



**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 July 1, 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	Elizabeth Behrend	Barbara Ernsberger	Mary McDonough
Carol Peterson (called in)	Sharon Spooner	Gene Ciavarra	Alan Hohlelder	Harold McCutchen
Raymond Gastil		John D Norton	Eve Picker	Norman Cleary
Ernie Hogan		John Freyvogel	David Menk	Melissa McSwigan
		Greg Spicer	Karamagi Rujumba	William Otto
		Tyler Green	Craig Worl	Michael Mitcham
		Michael Kratsas	Michael Shealey	Christine Simmons
		Darren Toth	Carole Malakoff	Evelyn Jones
		J. Bacharach	Dick Clouser	Deborah Walko
		Mike Abney	Robert Kelley	Doug Sipp
		Tom Certo	Bob Baumbach	

**Old Business**—None.

**New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the June meeting minutes, Mr. Gastil motions to approve and Ms. Peterson seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Ms. Peterson, Mr. Gastil, and Mr. Hogan are in favor and Mr. Harless abstains. Motion carries.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the June Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Gastil motions to approve and Mr. Harless seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Gastil, Mr. Harless, and Mr. Hogan are in favor and Ms. Peterson abstains. Motion carries.

**Other Business:**

1. Ms. Quinn states that the other item under “New Business” is the approval of the Design Guidelines, which is something they need to think about. She reminds the Commission that there is no hearing in August, so anything they table today will not be heard again until September. She talks about the grant that was received for doing a National Register nomination in Lawrenceville; due to issues with the state budget the funds may not be received for a while.

2. Mr. Gastil talks about the Design Guidelines. He states that the Commission does need to approve them but thinks they need more time to review them. He suggests that it should stay on the agenda for the next meeting and they will vote on it then.
3. Ms. Quinn talks about a preservation forum being planned for this fall in partnership with Point Park College and preservation organizations throughout the city. She also states that work on implementing the archiving legislation is progressing.
4. Mr. Gastil expresses his support for the preservation forum.

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Harless motions to adjourn the meeting.

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

**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 states that they have made revisions to the project that was presented last month. He shows the plans and states that the proposed house is at the corner of Avery and Middle Streets. They are proposing a 20 by 40 foot wide house with a 12 foot wide parking space, and a patio with an accessible ramp. He states that he believes that when the project was presented last month the materials were acceptable as well as the proportions of windows, roofline, etc. He states that there were questions about the appearance of the Middle elevation, so he has reworked the design. He states that in the previous design they had the gable end of the roof facing Middle and no door facing either of the streets. Even though the Commission did not require them to add a door they decided to add one on the Middle side; the Middle elevation now has traditional townhouse proportions. They also changed the direction of the ridge line for the roof to be more traditional in appearance. They have also added a flower terrace on the west side, which steps back about three feet from the rake of the roof. He shows the elevation with the dormer shedding out with the terrace which has three glass doors.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that he feels the proposal is greatly improved. He states that the proportions and window fenestrations are much more suited to the community, and the rear dormer is inconspicuous. He asks for public testimony; there is none. He asks for a motion.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

3. Mr. Harless motions to approve the project as submitted.
  4. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  5. Mr. Hogan states that final materials, colors and specifications should be submitted to staff.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1021 E. Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Morgan Family Development  
6 Parklea Drive  
Monroeville, Pa 15146

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-G-134

Inspector: Jack Heath

**Applicant:**

Front Studio Architects  
357 N. Craig Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 6/11/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jameson Fielding from Front Studio Architects steps to the podium. Mr. Dan Berkowitz also steps to the podium; he is representing the owner. Mr. Fielding explains the project, stating that the building had its original storefront removed at some point, so they will be removing what is there and rebuilding a new storefront. They are proposing Juliet balconies at each of the existing upper-story windows; they will be keeping and repairing the windows themselves. They will also be cleaning the existing brick.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials for the balconies.
  3. Mr. Fielding states that it is a steel frame with a welded wire mesh. They weren't trying to replicate anything with the balconies; the owner has an interest in structural steel and wanted steel detailing to be incorporated into the design.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks if that is the reason for the ornamentation on the signboard as well.
  5. Mr. Fielding says yes, and they also wanted to reflect the materials of the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks about the other materials.
  7. Mr. Fielding states that the storefront will be painted wood with a wood and glass entry door. There will be glass side lites and a glass transom above the door.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks if they are doing a signboard with a projected crown and if the muntins are flat; the applicant says yes to both. He asks if it is a fixed pane or transom above the door; the applicant states that it is a fixed pane. He asks about the windows.
  9. Mr. Fielding states that the existing wooden one-over-one windows are to remain. There is one that is missing which they will replace to match.
  10. Mr. Hogan states that he is not a fan of the Juliet balconies although he
- 
-

---

---

appreciates the intent behind them. They are not original to the building and aren't adding anything to it. He also isn't a fan of the double side-lite and would rather see a transom over the door.

11. Mr. Gastil states that he appreciates aspects of the architectural character of the balconies, but does not see the relationship to the historic district. He doesn't comment on the side lites but states that he appreciates the large area of windows at street level which he states is needed in this part of the district.
12. Mr. Hogan asks about the uplighting and light fixtures.
13. Mr. Fielding states he could provide a cut sheet if the Commission requires it.
14. Mr. Hogan states that it would be helpful. He states that they look like an old exposed bulb fixture but he can't tell for sure.
15. Mr. Fielding says that the bulbs would be exposed.
16. Mr. Hogan states that they should probably rethink the fixtures. Although they have approved other options for signage lighting, gooseneck lamps would be the choice most in keeping with the district.
17. Mr. Harless agrees with the other Commissioners on the balconies. He asks if they are planning on having apartments on the upper floors and if the balconies would have any use.
18. Mr. Fielding says they will be apartments but the balconies would just be decorative. He states that they are willing to eliminate them if that is what the Commission wants. He asks if there is anything else they should address other than the lighting.
19. Mr. Hogan states that he is not a fan of the door but will go with the will of the other Commissioners.
20. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
21. Mr. Gastil has some reservations about the side lites, but feels that they don't have to order a redesign unless they feel that they are truly out of step with the neighborhood.

---

---

**Motion:**

22. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the application as submitted, with the condition that the balconies be removed from the design. He recommends that they take another look at the transom, side lites, and door.
  23. Ms. Quinn states that the motion needs to be specific.
  24. Mr. Gastil revises the motion to approve as submitted, with the condition that the balconies be removed and the lighting be changed to gooseneck lamps.
  25. Mr. Harless seconds.
  26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
  27. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the approval does not include signage; that will need to be reviewed under a separate application.
- 
-

**2134 E. Carson Street**

**East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Morgan Family Development  
6 Parklea Drive  
Monroeville, Pa 15146

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-K-44

Inspector: Jack Heath

**Applicant:**

Front Studio Architects  
357 N. Craig Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 6/11/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jameson Fielding from Front Studio Architects steps to the podium. Mr. Dan Berkowitz also steps to the podium; he is representing the owner. Mr. Fielding explains the project, stating that they are proposing façade renovations, including removal of existing signage from the original storefront and restoration of the original storefront by removing paint and repainting. On the upper floors they will be restoring the brick, restoring the existing windows, and installing a new cornice.
  2. Mr. Hogan confirms from the application materials that they will be cleaning the brick, reinstalling the cornice, restoring the storefront and removing the retractable protection gate.
  3. Mr. Fielding states that that is correct.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks if they have any evidence that the storefront had curved windows.
  5. Mr. Fielding states that the storefront is existing behind what's there. He states that they don't have any photographic evidence for what the cornice might have looked like.
  6. Mr. Harless asks if the ramp is offset from the entry door as it looks like in the drawings.
  7. Mr. Fielding states that that is an issue with the drawings and is not an existing condition.
  8. Ms. Quinn asks if that is the same case with the railing.
  9. Mr. Fielding says yes.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks about the lighting.
  11. Mr. Fielding says that they are using gooseneck lamps for this project.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

13. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the project as submitted.
  14. Mr. Harless seconds.
  15. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
  16. Mr. Hogan states that final materials and color should be submitted to staff.
  17. Ms. Quinn states that signage should be submitted in a separate application.
- 
-

**237 7<sup>th</sup> Street**  
**The Benedum Center**

*Individual Landmark*

---

---

**Owner:**

Gene Ciavarra  
The Pittsburgh Cultural Trust  
803 Liberty Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 1-D-57

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Alan Hohlfelder  
MacLachlan, Cornelius & Filoni  
307 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 6/11/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Gene Ciavarra steps to the podium; he is the VP of operations for the Benedum Center. He explains the project, stating that it involves renovation of the marquee.
  2. Mr. Alan Hohlfelder from MacLachlan, Cornelius & Filoni, the architects for the project, steps to the podium.
  3. Mr. Jacob Bacharach steps to the podium; he is also with the Benedum Center and Pittsburgh Cultural Trust.
  4. Mr. Ciavarra explains that two marquees are to be renovated, one on 7<sup>th</sup> Street and one on the Penn Avenue side. He explains that on the Penn Avenue marquee, the metal has deteriorated after 30 years, and the paint has faded. This marquee always reads “Benedum Center for the Performing Arts” and that will remain as-is. The metal on the 7<sup>th</sup> Street marquee has also deteriorated, so they are proposing to renovate it using the same colors. They are also proposing that the hand-installed letters be replaced with an electronic system that will replicate the lettering and blue background. They are also proposing to replace the chase lights with LED lights rather than incandescent lights. He states that they already have an electronic marquee on the Byham Theater, and they did some experiments on it to show what it would look like for the Benedum. He shows that they were able to replicate the blue background.
  5. Mr. Hohlfelder speaks more about the renovation of the marquees. He restates that the application has three parts: the sign behind the marquee, the 7<sup>th</sup> Street marquee, and the Penn Avenue marquee. He states that only the 7<sup>th</sup> Street marquee will have the digital signboard, and that it be on all three sides of that particular marquee.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for more information about the LEDs and what they will look like.
  7. Mr. Hohlfelder states that the lamps will look virtually identical to the existing
- 
-

---

---

lamps, just with LEDs. He states that they have tried some LEDs as samples, and they are indistinguishable from the existing lamps.

8. Mr. Gastil asks about the black space that appears to be around the blue field on the Byham Theater test of the digital signboard.
9. Mr. Hohlfelder states that the blue field will go all the way out to the edge like the existing Benedum signboard.
10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

11. Mr. Gastil motions to approve.
  12. Mr. Harless seconds.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**311 Lowenhill Street  
Lowen-Shaffer House**

*Individual Landmark*

---

---

**Owner:**

Christine Simmons  
311 Lowenhill Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Ward: 19th

Lot and Block: 16-G-82

Inspector: John Stahl

**Applicant:**

Christine Simmons  
311 Lowenhill Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 6/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Replacement of roofing material.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Christine Simmons steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that her late husband had restored the house and she is trying to keep it up. She states that over the last several years the tin roof has really deteriorated; her husband used to try and patch up the holes that would open at the seams, but she has been unable to keep up with it. She has five leaks on the top floor of the house, and there are patches of rust and other holes. She had people out to look at that, but they declined to do the work, stating that it would be like trying to put a band-aid on it. She states that she doesn't have enough money to install a new tin roof, but she does want to have a period-appropriate roof installed. She and her family have researched to find the asphalt product that she is proposing today.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks what neighborhood the property is in.
  3. Ms. Simmons says it is in Beechview.
  4. Mr. Gastil asks what the date of the house is.
  5. Ms. Simmons says that it is from about 1865.
  6. Mr. Hogan states that it is a stunning and important piece of architecture.
  7. Ms. Simmons agrees, and she says she wants to keep up the integrity of the style of the house, but just can't afford a tin roof.
  8. Mr. Hogan states that a commercialized standing-seam roofing product is available and asks if they looked into it.
  9. Ms. Simmons says yes, and it is way out of their price range. They struggled to come up with something affordable as is. She states that the house may be lost if they can't do this.
  10. The Commission discusses the proposal.
  11. Mr. Hogan suggests that they explore the loan programs from the URA. He states
- 
-

---

---

that they need to help her connect with resources.

12. Mr. Gastil asks if they have researched any loans, grants, or historic resources. He states that he does understand that she has an emergency situation with the roof.
13. Ms. Simmons says she is not in a position to take out a loan.
14. Mr. Hogan states that they do understand the difficulty with maintaining older homes to their standards. However, this is such a significant piece of architecture, which is why it was individually nominated and approved to be a city historic structure. He states that she has done a commendable job in keeping the house together. He understands that the asphalt shingle is an affordable product, but he also thinks that the Commission should research options to help her put the correct metal roof on. The shingles significantly alter the appearance of the house, as the roof is an important part of its significance. He states that they would usually consider an asphalt roof in place of a slate roof, but this house never had a slate roof. He does also understand that time is of the essence for her.
15. Ms. Simmons states that she has a deadline from her homeowner's insurance of September 4<sup>th</sup>. They wanted the roof to be painted, but the roof is in such poor repair that painting would not work. They have given her 60 days to replace the roof or they will cancel her policy.
16. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
17. Mr. Gastil asks what would happen if she was to file a hardship case.
18. Mr. Hogan says that they would have to deny the application and she would have to reapply as a hardship case in September.
19. Mr. Harless states that the guidelines refer to work being able to be reversed in the future.
20. Ms. Quinn states that these guidelines are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which are used for individual properties.
21. Mr. Gastil states that if they did have a hearing in 30 days they could table the application for more discussion. He states that they recognize that the structure of the house is in peril, and states that the greater good here may be the preservation of the house, as opposed to sustaining the existing roof material. He states that it is a difficult situation.
22. The Commission looks at the materials.
23. Mr. Hogan states that they are keeping the red color.

---

---

**Motion:**

24. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the application with the product and color specified, which is to match the color of the existing roof as closely as possible.
  25. Mr. Harless seconds.
  26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Gastil and Mr. Harless are in favor and Mr. Hogan opposes. Motion carries.
  27. Mr. Hogan suggests that the homeowner contact Councilwoman Rudiak to explore available resources.
- 
-



**1319 N. Franklin Street**

**Manchester Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

David Mistick  
11779 Aurelio Lane  
Orlando, Fl 32827

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 22-K-334

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**

Mistick Construction  
1300 Brighton Road  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/28/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Deck and fencing replacement.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Brian Tarquinio with Mistick Construction steps to the podium. He explains the project, stating that they are looking to replace the existing rear deck, fence, and rear driveway. He shows photos of the existing conditions, stating that the railing on the deck was not up to code and the deck was in disrepair. He shows photos of the existing parking pad, which is also in disrepair. He states that they are proposing to extend the deck out four feet, and have a U-shaped, switchback stair rather than a single stair.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks about the material.
  3. Mr. Tarquinio states that it would be pressure-treated, stained wood. The decking itself will be Trex. He shows photos of a stockade fence that surrounded the rear of the property; they are proposing a different style of fence in the same pressure-treated stained wood. The color will be dark gray.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks if it will be a flat picket with a top and bottom running band.
  5. Mr. Tarquinio says that is correct, they are five-quarters by six flat pickets.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks if this is all on the rear of the house.
  7. Mr. Tarquinio says yes.
  8. Mr. Harless asks if the location of the fence will change from what is existing.
  9. Mr. Tarquinio states that they are keeping the same location except that they are proposing to close of the end of the parking pad off.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
  11. Ms. Evelyn Jones steps to the podium. She states that the project was started with no permits, and the building inspector shut the job down. She says that part of the fence is already up. She states that the fence may be alright, as long as they don't take the fence all the way to the alley.
- 
-

---

---

12. The Commissioners state that the proposal was not to take the fence all the way to the alley.

13. Mr. Hogan asks for any other testimony; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

14. Mr. Harless motions to approve.

15. Mr. Gastil seconds.

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

---

---

**1416 Sheffield Street**

**Manchester Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Jamie Dietz  
1416 Sheffield Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 24-N-222

Inspector: Pat Brown

**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:** Deck replacement.

---

---

**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 to replace an existing deck. He shows that it is on the side of the house, but there is an open lot next door so it is visible from the street. They plan to keep the footprint of the deck identical, so they are keeping the timbers and posts in the same place. The posts will be six by six, and they will have a two by eight apron in the front. They are proposing to do a top and bottom rail of treated lumber, and the pickets will be metal decorative balusters. The deck will be stained a charcoal gray.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks for more detail about the railing.
  3. Mr. Baumbach shows the section. He states that the pickets are round, black metal, about an inch in diameter, and will go into the top and bottom rails. The railing will also have a wooden cap. The railing will be stained gray, so it won't be a high contrast between the materials.
  4. Mr. Hogan states that he would prefer a different railing.
  5. Mr. Gastil asks if there was any reason or precedent for the metal railing.
  6. Mr. Baumbach says no.
  7. Mr. Hogan would recommend that the railing be all wood.
  8. Mr. Baumbach states that he could try a flat picket and resubmit the drawings.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the project as submitted, with a modified picket or baluster to be resubmitted in wood to staff for final approval.
  11. Mr. Harless seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-



**2 S. Market Place**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

N & P Properties  
204 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 404  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-223

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Primanti Brothers  
2100 Wharton Street, Suite 720  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 6/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Enclosure of sidewalk canopy.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Michael Kratsas steps to the podium; he is representing the owner.
  2. Mr. Mike Mitchum steps to the podium; he is also with Primanti Brothers.
  3. Mr. Kratsas explains the project, stating that last year in February they received approval to construct an outdoor canopy for the sidewalk café. He states that they are proposing an enclosure so that the café can be used in the off-season. The canopy will be placed behind the columns and will comply with the celestial divided, wood-framed windows above. He shows a rendering with the overhead panels closed; the panels will retract and lift up into the ceiling of the canopy. They would like to do this rather than using a plastic curtain as some of the other merchants in the district do. The presented it to several neighborhood associations and received support for their plan.
  4. Mr. Hogan explains the previous approval to the Commissioners who were not present at that meeting. He states that there has been interest from other owners in adding canopies all the way around Market Square; however, Primanti's was able to demonstrate that a canopy had been present historically, so the Commission was able to grant approval. He asks if they have any historical evidence of an enclosed canopy, because to his knowledge it would have just been an open breezeway to protect shoppers.
  5. Mr. Kratsas says there are other examples in the City.
  6. Mr. Hogan states that he would like to stay in context. He does think this is well-done, but is concerned about precedent. He asks about the materials.
  7. Mr. Kratsas states that the material will be wood and will align with the existing structural steel canopy. He states that the encroachment will be inside and not in the public right-of-way.
  8. Ms. Quinn states that they did not receive any specific comments for this project, but she did receive an email from someone in charge of the PDP stating that he is
- 
-

---

---

working with City Planning on sidewalk café guidelines.

9. Mr. Kratsas states that the type of doors they are proposing are seen in other historic districts in the city. They provide a historic appearance when closed.
10. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is actually that they are asking to enclose the space and create a permanent outdoor dining room. He says that other doors lift to create an awning and revert to their historical appearance when closed, but this is not the same situation. He states that their canopy has added value to the district. He states that enclosing it, though, would be a significant departure from the guidelines and a step in a different direction for the district.
11. Mr. Gastil asks if they could use the plastic.
12. Mr. Hogan says that since it is not permanent, they could use it and would not need additional approval.
13. Mr. Harless clarifies that the reason the canopy was approved is that it had existed historically.
14. Mr. Hogan says yes, and if the building is contributing and the applicant can't prove that a structure was there historically, the Commission has not been approving canopy structures in this district.
15. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none. He acknowledges for the record letters of support including letters submitted by the Market Square Merchant's Association, Highwoods, the Big Y Group, and PHLF.
16. Mr. Harless states that they should take a stand and not approve this type of canopy in the district unless it was existing.

---

---

**Motion:**

17. Mr. Harless motions to deny.
  18. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  19. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. He states that they can come back if they change the design or can prove it existed historically.
- 
-

**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. Bill Sidick steps to the podium; he is representing the applicant. He presents a memorandum outlining the project's compliance with the historic district criteria. He states that since the application was before the Commission last month, there have been significant changes. He states that there had already been significant changes made for the very first application they submitted, which was for an 11-story, 190 room, 200,000 square foot hotel. He states that they made changes as a result of community feedback; many of those changes were presented last month, and additional changes were made for this month. Some changes were made in response to specific comments for changes to the design, and changes were also made to the presentation, specifically in response to one commissioner, Mr. Falcone, who requested additional views. He details the ways in which this application deviates from the original. The size of the hotel was reduced significantly; it is now 10 stories, 175,000 square feet, and 170 rooms. The name of the owner on the application was corrected. The materials were designated and changed per the Commission's request, with the primary to be Oakridge and the trim to be Hearthstone. The monument sign was eliminated completely, and any other signage will come back as a separate application. They have included additional view angles and added additional details such as the PAA porte-cochere and streetscape detail on the Lytton Avenue elevation. They have added the PAA top level addition to the drawings and have included additional height comparisons with the PAA and surrounding buildings. They have made a unilateral change in the light fixtures on the first floor from the more contemporary fixtures shown on the original application. Together there are about 8 significant changes to the application. He knows there are opponents of the project, and while they are significant in that they are Schenley Farms neighbors who are committed to the historic nature of their community and their homes, they represent a small constituency. He states that the Commission will hear not so much about design, but about scale. He says that opponents want to go back to the turn of the last century, but since then there has been a major change, which is
- 
-

---

---

structured parking. The parking requirements dictate the base of the structure, and they have designed the smallest base possible to accommodate structured parking. He states that structured parking, which wasn't an issue in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, will also affect the view corridors. He states that parking requirements will also affect development on the Syria Mosque site. He states that with this project, they will be able to replace a large surface lot that went lot line to lot line and place that underground, then shrink the building on top of it to create the most minimum sized parking lot that they can that will serve the needs of the hotel and the PAA. He states that one thing they have learned that has gotten lost in the process is that the people that are most concerned about the historic nature of the hotel are the caretakers of the PAA. The caretakers are the ones that they dealt with prior to going out to the community, and that part was one of the most arduous parts of the process. The caretakers were obviously concerned with all the things that are being reviewed by the Commission and all of the things the neighbors are concerned about, but at a much higher level. They are the organization that will have to live with it, so they have looked at everything from the nature of the use, the parking, the connections with the building, and the overall architecture. This process has gone on for two years, and, in addition to taking into consideration the comments from the Commissioners—and he thinks this is even reflected in the comments of those that are opposed—the developer has done everything that they have been asked to do and that they can do within the confines of the project to make it the best project that it can be. He introduces Keith McGraw, who did not speak at the last hearing. He states that he will give more information from the developer's side, including concerns for the PAA and information on the quality of the hotel and the structure.

2. Mr. Keith McGraw steps to the podium; he is a partner in Concorde Hospitality Enterprises. He states that they have developed 17 hotels in the area over the past 15 years. He states that this location is the culmination of many years of work to find an opportunity to build a special hotel. From the beginning of the process they felt that any hotel that is to be built on this location needed to be an upscale, luxury hotel which would be new for the East End. They also realized that the most significant aspect of the project for the PAA was the PAA itself: its legacy, its future, and how the hotel could complement their operation and help support it and make it flourish. After two years of meeting with the board and satisfying them as to their ability to develop the site, finance the site, and secure the right type of hotel brand, they came to an agreement with them and a long-term lease. They believe that the hotel will complement the PAA from a financial standpoint, and the PAA is interested in doing capital improvements and operational enhancements to the PAA to see it sustained for another hundred years. They are proud to be a part of this process and they feel that they are a very responsible and civic minded developer. He explains that they are in the process of securing a franchise from Hyatt; this will be a new brand of hotel for them that is only being developed in vibrant urban areas such as Manhattan, Miami, D.C., San Francisco, London, and Paris. They feel that the hotel will be a tremendous asset to the area. They have also met numerous times with University of Pittsburgh, who have indicated that they prefer an upscale hotel. They have also met with CMU, the Oakland Task Force, and Schenley Farms, and through this process he feels that they have formulated a partnership. They took many recommendations from these groups on how the hotel should be developed. There was concern about the setbacks from Bigelow and Lytton; originally, they had mimimun five foot
- 
-

---

---

setbacks, and in order to accomplish 15 foot setback on each road they needed to reduce the size of the hotel. They shrunk the hotel by about 26,000 square feet in order to achieve those setbacks. The Oakland Task Force was concerned about the openings into the parking garage; they had three lanes of access on Bigelow, which they reduced to two in order to, per the OTF, present a better architectural enhancement to the building and mitigate safety issues for pedestrians. They also changed the traffic pattern; hotel guests will not be able to exit the hotel on to Bigelow and will use Lytton, where they will only be able to make a right turn. PAA members will be able to exit either way on to Lytton. The hotel has a unique feature, with the lobby being on the top floor, and they are also planning other upscale features such as an outdoor terrace to show off Oakland to out-of-town guests. The hotel will also be LEED certified.

3. Mr. Clarence Vincen steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He goes through the presentation, starting by showing some contextual images. He shows some overhead maps and a bird-eye view of the two blocks surrounding the site. He states that a later slide will identify some of the heights of the surrounding buildings, and they feel that they are appropriately positioned in terms of scale. He shows the computer-generated, mathematically correct models of both the hotel and the PAA, which they created in order to correctly show the proportions between the two. He shows slides of various before-and-after views of the site. From the Schenley Farms neighborhood, they feel that they are not blocking very many views at all except for the back of the PAA. He shows the plans of the building. He states that they have a landscape architect that has developed the terraced areas and setback areas. They will be creating an outdoor dining area for the first-floor restaurant. He shows the floor plans and talks about the parking arrangement and layout of the hotel. He states that the ramp system for the parking is a compressed as it can get. He states that they have created over 15 foot setbacks from the property line on either side, whereas they were only set back one or two feet originally. They have identified the primary materials based on the Commission's feedback from the last meeting. They will be using the simulated limestone product in the color "Oakridge", and the lighter gray brick in the color "Heritage". They are going to use low-e, high performance clear glazing, and a dark bronze grayish metal for the window wall systems and the canopies. He shows the straight-on views as you walk around the building. He states that the slides now show the proportional relationship PAA with its existing addition and the height of the PAA. He states that the hotel is only 15 feet or so higher than the PAA, excluding the hotel cooling tower, which will be minimally visible. He shows more information about materials and potential patterns. He shows slides with the relative heights of other buildings in the neighborhood; they feel that they are scaled appropriately for the neighborhood, specifically the two-block radius surrounding the site. The taller buildings include Nordenberg Hall, Litchfield Towers, the Cathedral of Learning, Soldiers and Sailors, and Alumni Hall. He talks about the architecture of the hotel, stating that their primary focus was to play off of the traditional classic nature of the PAA, including the divisions into top, middle, and base, the strong vertical elements, and the architrave at the top of the first set of pilasters. They felt that incorporating these elements would give harmony to the buildings, especially at the pedestrian scale. They have incorporated the vertical elements in the arrangement of the guest rooms. They have incorporated a base element that also conceals the parking structure, and they have incorporated a top, colonnaded element. He shows details of the street
- 
-

---

---

level; they feel that they have enhanced and amplified the pedestrian friendly nature of the street level. They have added canopy elements articulated more at the front entrance than was previously submitted, with cheek walls and a platform reaching out to the sidewalk. They added more of a traditional, transitional sconce element. They have also added outdoor dining to help activate the street level. They have incorporated vertical elements into the solid walls of the parking garage to help break down the scale of the building and relate back to the PAA. He shows drawings with the actual dimensions from the curb and from the property line.

4. Mr. Harless asks Mr. Sidick to briefly outline the changes that have been made to the application.
  5. Mr. Sidick states that while the plans presented last month did reflect many of the changes from the original, the application itself did not reflect the changes, so there was some confusion. He states that the application has been corrected to show the setbacks as 15 additional feet on both streets, as well as to show the elimination of one floor of the building. He states that the number of rooms went from 190 to 170, and the square footage went from 200,000 to 175,000. As a result of the changes to the base of the building, the number of parking spaces changed as well. They have identified and specified the colors of the exterior primary and trim materials. They have completely removed the monument sign. They have added additional view angles, specifically views from the community and from street level, as requested to provide more perspective. They corrected the name of the applicant on the application to reflect the entity that is actually going to construct the hotel. He states that one of the things that had been missing from the application since the beginning was the element on top of the PAA, which misrepresented the scale of the PAA as the element is significant in height. They have also provided some additional context for the building in this application. There were some outdoor fixtures that were changed as well to make them less contemporary and more in context.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional testimony on behalf of the applicant; there is none. He asks for public testimony.
  7. Ms. Deborah Walko of Schenley Farms steps to the podium. She states that she is opposed to the proposed PAA hotel as submitted to the HRC for this hearing. 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. It blocks the historic views up and down Lytton Avenue and along Bigelow Boulevard. She states that it is not relevant to the HRC's decision that the developers say they have made concessions. If the proposed development still does not adhere to the historic guidelines, then it is still unacceptable for the historic district. She states that she was also opposed to the former development plan and has attached her June 3 testimony. She doesn't see any significant change from last month's plan to the new plan in the size or the scope of the building. She doesn't know what the recommendations were to the developer for changing the application to make it acceptable to the Commission, since the letter of denial was not made available to her or the Schenley Farms Civic Association. She would like to request that such documents be made available to interested parties in the future. Many people, including PHLF, Preservation Pittsburgh, and the Councilman, remarked at the previous hearing that the hotel size is too large for the lot. The developer states that a smaller building, right-sized
- 
-

---

---

for the OOCCHD, would not fit their business model, and therefore it is asking them to endorse squeezing this large building on a site that is too small for it. She states that the guidelines should not be set aside to satisfy a developer's business model, nor to save the PAA club. She states that this development plan does nothing to protect the PAA building if the PAA club does not survive, as they have been told that the PAA hotel developer has no interest in developing the PAA building if the club were to fail. She states that this development plan also sets a bad precedent for the Bigelow lot. Pitt plans to develop the Bigelow lot, and a building with similar setbacks and height at the PAA hotel on the entire Bigelow lot would be unacceptable. She states that Carol Kowall's June 1 testimony said it well: "this entire block is the last, largest, and the most valuable land left to be developed in the civic center historic district. There will be no more important decision for the future. What happens on the PAA lot will enhance or degrade this entire block. What happens on this entire block will enhance or degrade the entire district." 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 sets an unacceptable precedent for future construction in the OCCHD adjacent to their community.

8. Ms. Elizabeth Berend of Schenley Farms steps to the podium. She states that one of the pictures in the presentation was taken from her driveway, so that's what her view will be once the "monster" of a building is put up. She states that the area around the Cathedral of Learning is made up of classically designed buildings with green space and setbacks. She states that the proposed building does not honor this design and is ugly by comparison. She states that it would be more suited to areas by the stadiums and the casino because it matches that kind of development. She states that the Civic Center has been cited all over the world as being a wonderful place, and this development does not match it. She also wonders what the demand is for hotel space; she states that it has not been mentioned that there is hotel right across the street, which does not have much signage, has sufficient setbacks, and has been quietly incorporated into the neighborhood without disturbing it. She states that there has been construction of a 128 room hotel in the area as well as a 152 room hotel in the Strip District and she doesn't know why this hotel has to be so big. She states that the hotel will not enhance the neighborhood. She states that she is a member of the PAA and is sympathetic to their problems but states that they should explore other solutions. She echoes Ms. Walko's concerns about the precedent this will set for development of the adjacent lot.
  9. Ms. Melissa McSwigan of Schenley Farms steps to the podium. She states for the record that she is not looking to go back to any century, architecturally or otherwise, and she welcomes modern or contemporary new buildings if they are done well with quality materials. She appreciates that the developer made a number of revisions to the hotel design to fit the historic district guidelines based on community feedback. She states that despite the concessions, the guidelines have still not been met. The lot size is just not big enough for the hotel to make the revenue that it needs, so they have a building that is out of proportion, too close to the PAA, and not in adherence to the guidelines, all in hope of saving the PAA. She states that she is frustrated with what she sees as a lack of planning and process on the part of the city; they understand that the former Syria Mosque site will likely be developed, and she thinks it seems prudent to look at the big picture of the two lots before granting any approvals. Otherwise, they will continue to have city
- 
-

---

---

planning in a haphazard way. She understands that trying to find the highest and best use is not always feasible, but she feels the city should take steps to have a public meeting with all of the entities involved. They know that both sites will be developed, and she thinks people are not necessarily opposed to development on the sites, but they are concerned about the way it is handled, among other things. What is built on the PAA site will set an architectural precedent for other new construction.

10. Ms. Mary McDonough of Schenley Farms 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, and, 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 in 1983, 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 proposed 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 E 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.

11. Mr. Norman Cleary steps to the podium; he is the president of the Schenley Farms Civic Association. He states that at the last HRC hearing he testified on behalf of the SFCA to advise the Commission on the ongoing dialog with Callay Capital/Concord Hospitality Enterprises development representatives, the PAA, and City Councilman Dan Gilman. He states that the original design that was withdrawn from the April 1<sup>st</sup> agenda was almost unanimously rejected by the membership. The revised plan includes many modifications that evolved from the discussions and is an admittedly marked improvement in setback and massing; this application is fundamentally the same as the one before the Commission last month, which was denied. He states that a conclusion that is clear, unanimous and undisputed among their 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, which they are asking the HRC to confirm, 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 compromise discussions. There is concern for the club's financial stability and therefore the stewardship of the historic clubhouse building. PHLF offered their support for this project with the provision that the PAA building be protected with a façade preservation easement. The SFCA would urge the Commission to require a preservation easement as a precondition to granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. He states that there may be some legal basis for why the Commission did not consider that. It is their understanding that the PAA and the developer have agreed to the easement, but as of last Friday they were advised that it has not yet been executed, and he did not hear anything in today's presentation about it. 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. He states that they recognize development is inevitable and that appropriate development is desirable, but their concern is that with the compromise that is necessary for this project comes the risk of irrevocable damage to the OCCHD. He also mentions that according to the HRC Rules and Procedures, four members are needed for a quorum, and there are only three present. He questions if any action can be taken in the absence of a quorum.
  12. Mr. Mike Abney of Schenley Farms steps to the podium. He states that he would like to reiterate his support for the project. He appreciates the willingness of the PAA and Callay Capital and Concorde to actively engage with the community on this development and work to build a consensus. 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 the SFCA board voted and members were divided equally on the project. Despite the comments today, there are a number of people in the neighborhood that do support the project. 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 symbiotic business relationship. If the hotel is not built, the PAA Club may find something else to go into that space, and he doubts that they could find anything as beneficial to the club and as minimally intrusive to Schenley Farms. 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. 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.

13. Mr. Robert Kelley of Schenley Farms steps to the podium. He states that he is pro-development for the most part, but he is very much opposed to this project. He 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 was that development should be "human scale" and should not overwhelm or diminish the people or the existing visual treasures. Another key element was the protection of vistas and views that allowed these treasures to be highlighted. A new building should be a new jewel or accent the jewels that already exist. The visual jewels of Oakland run from the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Club and Western Historical Society Building to the north, the Carnegie and Frick to the south, the Presbyterian Church to the west, and Mellon Institute and St. Paul's to the east. This area contains over a dozen buildings that are significant and architecturally beautiful, which are jewels that need to be protected. They are also connected, and he states that new structures should not be built that diminish these jewels or separate them visually. He states that the new Nordenberg Hall has already started to encroach and visually separate the district. He fears that this new building will create another visual separation, and the encroachment will probably continue with the UPMC development. He believes that there needs to be some breathing room in Oakland, in fact, space was an integral part of the original City Beautiful plan. The PAA hotel, which is over-sized for both the lot and the surrounding buildings, diminishes that breathing space. He states that if the Oakland Civic Center and Schenley Farms are thought of as being connected visually, it is important to not
- 
-

---

---

create structures that separate them. There is already a “canyon effect” on the vistas coming in to Oakland especially at Bigelow and Bayard with the new building going up. The development of the PAA and the UPMC lots further obliterate the vistas in this area. He also states that the height of the addition on the PAA should not be considered for height comparisons, as it is something that would never be approved today. He believes that new buildings such as the PAA hotel will also have a negative effect on the growing tourist trade that visits Oakland to enjoy the visual treasures. He states that he is not against development. He knows that the PAA is in trouble, but he states if another proposal such as a smaller hotel or an architecturally significant building was presented, there would not be opposition. The issue is that this is a very large building that is going to destroy the visual harmony of the district, and he states that one of the things that they learned in Portland is that buildings live for a long time, and will impact future generations.

14. Mr. Karamagi Rujumba from PHLF steps to the podium. He states that PHLF does support the project for various reasons. He states that they believe that the developer has had significant community input, the building has evolved significantly, and the developer has made significant concessions in the buildings appearance, and they also believe that the PAA needs a lifeline. They have discussed the donation of the PAA façade to PHLF out of concern for failure of the PAA. That agreement is still in place and is going to happen. He states that overall, PHLF believes in architectural integrity, significance of places, and preservation of landmarks, but they also believe that cities are constantly evolving, and it is this evolution that keeps them alive. Although he says the building is rather bigger than they would like, the developers have done a good job in compromising on the size and design, and for that they support the project.
  15. 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 about seven years ago the board began the process of looking for a developer to enhance the revenue stream coming in to the PAA by developing the club’s parking lot. They spoke to many of their institutional neighbors and found out early on that they were not interested in preserving the PAA as a private club or as a building, they were just interested in acquiring the building. This was unacceptable to the board of directors and the development committee. He states that they reached out to Concorde Development two years ago, and by far they have been the best development partner that they have dealt with. The revenue stream that will be generated in the duration of the 99 year lease will be essential to the survival of the PAA and the preservation of their historic building.
  16. Mr. William Otto steps to the podium; he is a member of the PAA and is on the board of directors. He states that the developers have made a number of changes to the design based on concerns raised by the Schenley Farms Civic Association, but unfortunately, it was not enough to convince a small number of SFCA members. He states that he doesn’t know why residents would admire the beauty of the back of the PAA, which is not the best side of the building. He states that the hotel will give a very attractive backdrop to the PAA, while allowing the PAA to still be the dominant feature from Fifth Avenue. He states that what may or may not be done with the Syria Mosque site is irrelevant to the Commission; the project should be judged on its own merits.
- 
-

- 
- 
17. Mr. Dan Gilman steps to the podium; he is the City Councilman for District 8, which includes this site and the surrounding residential neighborhood. He thanks the Schenley Farms Civic Association and the residents as well as the development team from Callay and Concorde for working together through the process. He states that the community is supportive of development but also wants to protect what is one of the historic treasures of the city and Schenley Farms, and the developer is trying to balance their financial needs and the needs of the PAA. The discussions led to some of the changes that have already been outlined, specifically three critical changes: the width of the building, a reduction in the third lane of traffic, and improvements to the streetscape and pedestrian scale and feel of the building. He states that a concern for all of Oakland development is that the sites were built before cars; the requirements for parking mean that the setbacks of new construction can't meet those of the older buildings. It is a difficult balance and it is why the HRC exists to weigh modern development against historic context. He states that acquiring land and providing parking in Oakland is expensive, and he believes the developers have made the parking area as narrow as they can while still meeting code requirements. He believes the design has been well done in terms of color, materials, and incorporation of modern and historic elements. He talks about the importance of the PAA and states that the easement is necessary as well as the 99 year lease to ensure its continued existence. He again thanks everyone involved in the process and believes that this is a project that can be advantageous for the city and the neighborhood while also honoring the history.
  18. Mr. Jim Sheehan steps to the podium; he is the vice president 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 states that development in historic district has the challenge that the intensity of use of new development will be much greater than in the past. He states that taking into account all of the elements that make up the building, such as the fenestration, materiality, and parking issues, he thinks the developer has done a masterful job dealing with the multiple issues that needed to be solved. He talks about other development in the area. The Chevron Science Center recently had an addition constructed for an auditorium; he states that this is a good example of the intensity of use, as the university is not going to move to another site. He also talks about an addition to the Graduate School of Public Health as an example of intensity of use and also finding the highest and best use for a space. He states that the hotel is a retail development facing these same issues; they have to use the property for its highest and best use so that the intensity of use matches the needs of the developer.
  19. Mr. Josh Laverence steps to the podium; he is with Callay Capital, who is affiliated with the developer. He states that they appreciate the opportunity to work with the community to arrive at the current plan. He states that several references were made to the design guidelines of the Oakland Civic Center Historic District, specifically the spatial relationship to all surrounding buildings and open space. He states that there has been a lot of focus on how the hotel relates to the PAA, but it should also be compared to other buildings within the historic fabric of the district, such as Alumni Hall, the Cathedral of Learning, and the new Nordenberg Hall. He states that there is precedent to consider this building to be planned to scale appropriately. He also states that there have been a lot of references to Nicola and his Schenley Farms master plan, which is just one historical element;
- 
-

---

---

Hornbostel's Soldiers and Sailors is another, as is his plan for the "acropolis" plan that envisioned 40 buildings on several dense blocks. He believes their plan is consistent with a respectful yet modern and appropriate use. He doesn't believe the goal of the new construction section of the guidelines is not to have any new buildings, but to have buildings that are consistent and compatible with the historic ones. He states that there have been inconsistencies in some of the testimony about height comparisons; he says that heights can't be compared to the hotel without including all roof structures. He states that they have demonstrated that the hotel won't block views, and it is an exaggeration to say that the neighborhood only consists of green space and classical buildings. He also states that the project can't be judged on the basis of future development that may or may not happen in the neighborhood. He states that outside of this community, there are major institutions that are supportive of the project, and there is a need to draw people in to the neighborhood. There is difficulty in developing new buildings consistent with the historic fabric in a practical and financially feasible manner, but a neighborhood can not only consist of museums and non-tax-paying properties.

20. The applicant steps back to the podium to state for the record that they are still willing to do the façade easement.
  21. Ms. Barbara Ernsberger steps to the podium. She states that she grew up in the area and is very familiar with it. She states that the proposed hotel is ugly and too big for the site. She states that the PAA is concerned about revenue but is constructing a competitor next door. She states that this area has a quality that is different from anywhere else in the city, with the museums and universities, and should be maintained, but this building could be put anywhere and would not attract anyone wanting to look at it. She states that this building will diminish the entire district.
  22. Mr. Hogan asks for any additional testimony; there is none. He asks Ms. Quinn to read the emails she received for the record.
  23. Ms. Quinn reads the emails into the record. Mr. John Grefenstette is in opposition to the project. Mr. Andrew McSwigan asked to rescind his previous approval for the project. Ms. Dana Kline is in opposition to the project. Mr. Robert Iland requests to vote the same as Mr. Norman Cleary. Mr. Robert Kelley presented in person. Mr. Michael Vanukov is in opposition.
  24. The Commission takes a 10 minute recess.
  25. Mr. Hogan concludes all testimony. He acknowledges everyone's hard work on the project. He states that it a challenge any time fabric is being added to a historic district. He also acknowledges that there have been significant improvements to the design of the buildings. He notes that it is not in their privy to look at the façade easements, and although the economic concerns are important they should not have any bearing on the Commission's decision. He states that he understands and sympathizes with the longtime residents and he values their continued involvement as the city is only as strong as its historic fabric. He states that the commissioners have a lot of information to digest, and he was starting to read the information while listening to the presentations and testimony. He feels that he could use some additional time to review the materials and the design guidelines and asks if the other commissioners agree.
- 
-

- 
- 
26. Mr. Gastil agrees that it is a very important matter and people have spoken eloquently on both sides of the matter. He states that many of the speakers, even some of those opposed, recognized that this is a buildable site. He also agrees that there is a great deal of material and he would like some time to review the information.
  27. Mr. Harless states that if they are going to take additional time on this he will also participate.
  28. Mr. Hogan states that he would like to table action on the hotel, but need to address a procedural issue. The Commission is obligated to respond within 60 days to an application that they have taken testimony on. He states that all testimony is now closed. Because the Commission is recessed in August, they will need to have a special meeting in order to complete the transaction, or it would count as an automatic approval. He calls to note that they need to set a special meeting and suggests they take two weeks to review and then come to a vote. He asks for a motion.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Gastil motions to table and have a special meeting no more than two weeks from today.
  2. Mr. Harless seconds.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**942 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Gemini Holdings  
3 PPG Place, Suite 500  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-111

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Doug Sipp  
PO Box 332  
N. Lima, Oh 44452

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 6/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Extension of existing exhaust fans.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Doug Sipp steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project.
  2. Mr. Tom Certo also steps to the podium; he is the owner.
  3. Mr. Sipp states that they are seeking to relocate and extend the existing exhaust fans at the rear of the building to point upward instead of to the side. They will be stainless steel insulated ductwork risers.
  4. Mr. Hogan states that they are pulling the exhaust to the roof.
  5. Mr. Sipp says yes, up past the existing parapet.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
  7. Ms. Eve Picker steps to the podium; she lives in the building behind this one. She states that she is in support of the project as it will be a big improvement from what is there. Her only suggestion would be screening for the return areas.
  8. Mr. Lou DeNardo steps to the podium; he also lives in a building directly behind this one. He also supports the project although he would also like to see screening for the existing fans. As he understands it, these fans are being built up to reduce noise, but the existing fans would be loud as well.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for any other testimony; there is none.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any objection to screening by the applicant.
  11. Mr. Certo states that he is unsure about what is available from a functionality perspective.
  12. Mr. Sipp states that there are different metal screen and fencing available, but he is not sure about acoustic screens.
  13. Mr. Hogan states he would also be concern about air intake and output.
  14. Mr. Sipp states that they could add some baffling that would be minimally visible but would reduce noise to the intake side; they would want to leave the exhaust
- 
-

---

---

side free.

15. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

16. Mr. Hogan motions to approve; he would like to encourage the owners to explore baffling options.

17. Mr. Harless seconds.

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

---

---

**4255 Parkman Avenue**

**Schenley Farms Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Barbara Brown  
4255 Parkman Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-188

Inspector: Joe Motznik

**Applicant:**

Barbara Brown  
4255 Parkman Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 6/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Stabilization and refinishing of retaining wall.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Barbara Brown steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that she has a huge, collapsing retaining wall at the rear of her property. She states that it took her three years to find an engineer that was willing to attempt to stabilize a wall like this, with a sloped entry and no work space for standard equipment. It took the engineer another few years to find a contractor to take on the project. She states that some chunks of the wall had started to fall, and they moved in backhoes by crane into the narrow work space. At this point, after a month of preparation, the wall is ready for serious stabilization and finishing. She states that the materials provided show the need for the work and the difficulty of the approach, as well as samples of finishes. In keeping with the historic nature of the wall, she has chosen to have the stabilizing cement hand-carved and hand-dyed to replicate the existing stone. She has verified and updated her neighbors that the work being done on her wall will not negatively affect their property and will actually assuage further deterioration. She has the support of her neighbors and has submitted their comments to the Commission. She introduces her engineer, Bud McCutcheon from KE Resources.
  2. Mr. McCutcheon states that he has been involved with this project for several years and has watched the wall deteriorate to the point that something needs to be done this summer. He gives some information about the construction of the wall, stating that the wall is a small section, and there are stones stair-stepped up the slope as an erosion-control measure. He shows pictures of the existing conditions, stating that the wall is bowed and the stone is deteriorating. Recently, a chunk of stone did fall off of the wall. The solution they are proposing is a one-foot wall with a three-foot buttress, and they will also redo the patio in concrete. The structural wall will be set in front of the existing wall to hold it back. The main thing they are presenting to the Commission today is the final look of the finished product. Structurally, it will be a concrete wall, but they believe that they can make it look like the historic wall both in size and scope of the stone. They are proposing to have a contractor carve the stone to replicate what is existing; visibility of the wall
- 
-

---

---

from the street is low, but what can be seen will look like what is existing.

3. Mr. Harless explains that he already authorized the concrete wall based on the engineer's report, and a permit has been issued.
4. Mr. McCutcheon shows a picture of the progress of the work.
5. Mr. Hogan asks what the height of the wall is.
6. Mr. McCutcheon states that the wall is about thirteen feet up from the original patio level.
7. Mr. Hogan states that from the photos, it is clear that the visibility from the street is minimal.
8. Mr. Harless states that the issue was to get the wall stabilized, with the Commission to review the finish of the wall.
9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Hogan motions to approve. He thinks the approach is appropriate and has minimal impact on the neighborhood.
  11. Mr. Harless asks if a sample of the finish should be submitted. The Commission reviews the photos and determines that will not be necessary.
  12. Mr. Harless seconds.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**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 last month he was instructed to bring in a new materials list and larger drawings, which he has done. He states that the only difference between these plans and what was approved in March was that some windows were removed due to fire code. He states that there were concerns expressed last month that the house that was demolished was an original house, and he has since learned through photographic evidence and a title search that that was not the case. He states that he found that the original house was built between 1928 and 1937. He shows a photo from 1931 showing a different house at that address. He states that the title shows there were originally three houses built on two lots, two on Day Way and one on Monterey Street, but by 1951, the Monterey house was gone. In 1972 when the property was sold again, there was a house at 1224 Monterey. He restates that they are proposing to build the approved plans from March on the lot that is now empty.
  2. The Commission reviews the materials.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  4. Mr. Worl states that he has the support of Councilwoman Darlene Harris, the ACCA, and the Mexican War Streets Society. He states that he also has letters of support from neighbors.
  5. Mr. Hogan states that the roofline and the dormer look fine. He asks if they are proposing a box gutter, because it is not shown in the drawings.
  6. Mr. Worl says yes.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks about the material for the brackets.
  8. Mr. Worl says they will be wood.
  9. Mr. Hogan states that the window proportions seem small.
- 
-

- 
- 
10. Mr. Worl states that they arranged the windows per city code, so they did have to shrink them a bit from their original plan. They were told the windows had to be three feet in from the property line.
  11. Mr. Hogan states that that only applies to windows on the side of the house. He asks if they would be willing to consider a more proportional window.
  12. Mr. Worl says the will.
  13. Mr. Hogan says he doesn't have a problem with the door, although he doesn't know of many central doors like this. He states that for such a narrow house, the door would usually be located to one side.
  14. Mr. Harless states that the plans follow closely with what was there, but that application is void at this point because the house is gone, and they need to treat it is a new application for new construction.
  15. Mr. Hogan states that what was done was done, and they want to work with the applicant to find a solution. He would prefer to see something more appropriate. It would not have to have elaborate ornamentation; as new construction it can be simpler. It just has to respect the district in form and fenestration. He would like to see three windows of appropriate size on the upper floor, either a picture window or two windows on the lower floor, and the door to be moved to the side where the stairs already are.
  16. The Commission discusses the placement of the door.
  17. Mr. Hogan suggests that they use a red or darker mortar so the building won't stand out so much as new.
  18. Ms. Quinn states that the wide door surround is making the windows look smaller. She suggests a door that is simpler to make the façade more balanced.
  19. Mr. Hogan agrees.
  20. Mr. Worl asks if the changes can go to staff review.
  21. Mr. Hogan says yes.
  22. Ms. Quinn agrees. She clarifies the changes that have been suggested.

---

---

**Motion:**

23. Mr. Hogan motions to approve the construction of an infill house with the following clarifications and modifications: the front mansard roof is to be slate, the dormer is to be a double dormer ending with a box gutter, corbels are to be wood, façade is to be solid brick with dark mortar, window fenestrations are to be revised to be more appropriate with at least two upper floor windows and a larger first floor window, and the door is to be moved to the right. The rear is approved as submitted. Lighting is to be moved to the side of the door. A limestone foundation and sill are to be constructed, with existing limestone stairs to be reused.
  24. Mr. Harless seconds.
  25. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report - July 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>
Y	15-078	6-Jul-15	1224 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	After-the-fact demolition and new construction
Y	15-079	7-Jul-15	940 W North Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind window replacement
Y	15-080	6-Jul-15	1226 Sheffield Street	Manchester	Painting
Y	15-081	7-Jul-15	946 W North Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind replacement of fence
Y	15-082	8-Jul-15	1001 Allegheny Avenue	Manchester	In-kind replacement of wooden door
N	15-083	9-Jul-15	4255 Parkman Avenue	Schenley Farms	Stabilization and refinishing of retaining wall
N	15-084	9-Jul-15	942 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Extension of existing exhaust fans
N	15-085	9-Jul-15	1319 N Franklin Street	Manchester	Deck and fence replacement

N	15-086	9-Jul-15	311 Lowenhill Street	Individual	Replacement of roofing material
N	15-087	9-Jul-15	237 7th Street	Individual	Marquee renovations
N	15-088	9-Jul-15	1416 Sheffield Street	Manchester	Replacement of rear deck
N	15-089	9-Jul-15	2134 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Façade renovations
N	15-090	9-Jul-15	601 Middle Street	Deushtown	Construction of new house
Y	15-091	14-Jul-15	3426 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	In-kind replacement of shingle roof
Y	15-092	15-Jul-15	1210 Palo Alto Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind replacement of 3 rear windows
Y	15-093	17-Jul-15	3609 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	Painting
Y	15-094	21-Jul-15	1001 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Replacement of HVAC
Y	15-095	20-Jul-15	435 Market Street	Market Square	Signage

Y	15-096	23-Jul-15	2017 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
Y	15-097	24-Jul-15	946 Beech Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind window replacement
N	15-098	28-Jul-15	1021 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Façade renovations