of the historic district, guidelines were created, including provisions for new construction. Those guidelines apply to the new hotel. Section E explains that: **"The aim of the guidelines for new construction is to encourage the visual compatibility of new construction with the character and quality of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century buildings that give the district and the adjoining Schenley Farms Historic District their historical architectural significance and visual character". Addressing "scale, massing, rhythm, and siting," Section E3 is specific in directing that "the Commission will review the spatial relationship of a new building to the open spaces and buildings around it."** She contends that the scale of the hotel overwhelms the PAA. It is too big for the PAA, too tall, too wide, and too big for the lot. She states that the siting of the hotel exceeds the setbacks of the PAA on Bigelow and Lytton. Those setbacks were established by the three buildings that occupied the block for most of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century—the PAA, the University Club, later known as the PAA annex, and the Syria Mosque. She provides an illustration of that trio of buildings from about 1916 and another from about 1911, showing the PAA and the University Club. She states that many
- 
-

---

---

arguments have been offered recently about why the hotel should be built, but she thinks there is only one relevant issue for the Commission: does the proposed hotel satisfy the requirements for new construction in the historic district? She believes it does not and asks that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be granted.

13. Ms. Carol Kowall steps to the podium. She states that she opposes the project. She has struggled with how to tinker with the proposed development to create the least harm to the area but it is harm nonetheless. She asks that the Commission deny the application on the merits, but as a byproduct, this will cause a needed delay in the development. She states that for her the biggest problem is the relationship of this development to the PAA and the surrounding properties. The guidelines for the Civic Center specifically require that the spatial relationship of the new building be compatible with the open spaces and buildings around it. Here the spatial relationship is totally incompatible with the PAA because it eliminates an important open space next to the PAA. She states that judging the special compatibility of this project is complicated because the lot behind the PAA property is now empty; however, UPMC has acknowledged it is negotiating the sale of the rest of the block to Pitt and that sale and eventual development will take time. The proposed **development here means the other lot can't be developed** in the proper relationship to the PAA and this project ruins the opportunity for this entire block to again become a jewel. She understands that the rest of the block is not before the Commission, but she asks that they understand that this entire block is the last, largest, and the most valuable land left to be developed in the civic center historic district, and what happens on the PAA lot will enhance or degrade this entire block and district. She knows that the ordinance does not permit the Commission to act prior to an application and that they can only judge what is before them, but piecemeal decisions eliminate the possibility of a better development for this whole block. She feels that the Commission should decline to approve this project on the merits because it completely eliminates the space behind the PAA and to the next lot. She hopes that the next owner of the rest of the block will seize the opportunity created by this delay to develop the larger lot in the proper relationship to the PAA and other buildings.
  14. Ms. Barbara Brown steps to the podium; she is a member of the board of the SFCA and is presenting testimony for Robert Kelley, another neighbor. She states that in 1980 he was a member of **Portland's** city-wide committee asked to develop a **"vision for the year 2000", which became a blueprint for Portland's** subsequent development and success. A key element of their thinking at that time was to create a city where people would feel physically, socially, and emotionally good about living there and where they would want to raise their families. The idea was that if people moved there for the value/beauty of the city, then economic development and jobs would follow. This translated into Portland development **having to be "human scale", i.e.,** it should not overwhelm or diminish the people or the existing visual treasures whether natural or human made. Another key element was the protection of vistas and views that allowed these treasures to be **highlighted. The visual jewels of Oakland run from Soldier's and Sailor's to the north and the Carnegie and Frick to the south.** This area contains several buildings that are significant and architecturally beautiful, individually and collectively. For the most part, there is enough open space to show them off. **However, Pitt's new dorm, Nordenberg Hall, has already started to encroach on these jewels and their collective vista.** It does not fit architecturally and adds little
- 
-

---

---

or nothing to the architectural enrichment of the area. The proposed PAA hotel continues this encroachment. Since it is over-sized for both the lot and the surrounding buildings, especially the PAA, it further destroys the spatial and **architectural harmony of Oakland's jewels and** collective vistas. Like Nordenberg Hall, it also adds little or nothing to the architectural enrichment of the area. Likewise, for the many people who enter Oakland traveling South on Bigelow and Bayard, the view has already been obliterated by the new building going up there now. The development of the PAA and the UPMC lots further obliterate the vistas of Oakland by creating a canyon cliff effect along Bayard. This will rob all travelers and Schenley Farms residents from seeing into the heart of Oakland, let alone enjoying its architectural and historical beauty. So, the proposed PAA development **is beneficial to PAA, the developers, and perhaps the City's revenues. However, it will be at the expense of the City's residents, Oakland residents, Pitts' employees and students, and everyone who comes to Oakland.** He believes it will also have a negative effect on the growing tourist trade that visits Oakland to enjoy these treasures.

15. Mr. Karamagi Rujumba from PHLF steps to the podium. He states that over the last few months, they have met with many of the present parties including the **SFCA, the leadership of the PAA, City Councilman Dan Gilman's office, and the project development team.** He states that in principle, they believe the hotel building is too big for the site; however, they also understand that in order to attract a needed first-class hotel the size is needed. The project would not work financially if the hotel was smaller. They understand the challenges of building in a historic district as well as the challenges the Commission faces in moderating such development. He states that they recognize that a city is constantly changing, and they feel that the developer has worked well with all parties and with them in reaching a compromise on building setbacks, height, and parking configurations. They do remain concerned about the building of the PAA itself, which is why they have proposed a preservation easement, which is in the process of being worked out. The easement will protect the façade of the building in perpetuity. He states that they do support the project.
  16. Ms. Melissa McSwigan steps to the podium; she is the secretary of Preservation Pittsburgh. She states that PP was formed after the demolition of the Syria Mosque, and its first accomplishment was the designation of the Oakland Civic Center Historic District. While they do appreciate that the developer has made revisions to the hotel design to fit the historic district guidelines based on community feedback, they still believe that the new hotel does not fit the guidelines in terms of the scale, siting, massing, and contextual setbacks. They value the historic and architectural merit of the PAA building, and they realize that there are economic concerns for the PAA, but they are weighing in on the historic guidelines only. They feel that it is important to be good stewards of historic and architectural resources, and they know that development in the historic district will affect the surrounding community. The community is rich with a mix of residential housing and various institutions with the potential for further development, they feel that it is important to adhere to the guidelines, especially as precedent could be set.
  17. Mr. Norman Cleary steps to the podium; he is the president of the Schenley Farms Civic Association. He states that for the past five months, the SFCA has been engaged in ongoing dialog with Callay Capital/Concord Hospitality Enterprises
- 
-

---

---

development representatives, the PAA and City Councilman Dan Gilman. The original design that was withdrawn from the April 1<sup>st</sup> agenda was almost unanimously rejected by the membership. The revised plan before the Commission includes many modifications that evolved from the discussions and is an admittedly marked improvement. However, the membership vote to endorse or oppose the revised plan resulted in a deadlock. A conclusion is clear, unanimous and undisputed among the members is that the scale of the proposed structure is out of proportion with Lot 27-R-110 and the historic clubhouse structure that it will overshadow on Lot 27-R-138. Their interpretation is that the scale of the proposed hotel building is not in compliance with the New Construction Design Guidelines for the Oakland Civic Center Historic District. He presents Illustration 1, showing the width of the proposed structure to be about 38 feet larger than the historic clubhouse. Illustration 2 shows the proposed hotel will be about 50% **higher (+39'6") than the roofline of the clubhouse. Inclusion of the cooling tower (+51'6") would be 66% higher.** In their opinion, significant compromise will be necessary for this development to be judged appropriate. **The PAA and the developers have introduced factors, unrelated to the building's OCCHD compatibility, which has contributed to the neighborhood's indecision and compromise discussions. There is concern for the club's financial stability and therefore the stewardship of the historic clubhouse building.** They would urge the Commission to require a preservation easement as a precondition to granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. He states that there is a desire for commercial rather than institutional development in North Oakland, and recent knowledge of **Pitt's negotiations with UPMC for the acquisition and development of the adjacent lot 27-L-212, the Syria Mosque site, has created uncertainty about this development's compatibility** with the evolving larger Bigelow Blvd. surface parking development. The OCCHD is a precious tapestry of monumental and historic structures. He states that they recognize development is inevitable and that appropriate development is desirable, but their concern is that with compromise comes the risk of irrevocable damage to the tapestry.

18. Mr. Robert Dower steps to the podium; he is speaking on behalf of the PAA and as a resident of Oakland. He wants to give some context to what this will mean for the PAA, even though some of it is outside of what the HRC is allowed to consider. He states that they have been looking for revenue sources for a long time. They reached this agreement with the developer as the best possible use that fits best within the neighborhood. He states that this deal is essential to the survival of the PAA. Failure of the PAA would not be just a failure of the club, but would also mean the loss of jobs and possible conversion to an institutional building, which would compromise the historical integrity of the building. He supports the project as a resident also, and feels that this class of hotel is needed.
  19. Mr. Scott Bowfinger steps to the podium; he is representing LGA Partners and also commenting on behalf of Jonathan Glanz, a partner in the firm and resident who wanted to express his support for the project. He states that his firm works in architecture, interiors, planning, and historic preservation. They have worked on a number of projects which were historically significant. He states that they are working with the PAA in evaluating options for their properties. They have reviewed this project extensively and feel that it is appropriate and compatible in its context, and it provides a future for the PAA organization as well as the building. They are in support of the project.
- 
-

- 
- 
20. Mr. John Fryvogel steps to the podium; he is a member of the PAA and was a past president of the board. He is also a resident of Schenley Farms. He states that when the board of directors started exploring their options years ago, their objective was to not only save the PAA as a club, but to save the PAA building. They believe that this project will do that, and they are willing to grant the preservation easement.
  21. Mr. Dan Gilman steps to the podium; he is the City Councilman for District 8, which includes this site. He states that this project is one of the most difficult he has worked on, but also one of the most rewarding. He states that there is the charge of protecting one of the most significant buildings in the area, along with saving the PAA as a club and developing adjacent to it. Schenley Farms and the developer have been working together with his office for five months. He has never **seen a project come to a dead tie, which didn't give him ideal guidance from his constituents** but is nevertheless part of the challenge of his job. He understands **and doesn't disagree with many of the comments from neighbors, but wants to** make a few key points. The first is about the width of the building; the developers have taken thirty feet off of the building. There are economic realities to development, and many of the historic buildings were built before there were cars; space for parking does need to be considered. He also states that in addition to the historic buildings there has also been modern development such as Nordenberg Hall, the Wyndham Hotel, and the UPMC complex, that have fit well into the neighborhood. The developers have done a good job of honoring the pedestrian landscape, which is essential in Oakland, by working with the scale and narrowing the garage opening. He fully supports the preservation easement and the protection of the PAA as a building and a club. He also supports a full-scale hotel as an essential piece of the neighborhood.
  22. Mr. Jim Sheehan steps to the podium; he is a member of the board of directors of the PAA. He states that the board and the membership are fully in support of the project. As an architect, he understands the challenge of building in or adjacent to a historic district. He urges the Commission to look at each problem that the development team tried to solve and analyze what they did, and then provide guidance on any specific issues rather than accepting or rejecting the design as a whole.
  23. Mr. Hogan asks for any additional testimony; there is none. He acknowledges an email received in favor of the hotel from Andy McSwigan, dated June 3, 2015.
  24. Mr. Hogan states that whenever the HRC reviews alteration a historic district and buildings, such as when Pitt came to them to propose Nordenberg Hall, it is always a long and challenging process. He states that even the testimony was deadlocked as far as speakers for and against, and he hears the passion from the residents that cherish this community and commends them for protecting it. He asks for comment from his fellow commissioners.
  25. Ms. Peterson states that she feels that the proposed building is still out of proportion with the scale of the neighborhood and given the constraints of the historic district. She acknowledges that she was not a commissioner at the previous hearing where this project was presented.
  26. Mr. Falcone states that he also has concerns with the scale and massing of the building. He also has concerns about minor details, such as the fenestration. He is considering what visual impact the project will have on the district as a whole, and
- 
-

---

---

as he is bound by the guidelines, he cites a specific line in the guidelines for new construction that mentions the relationship between this district and the Schenley Farms Historic District. He cites one of the slides that showed what impact this building will have on the relationship between those two districts. He is trying to process the overall visual impact.

27. Mr. Serrao states for the record that he is a member of the PAA but was in no way involved in the decision-making process. He states that he was present for the previous presentation. He understands that it is a difficult situation, developing new construction in a historic district and adjacent to a historic contributing building. He does have some concerns, but he feels that the developer has done a lot to address and minimize some of the issues such as setbacks, massing, and the architectural louvers. He understands the reality of construction and that the development needs to make money. He is not 100% convinced, but he is leaning towards the idea that a good compromise has been reached.
28. Mr. Hogan states that he has reviewed the evaluation criteria and feels that per the code the project in many respects meets the criteria as stated by the developer. He has also reviewed the design guidelines and believes, with his experience in development, preservation, and as a resident of a historic neighborhood, that many of the concerns raised by the HRC and some concerns raised by the neighborhood have been addressed. He had been very concerned by the setbacks, which have been improved despite the effect on the economic model. The materials and articulations of the glazing have been improved. The guidelines are very specific in stating that new construction should not replicate historic structures, but that it is to emulate the components of the district and respect the size and massing of the other buildings in the district. This district has building with a variety of articulations and heights. He also thinks that this is a project that moves the district in a forward direction and also offers great value and potential for growth in the district. He thinks the Commission, if approval is granted, should prescribe the standards of the materials; he thinks they should be more harmonious with the environment of Oakland Civic Center and Schenley Farms. He asks for a motion.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of the 10 story hotel with the following conditions: that the majority stone be the Oak Ridge, with the accent to be the Masonry Heatherstone, and that the signage is to be resubmitted at a future time. He comments on the preservation easement, stating that preservation of the façade is what the Commission does.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that the preservation easement is not before them. He asks for a second.
  3. Mr. Gastil asks if they should consider tabling.
  4. Mr. Hogan states that he thinks he is able to second the motion under protocol. He seconds the motion in order to move to a vote.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan and Mr. Serrao are in favor and Mr. Falcone and Ms. Peterson are opposed. Mr. Hogan states that Mr. Gastil is an abstention.
  6. **Mr. Hogan states that they can't move forward and the applicant will have to**
- 
-

---

---

resubmit. He states that they may need legal advice from the law department as to what two in favor, two opposed, and one abstention would mean.

7. Mr. Falcone asks if they can make another motion to table.
  8. Mr. Hogan states that Mr. Serrao would have to withdraw his motion.
  9. Mr. Serrao withdraws his motion and makes another motion to table the application for 30 days.
  10. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  11. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, Ms. Peterson, and Mr. Falcone are in favor and Mr. Gastil abstains. Motion carries.
  12. Mr. Hogan states that from a procedural standpoint the application is tabled for 30 days and the Commission will seek advice from the law department.
- 
-

---

---

**1224 Monterey Street Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Richard Worl  
Monterey Street Project  
1228 Monterey St  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-265

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Richard Worl  
Monterey Street Project  
1228 Monterey St  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/11/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** After-the-fact demolition and new construction.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Richard Worl steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he was before the Commission in March to obtain approval to renovate the house. It was an infill house that had been abandoned for over 20 years with no roof. After he received approval from the Commission and started demolition, he states that the building inspector said they were doing too much demolition and **the work was stopped. At that point the building was condemned and they weren't** allowed to enter the property. They then got a demolition permit, put up the proper notices, and proceeded to demolish the house, not realizing that the demolition permit was not for a full demolition. He says that after they did that and the building inspector signed off, they were told that they needed to come back to Commission and they received a revocation notice for the demolition permit. He states that they are proposing to put up the same house that was approved the first time. He states that they have a letter of support from Councilwoman Harris and the ACCA, as well as verbal support from his immediate neighbor. He repeats that plans have not changed since March except for that there is only a basement remaining now. He states that the house that was there was a concrete block shell, with lap-siding and wire scraped brick on the front and aluminum windows. There was no plumbing, heating, or mechanicals, and the rear addition was built without footers.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that the original approval was just to demolish the addition on the rear, as well as renovation of the front and back.
  3. Ms. Susan Warner steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She states that the center section of the building had 7 ½ foot ceilings, and they are now proposing 9 foot ceilings in order to have taller windows. With the original building, it would have been difficult to keep the floor levels the same.
  4. Ms. Quinn states that she was told that the building was demolished because it was all rotted inside and asks if they are now saying it was demolished because they
- 
-

---

---

wanted higher ceilings.

5. Ms. Warner says it was rotted, the ceiling height is a separate issue.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
  7. Ms. Peterson asks if the owner or architect asked the building inspector to demolish the house.
  8. Mr. Worl says no.
  9. Mr. Hogan says they had gone so far with the demolition that the house was probably unsalvageable. He states that he knows exactly what they approved as far as demolition, and someone got very overzealous with the machine and kept going. By the time the inspector saw it, they had demolished the approved rear addition, the middle addition, and had started in on the front of the house. He states that **they have completely overstepped the process. He states that he doesn't know if** it was intentional, or if the contractor or demo guy accidentally overstepped. He states that this is a serious problem, and states that they do have the power to order them to reconstruct what was there, which would be painful and nonproductive. He states that the condemnation notice is irrelevant to the discussion because they caused it with their excessive demolition.
  10. Ms. Quinn provides a timeline, stating that they came to Commission and got approval for rehabbing the front of the building and removing a rear addition. A building inspector came to her and asked if they had permission to demolish half the building; when she said no, a stop work order was issued, the building was condemned, and they were instructed to return to the HRC. She provides an email comment from Kate Kay.
  11. Mr. Hogan states that they can table it, approve the plans with comments, or order them to reverse what happened. He states that the house was an original house, although the applicant has argued that it is infill. The roofline and dormer is the same as on the adjacent house.
  12. Mr. Worl states that the materials show that the house was not original.
  13. Mr. Hogan says it had obviously been remodeled many times, but is still the original house.
  14. Ms. Peterson states that it is both in the city and the national historic districts.
  15. Mr. Falcone says that he is not comfortable with making the decision with only three commission members present.
  16. Mr. Hogan would like to have the building rendered with the neighboring houses since he believes there is a height difference.
  17. Ms. Peterson asks if there is any precedent for a house being demolished without approval in a historic district.
  18. Mr. Hogan states that there is none that he knows of.
  19. Mr. Worl states that it was an accident and a misunderstanding, and they would like to get started with correcting what is now a hole in the ground.
  20. **Mr. Hogan states that they can't do anything right now, as the original Certificate** has been revoked and this is a whole new case.
- 
-

---

---

21. Ms. Peterson states that the Iron City Brewery did demolition without permission, and after enforcement was sent they had to go before the magistrate and pay a fine. She reiterates her initial testimony that the house is indeed original and not infill. She agrees that the application should be tables.

---

---

**Motion:**

22. Mr. Falcone motions to table the application for 30 days.

23. Ms. Peterson seconds.

24. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. He asks for more contextual materials and larger plans.

---

---