



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 September 2, 2015
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>		
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	John DeSantis	Darren Toth	Catherine Serventi
Carol Peterson	Sharon Spooner	Gary Van Horn	Chris Bryan	Carole Malakoff
Raymond Gastil		Michael Shealey	Cliff Rowe	Tim Merrill
Ernie Hogan		David Liu	Evelyn Jones	Suzan Lami
Matthew Falcone		Leslie Kaplan	Peter Kaplan	Duane Palmieri
Joe Serrao		Brian Wilkes	Mike Trombley	Chuck DiLoreto
		Tom Smith	Dr. Grant Latimore	Stephanie Turman
		Joel Cluskey	Raymond Marks	Grant Scott
		Nick Kyriazi	Kathy Echement	Margaret Ringel Baker
		Robert Knuth	Donna Perkins	Sheila Morris
		Bob Russ	Larry Wasserman	Max Mavrovic
		Barbara Brown	Mike Abney	William Knapp

Old Business

Design Guidelines Review:

1. Ms. Quinn states that this item has been on the agenda for several months while they have been reviewing the guidelines and forwarding their comments.
2. Mr. Gastil states that they are appreciative of the comments that have been received. He states that staff is working on how to address the comments. He states that he welcomes any additional comments from Commissioners as well as the Local Review Committees. He feels that the document is very sound, and states that the comments noted that as well. He states that they are looking to have the document in shape by November.
3. Mr. Falcone asks if they have heard from the Mexican War Streets on their guideline review.
4. Mr. Hogan notes that they are doing a different review, not related to these guidelines.
5. Ms. Quinn states that the review of this document is open to everyone. As far as the art guidelines, the Mexican War Streets Society has had some internal leadership changes. She states that she spoke with the president of the Allegheny City Central Association about the guidelines issue.
6. Mr. John DeSantis steps to the podium to comment on the design guidelines. He states that he was not aware of the document until he saw correspondence between the Allegheny West **LRC and the Chair in the past week. He states that he doesn't know what the plan is for public involvement in adopting the guidelines, but he would like to suggest that there be**

more outreach to the historic districts and possibly public hearings. He notes that the prologue to the guidelines indicates that these are what the Commission will use in making decisions in all of the city historic districts. He states that the law department may need to be consulted, as when historic districts are adopted City Council adopts a specific set of guidelines in each district, and they are all different. He states again that the law **department should be consulted, but that legislation adopted by City Council can't** be overruled. The guidelines are also part of the public process during the creation of a district. He states that the new guidelines could be adopted as general guidelines, but would not be able to supersede the specific guidelines for the districts.

7. Ms. Quinn states that the guidelines were posted on the website back in March, and an email was sent out to the mailing list, so neighborhood groups were notified that way. She also states that she believes that, per the ordinance, the HRC adopts the guidelines and not City Council.
8. Mr. DeSantis disagrees; he states that the legislation from Council when a district is created would have to be consulted rather than the ordinance. The HRC would present a proposed district with proposed guidelines to Council, but it is Council that actually creates the district and the guidelines.
9. Mr. Hogan states that they will look into the matter.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the July 1 meeting minutes and the July 15 special meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Harless seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

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

Other Business:

10. Mr. Hogan asks about the South Side Library. He thought that they had asked them to screen the new HVAC system, but they only have a chain-link fence there now.
11. Ms. Quinn says staff will check into it.
12. Mr. Hogan invites Allegheny West to speak. He states that they received a request from the neighborhood to address the Commission on activity happening in their community.
13. Ms. Carole Malakoff from the Allegheny West LRC steps to the podium. She thanks the Commission for granting their request. She states that this summer has been very busy in Allegheny West, and there are several projects that the Commission will be reviewing later in the meeting. She states that one particular project brought up numerous issues, many of which have to do with Building Inspection. She states that there were 311 complaints filed on April 29th, but it took until May 8th to get a building inspector out to shut the project down. She states that one of the reasons for the delay is that the building inspector was in training for several days. She states that when a building inspector is in training or out on vacation, there should be someone else that takes over for them. After the project was shut down, work continued, and the neighborhood had trouble getting responses from Building Inspection as to why the shutdown was not being enforced. She states that she knows the inspectors now have cell phones and email, but are difficult to reach. They were told that the inspector was on vacation for a week, which is fine, but someone should have been able to

take his place. She states that the work continued for months. She states that the HRC review is scheduled for today, yet the application is dated May 1st. She thought that the project would be on the June agenda and it was not; it was placed on the July agenda but taken off the agenda the day before the hearing, when people had already taken off work to testify. She also wants to address training for building inspectors. IT became evident to her after speaking with the building inspector once that he did not know very much about **historic districts, as he referred to the HRC as the “Historical Society”**. The neighborhood would like to see more training for building inspectors that work in historic districts, so they will be familiar with the guidelines and will know the area. She also states that the neighborhood has had three building inspectors in the last two and a half years, so all the history and continuity between the neighborhood and the inspectors is gone. She states that all of these issues have led to a lot of disgruntled neighbors, who either wonder why they had to go through review and others did not, or think they are allowed to do whatever they want because there are no consequences.

14. Ms. Catherine Serventi steps to the podium; she is the president of the Allegheny West Civic Council. She states that the AWCC and the LRC have worked hard to position themselves as a resource for neighbors in getting through the building process. They feel that providing this assistance is their primary purpose, and neighbors are assured that once they approach the neighborhood groups they have their support and there are no surprises. On the other **hand, they don't have any** enforcement powers, so they can reach out to neighbors as much as they can, but if there is no enforcement to back them up they **can't be** very effective. They do want to be partners with the city, especially in terms of historic resources. She thinks there may be a perception that historic issues are not as important as other issues, such as safety issues. She says that it may be true in emergency cases, but the historic resources are **also irreplaceable, and once they are gone they're gone**. Her organization is dependent on the support of the city and neighbors to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood; they are also interested in knowing what they can do to support and advocate for city departments to make sure they get the resources they need in order to support the neighborhood. She states **that her organization doesn't want to overwhelm the city with constant 311 calls, but they don't have any paid staff or** any way to aggregate the calls. The officers of the organizations are good resources, however, and can reach out to the community and let them know the issue is being worked on if the city is being overwhelmed by 311 calls.
15. Mr. John DeSantis steps to the podium. He states that what happened in Allegheny West over the summer was a perfect storm of the worst possible outcomes for a historic district. He states that important historic fabric was lost permanently, neighbors were pitted against **neighbors, and the neighborhood came to believe that the laws are there but don't need to** be obeyed. He states that this was all avoidable and needs to be avoided in the future, and if it is happening in this district, it is happening in others. He states that in his opinion, the worst thing that happened this summer was that the of lack of proper, aggressive enforcement led to the staff of HRC and PLI being unfairly attacked and perceived as not doing their jobs. Ms. Quinn, Mr. Harless, and the building inspectors are the most important people in the process, and they were hung out to dry. He states that another bad thing was that this led to other property owners making bad decisions, because they perceived that the rules were not being enforced. The third thing is that across the entire system, the failure is easy to solve, by 1. Having a couple of building inspectors who really know historic districts work in the historic districts, and 2. Allowing Ms. Quinn and the local review committees to do their jobs. 311 works in most situations but it is not one-size-fits-all. He states that for purposes of historic district enforcement, Ms. Quinn should be the

point person and not mandated to refer everything to 311, especially for emergencies—if a building is being demolished, it will be gone by the time 311 gets to it. Historic fabric being **torn off a building can't wait** either. He states that the LRC should report to Ms. Quinn, who would be able to contact an inspector if necessary. This would cut a lot of time out of the process.

16. Mr. Harless addresses the comments. He states that he does appreciate the comments and suggestions, and there are a few things he wants to talk about regarding the direction his department is going. He states that they have really been rebuilding the department from the ground up in the last year. They have a lot of new inspectors that have come on board, and the inspectors have undergone new, intensive training. All of the new inspectors as well as the veteran inspectors were going through training at the same time, and this extensive training was a one-time thing to get everyone up to the same level and to make sure that they are consistent on enforcement of code duties. As a result, they had a lot of inspectors out all over the city for sometimes long periods of time, which did lead to concerns and complaints. He states that one of the new parts of the training was engaging the planning department, and Ms. Quinn in particular, in order to start training inspectors on specific historic review guidelines. He does not intend to have one or two inspectors that are specialized; rather, he would like to have inspectors that know the area and are well-versed on multiple aspects of the code. This way, if someone is out for vacation or training, someone else can step in. He also wants to avoid the inspector in a certain area being on-call for everyone that has a concern, and having to race from issue to issue. He states that issues that are not an immediate danger, like ongoing demolition, should be going to 311. He states that 311 is the best avenue for being able to track when something is put in and when it is responded to; if there is a delay there, that is something that then can be worked on and improved. For more immediate issues, he would ask that the call come to him, the area supervisor, or Ms. Quinn so that she can contact the supervisor, and then they can direct the inspectors appropriately. They want to avoid the one-to-one neighborhood-to-inspector relationship, as people can and will be relocated around the city. He does think that more training for inspectors is a very good idea that he would like to implement. There are many aspects of enforcement to work on that are not just related to historic issues, such as being able to access conditions of approval in order to be able to enforce an approved permit. He also wants to talk about what the process is when work is happening without a permit, so that everyone understands. The department sends the inspectors out and issues a stop-work notice; the owners are put on notice with that placard that work is unpermitted. Any work that is being done can be ordered to be restored as a condition of any permits issued later. However, inspectors are not out there to physically stop someone from doing work. If they need to go that route because of imminent danger or demolition, the department would work through the law department to get a court injunction and would get law enforcement to assist. This is a process that they would have to follow only for the most immediate and life-safety issues. A situation where work continues after a stop-work noticed is issued could also end up in district court before a judge, asking for a judgment for fines, to restore a building, to remove work, etc. These cases would often result in a requirement to obtain a building permit, which would result in a historic property coming before the Commission. It can be a lengthy process, and they would like to do anything they can to expedite the most immediate concerns through contacting Ms. Quinn or a supervisor.
17. Ms. Serventi asks if it would be possible for a supervisor to come to one of the neighborhood meetings, as Ms. Quinn has done in the past.

18. Mr. Harless says that would be a good idea. He says that the department actually now has created a position for community relations and to act as a liason between the department and the **community, and he will share that person's contact information.**
19. Ms. Quinn states that she was formerly an inspector.
20. Mr. Harless says she was, so she has a good understanding of all the issues.
21. Mr. DeSantis states that for stop-work orders that are ignored, it is possible for inspectors to issue citations daily for working without a permit. In the case of unpermitted work that goes on for months, hundreds of citations could add up, which he feels would send a stronger message.
22. Mr. Harless says that his point is well taken.
23. Ms. Evelyn Jones of the Manchester LRC states that 911 has been called before in Manchester to shut down illegal work such as demolitions.
24. **Mr. Harless says that 911 would be for emergencies only, and he doesn't think they would consider unpermitted work an emergency.** He states that it is not unheard of for 911 to contact their department to have an inspector sent out.
25. Ms. Serventi states that they did contact 911 when a contractor was pouring paint down the sewer, and the police did come.
26. Mr. Harless states that was appropriate as it was a health issue.
27. Mr. Hogan thanks Mr. Harless and all from the neighborhood that spoke. He thinks this **conversation is important and will strengthen the city's historic review process and affirm** the preservation of our communities.
28. Mr. Hogan asks for any public comment on the two National Register nominations; there is none.

Adjourn:

Mr. Gastil motions to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Falcone seconds.

Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and meeting is adjourned.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

913 Beech Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Howard Brokenbek
913 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-47

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Howard Brokenbek
913 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/3/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact construction of rear carport.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Howard Brokenbek steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that during the five years that they have lived there, they have done a great deal of work on both the inside and outside of the house. He states that everything they have done on the exterior of the house has been approved by the LRC and HRC, such as installation of new windows, installation of scalloped siding on the third floor, installation of a new fleur-de-lis on the top of the house, construction of a shed, replacement of fencing, painting, and replacement of stained glass. He states that a few months ago, he approached Ms. Malakoff of the LRC about **putting a carport behind his house. She recommended that he look at what Nicky's Thai restaurant did with their rear patio, which he did.** He is sure that she also directed him to the HRC, and he apologizes that he did not do so. He assumed that because it was not part of his house, that he could construct the carport; he did not obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit, and again he apologizes for that. He did try to make it look as decorative as possible with ornamental ironwork, a new picket fence, latticework, and canvas. He states that it is not an eyesore, and he feels that he took an area of the alley and improved it. He states that he also has two other items for review. He states that his house is a Queen Anne design, and the front of the house is at an angle front the top down. The end caps at the roofline are currently tin and are in bad shape. He wants to repair the end caps but using copper instead of tin. The last item is the porch balusters. He had approached the LRC about installing cement balusters on the front and back porches. Ms. Malakoff had advised him to look for another Queen Anne house that has them but he was not able to find any. He did find some Second Empire houses that have them. He states that his house does have stone columns with wooden supports on top for the roof, so the cement balusters would be coming off stone pillars and would blend in. Currently he has 114 wooden spindles that need to be painted, and there are about two dozen that are rotted and need to be replaced. He could remove the wooden spindles from the rear porch to **the front porch and use the cement balusters in the rear where they can't be seen,**
-
-

but he would like to use the cement all around.

2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He acknowledges an email received from the LRC stating that they are in support of the end cap replacement but not the other two items.
3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that the applicant met with the LRC last week to discuss the three projects. She states that the carport is made of a prefab metal tubing, and there is also white plastic latticework along the sides, unfinished barn wood installed vertically, ornamental ironwork along the sides, an awning above the opening, and curtains on one side. They believe that the shape and design of the structure seems to be that of a barn or country-style structure, and the roof shape as well as the materials do not reflect any of the architectural elements of the buildings in the neighborhood. For this reason, they do not support the carport. She states that when she spoke with the applicant back in June, it was already partially constructed. She recommended that he contact Ms. Quinn, send pictures, and apply for a C of A, and he told her he was not going to do that. As far as the stone balustrades, she states that the house is a Queen Anne that currently has wood railings and a porch floor that is wood. The applicant told them he wants to install stone balustrades directly on the porch floor. They recommended that the applicant look at buildings on the Northside and see where stone balustrades existed and on what style of house. She states that they would be found on mostly Classic style houses and not Queen Anne. For this reason, they do not support the balustrades. They do feel that the replacement of the end caps is appropriate.
4. Mr. John DeSantis steps to the podium. He states that he would like to support the LRCs position on all three items. He states that if the applicant had gone through the process, he would have a carport that would be appropriate for a historic **district. He states that people shouldn't be rewarded for ignoring the law**, and if this is allowed to stand it will set a precedent for the next application. He states that there is also a structural issue with the stone balustrade; although the lower structure is stone, the floor itself is wood, and the stone balustrade would have to rest on the wooden floor. The wood would not support a stone or concrete balustrade long-term in a location subject to weathering. If there is to be a balustrade, stone would be the appropriate material, however, and not concrete; there are no visible concrete elements in any of the original buildings on the street.
5. Mr. Joe Iannotta steps to the podium; he also lives on the street. He states that there is a concrete porch floor at 935 Beech.
6. Mr. Hogan states that the house is not a similar architectural type.
7. Mr. Iannotta agrees, but just wanted to address the statement that there is no concrete on the street.
8. Mr. Hogan asks for any additional testimony; there is none.

Motion:

9. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion. He would like to take the three items as independent actions, as the application before them is for the carport and the two additional items were later additions. He asks for a motion regarding the carport.
 10. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the after-the-fact construction of the rear carport.
-
-

-
-
11. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion regarding the in-kind replacement of the endcaps substituting copper for the tin.
 14. Mr. Serrao motions to approve.
 15. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 16. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion regarding substitution of the balustrade from the original material of wood to cement.
 18. Mr. Falcone motions to deny.
 19. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 21. Mr. Hogan explains that the applicant can proceed with the end caps. The carport should be deconstructed, and any other work on the balustrades will require a Certificate of Appropriateness.
-
-

929 Beech Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Joseph & Linda Iannotta
929 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-56

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Joseph & Linda Iannotta
929 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Replacement of front railing and after-the-fact alteration of steps.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Joe Iannotta steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He shows a photo of the original railing, which consisted of a 2x4 and metal piping. He would like to replace it with a wrought-iron railing, which is a material found throughout the neighborhood. He shows a picture of the railing on the house next door and states that he would like to duplicate it. He would also like to have the option of putting a railing on each side of the stairs, as they are seven feet wide. The second part of the application is an after-the-fact project. He had thought it was just considered a repair to install stone caps on top of the crumbling concrete steps; also, the last time renovations were done to the house after a fire in 2001, the restoration company handled everything, so he personally did not have experience with the review process. They only found out they did something wrong after the stone was already installed, and they immediately applied to the HRC. He does think the project looks good and makes for better mobility up and down the steps.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that they reviewed the project at their meeting last week. She states that they recommend approval for the wrought iron railing. As far as the work on the steps, they deliberated for a long time, and ultimately decided that they recommend that the HRC approve it. However, they did discuss a matter that is not shown in the photographs, which is some ceramic tile that was put in on the landing going up to the steps. They feel that it may be a safety issue, with the potential for slipping on the tile. She states that ceramic tile is not an acceptable paving material for sidewalks and landings.
 4. Mr. Iannotta responds that there was a half-inch gap that they needed to bridge, and the tile was the only thing they found that would work. He provides specs for the material.
 5. Mr. John DeSantis steps to the podium. He suggests that the hearing be continued
-
-

to the next meeting. **He states that the photos don't accurately represent the work** that has been done, and suggests that the Commission ask staff to take photos for the October meeting. He thinks that if they were to see photos of the whole installation they would find it inappropriate. He talks about the LRC meeting, and states that the committee is composed of neighbors who had to make a decision **about a neighbor's project that has already been completed. He states that as far as** he understands, the vote was split, and the committee ultimately decided on a favorable recommendation, but he states that they would not have done so if it had been reviewed in advance.

6. Mr. Hogan asks for any additional testimony; there is none.
7. Mr. Harless asks what characteristics they are looking at with regards to replacement of cement steps with stone, i.e., color, dimensions, etc.
8. Mr. Hogan states that the steps would have originally been a stack of stone. There would not have been any grout lines or gaps as in this installation. He states that he would like to understand what the condition was prior to the work, and he would also like to have more contextual information about the row of houses, **which is architecturally significant in the neighborhood. He doesn't see an issue** with the handrail, but is not comfortable with the stone. He recommends seeing the house and row in person if the other members have not.
9. Mr. Iannotta shows photos of the original conditions.
10. Mr. Serrao agrees on the railing and the concerns with the steps.
11. Mr. Falcone is concerned about the nature of the application and that it is coming out in pieces rather than having been submitted as a package. He also states that as the railing would be anchored into the stairs, it would be difficult to approve the railing and not the steps.
12. Mr. Hogan states that if the Commission would like more information, they can ask staff to provide more context photos. The applicant could also provide additional information and possibly work with the LRC. He asks for a motion to table.

Motion:

13. Ms. Peterson motions to table.
 14. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

911 Galveston Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Delta Foundation
PO Box 100057
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233-0057

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-151

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Delta Foundation
PO Box 100057
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233-0057

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/1/15

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

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact storefront rehabilitation.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Gary Van Horn steps to the podium; he states that he is a volunteer with the Delta Foundation, which purchased the building, and he is also the president of the board. He states that in April they found that someone had run into the front two windows of their building. They immediately secured the building with plywood, and were told that they would need to replace the glass and broken wood. He shows photos of the original and current conditions of the building. He shows a photo of the front entrance and states that there have been some questions about the lower area to the right and left. He states that they have been painted over for years, and some of the sections glass and some have been filled in with wood. They were told by the building inspector not to paint at this point, but their intention was to paint; right now the wood is just primed for protection. They would like to paint to match what was there. He shows photos of the alley side where there were three windows and a doorway. Their understanding is that there was something hanging off of the side of the building, of which there is a metal pole still there, and there were two windows that were blocked in. He states that they spoke with building inspection originally about making changes there and were told that since it was the alley, it did not fall under the purview of the HRC. He states that he **included pictures of the street face, and that you really can't** see the side. He states that they did obtain a permit to redo the front sidewalk. He states that he also included a petition from neighbors who feel that the work does represent the neighborhood. He states that the option they had back in April was to leave the plywood up and apply for a permit and wait for months; he states that they found out that it would not be a simple process because they would need drawings of the building and other materials that they did not have. They also had their opening in the middle of May. Since the space is a first-floor commercial space, they felt that it was necessary to fix the windows so that it would not be an eyesore and so it would be clear that they were open.

2. Ms. Peterson states that the petition has signatures from six different
-
-

neighborhoods and from outside the city.

3. Mr. Van Horn states that they did ask neighbors to circulate the petition. He states that the first two pages are all from the neighborhood.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. John DeSantis steps to the podium. He states that he served as the chairman of the HRC for 13 years and conducted more than 1500 hearings, and he has never seen a case quite like this one. He states that in the last six months, he has learned to distrust everything Mr. Van Horn says. He states that the presentation that he just gave is no exception and what he has come to expect from him. He states that everything began in the spring of 2014 when Delta acquired the building; he was peripherally involved in talking with Delta because he formerly worked with their paid executive director. Delta was originally looking at a building on Western Avenue before focusing on this one, and like the rest of the neighborhood he was supportive. As a longtime supporter of the Delta Foundation, he knew the neighborhood would be very welcoming of them. He states that the neighborhood did not anticipate that the president of their board would be running the show; because of this, he is unconvinced that the rest of the board members have any idea of the hot water that they are in. He doubts that Mr. Van Horn has been truthful with his own board. He states that in the spring of 2014, Delta went to the local review committee and presented plans. The LRC raised issues with the plans. Delta next took out a permit to pour concrete for the sidewalks, which is the only permit they took out. In March 2015 they began full-tilt construction. They started along the alleyway by replacing windows with inappropriate aluminum-framed square windows in arched openings; they also replaced an original wooden door with a solid steel door that did not fit the shape of the opening, and hung heavy-duty industrial lighting on the side of the building. He states that one of the neighbors alerted the LRC, and he got a call during the first week of April from Mr. **Van Horn asking if he could “calm down” the neighbor. He asked Mr. Van Horn if he had obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit, and he said that they did have a building permit. He told Mr. Van Horn that they should be posted in the window so that the neighbors know that he has permission to do the work. He encouraged Mr. Van Horn to ensure that he has all the needed permits before proceeding with any work. He states that he has provided a piece of correspondence to the Commission from April 29th, three weeks after the phone conversation. He reads the highlighted parts, starting with his own: “When you called me during the first week of April to discuss the already installed first floor windows along the Dounton Way side of the building, I told you that any work done without the proper approvals and permits was subject to being rejected by the various city review entities. I pointedly urged you to do no further work until you have obtained all of the required approvals and permits, in order to save further embarrassment and expense for Delta. Since that time, a great deal of work has proceeded apace...” He states that the Commission can read the rest of the letter, and repeats that as of April 29th, work was proceeding apace. He has also provided photographs that he took when he was just passing by. He states that every single day from the beginning of April until just a few weeks ago, there has been construction activity on the outside of the building, continuing without any abatement, any building permits, outside or inside, and any C of A. He references the pictures and states that on May 14th, he was driving by and there was a man dumping five-gallon buckets of paint down the storm sewer. He took a photo and**
-
-

called 311, who immediately advised him to call 911, which he did. The police did arrive and told them to stop. He states that the photo to the right of that one was taken the very next day of a different worker again dumping five-gallon buckets of paint down the same sewer. He has pictures of work going on July 16th and again on August 3rd, and it is not that these are the only days anything happened, they were just the only days he happened to be passing by. He states that photos could have been taken on 100 days this summer. He states that this is deliberate, and it is one individual, Mr. Van Horn, acting on behalf of a good organization who almost certainly has no idea what has been going on. He states that Mr. Van Horn has been going full speed ahead to get the building done so that he can then come to the Commission and plead mercy. He states that not only should they reject all of this, he urges them to require that Delta immediately vacate the building, for which they have no occupancy permit and for which an occupancy permit cannot be obtained until they have completed the construction in a manner that matches the application, which they have not made, for a building permit. He also encourages them to order Delta to come back with a full set of plans, drawn by a competent architect, for any work that they want approved on the building; he states that they should not use the photographs or the work that has already been done, but should start from scratch. He states that this is what should have been done seven months ago, or better yet, back in the spring of 2014 when they first presented plans to the LRC. He states that they should not be given a break at any point. He also states that, thanks to PLI, there will be a hearing on the matter in two weeks in front of the local magistrate; unfortunately, it takes the magistrate three months to conduct a hearing. He states that at the hearing he plans to press for Mr. Van Horn to serve jail time. He states that this was a deliberate attempt to get around the entire system, and it has continued unabated since March. He also encourages PLI to immediately and aggressively remove any possibility of occupation of this building until new plans have been approved, work has been completed, and inspectors have assured that the building is safe to occupy. He states that the outside of the building is only the surface of the project, and that they have been doing tens of thousands of dollars of the work inside the building for six months that no inspectors know anything about. He again urges the Commission and PLI to be aggressive, and that if there is anyone that deserves this kind of punishment, it is this applicant.

6. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that there is very little else to add, but she does have a few more details. She states that in May of 2014, Mr. Van Horn and his architect at the time met with the LRC. They presented a set of plans of which she has a copy. The LRC had some issues with particular elements of the plan, and Mr. Van Horn said that they were not ready to do any work yet and that they would come back. They described the process to him clearly, so there were no hidden agendas; they told him what the process was, how to get approvals, and how to make out the application. They did not hear from him again until they saw the construction starting in April. A 311 complaint was filed April 29th, and she did talk to Ms. Quinn and the building inspector about construction starting. They were told by the building inspector that construction was shut down on May 8th; however, work never stopped. The work that was done without HRC approval includes, on the Doughton Way façade, installation of a flush garage door where a paneled door existed, installation of three non-wood windows on the first floor, five new aluminum windows on the second floor above the garage, installation of a flush steel door and a transom with
-
-

metal trim, removal of a stone step and replacement with concrete, installation of lighting that shines directly on the residence across the alley without any shielding, and installation of security cameras. On the Galveston façade, work includes removal of the left and right storefronts including the display windows, transom windows, and operable ventilation kickplate windows. They replaced the kickplate windows with plywood. They also installed new insulated glass in the display windows and transoms; the only storefront original windows that still exist are the angled windows on each side. They installed new wood trim across the entire storefront with a different profile than the existing. The LRC recommends that the owners be cited and told to come back with new plans to be approved by the Commission.

7. Ms. Catherine Serventi of the Allegheny West Civic Council steps to the podium. She states that in general they are present to support the LRC, but she would also like to point out that they do not usually take specific stands on individual projects. However, she states that the issues with this property have been significant and they have had many neighbors come to them that were impacted by the construction, and they are also concerned about the destruction of historic elements of the building. She states that the neighborhood as a whole, not just the **board, voted to take a specific stand in support of the LRC's concerns. She states** that the issues with this project, including the historic review and permitting issues, should be taken very seriously by the city.
8. Mr. DeSantis steps back to the podium to mention the last sheet in the packet that **he provided. He states that Mr. Van Horn testified that someone "ran into" the** display windows, which was why they had to build the plywood enclosure around them and make repairs. He points out the email on the last sheet, which includes **Mr. Van Horn's email from April 24th** telling him that the plate glass windows were vandalized the night before, and they built the wooden enclosure the next morning so that they could make repairs. This was a big deal, as Delta is one of the major LGBT organizations in the area, and vandalism of their windows is not just a broken piece of glass. **His response and Ms. Serventi's as well was very aggressive** and supportive. The fact that Mr. Van Horn was willing to allege that an LGBT **organization's window was vandalized as an excuse to build a plywood enclosure to** hide their façade work is outrageous in the extreme. They have checked the 911 records and there was no police report filed on the alleged vandalism. He also notes that Mr. Van Horn testified today that someone drove into the glass, and that is not what the email says. He states that this was a complete cover-up from the beginning, and is so outrageous that it is scandalous.
9. Mr. Van Horn steps back to the podium. He states that there is still visible damage to the front of the building, and they are not sure if someone ran into it or how it was damaged. He points out the damage to the columns in the picture.

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application for the after-the-fact storefront renovation. He states that the applicant should submit new documents and start the process over.
 11. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan states that there has clearly been significant work done to the structure.
-
-

He is not certain of the building permit process but believes that, for exterior work, they are not issued until the HRC has issued a C of A.

13. Mr. Harless states that that is correct.
 14. Mr. Hogan says that the exception might be an emergency situation, which he **doesn't know if that is the case or not here. He also states that clearly they have not** received a detailed package on this project. His advice to the applicant is to prepare a full application. He states that now that he has seen pictures of the original conditions of the building, he thinks that the work is a significant **departure from the building's original configuration. He states that the drawings** provided by the LRC would not have been approved either, so the applicant really needs to start over.
 15. Mr. Harless echoes the concerns and states that they need to have a full submission package prepared by a design professional that can be reviewed appropriately. There were several issues brought up in the public testimony that were not part of the presentation. He states that the package needs to be all-inclusive and very specific with details of the storefront system, windows, garage door, colors, and materials.
 16. Mr. Serrao asks if they should set a 60 day deadline for resubmission.
 17. **Mr. Hogan says they are denying the application and not tabling it, so they won't** set a deadline.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. He states that the applicant should work with staff and review the design guidelines in order to submit a new package. He states that they need to think about how to replicate what was original, and in places where there were not original materials they need to come up with appropriate materials and submit all of that information.
 19. Mr. Serrao states that the documents presented by the LRC were insufficient and will need to be considerably more detailed and more appropriate.
-
-

900-906 N Lincoln Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

James Messer
808 Allegheny Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-260

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

RSH Architects
363 Vanadium Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15243

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/12/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Renovations with composite materials.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Joel Cluskey from RSH Architects steps to the podium. He also introduces Ray Marks, the assistant director of facilities for CCAC. He points out the last two sheets in the packet which are new, one of which is an original photograph which they believe was taken right after the building was completed in 1901. He talks about the history of the building, which was completed in 1901 as the Allegheny Preparatory School, and changed ownership several times before becoming part of CCAC as the Visual Arts Center. He explains that the project initially was to address the water infiltration issues, and it has expanded into an entire exterior envelope renovation. He explains the project, starting with the roof; there is quite a bit of deterioration, especially with the original slate shingles, which are deteriorated to the point that replacement is necessary. Other damaged areas include the framing around the dormer windows as well as the cornice enclosure that they believe was put in in the 1960s or 70s. The original photographs show what they hope will be revealed once it is removed, which is the original cornice with its original features such as brackets. They now intend to restore that cornice as part of the restoration. As far as the roofing material goes, they do want to bid the project with three options. The college would like to use slate, but they do want the option to either use a simulated slate shingle product or an asphalt laminated shingle product that would give the appearance of slate. The only part that they have definitely recommended to keep as slate are the sides of the dormers. All of the flashing on the dormers will be replaced and the box gutters will be relined using either a copper or stainless product. The dormers themselves have been rebuilt several times in wood, but because of the severe exposure to the weather they deteriorate very rapidly. They have recommended an identical profile mold be made of the face in fiberglass, which can be done for each of the fourteen dormers and will be cost effective and will last. The original photographs show that the color was a lighter white or cream color. The windows also need to be replaced; currently the windows are aluminum-framed with insulated glass. They will keep the same one-over-one double-hung configuration, which was original to the
-
-

building. Once they find out what is in the cornice area, they will use the same approach using a fiberglass formwork to match the profile of what is there. If they **don't find anything, they are hoping to at least find markings that they can match.** They want to match what shows in the photograph, which shows a row of dentils with an egg-and-dart above it, which they hope is sandstone so they can do a masonry restoration and will not need to reconstruct it. They have included in the packet plans for an overall masonry restoration that may or may not fit in the budget. As part of the roof work they know they have to restore the chimneys; they will be cleaned and the masonry will be repointed. They will be very careful that the brick will not be damaged and that the right type of mortar will be used. They intend to replace the downspouts, and if the boots need to be replaced they will use as close of a profile as they can. They will use terne coated copper rather than shiny for the downspouts.

2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She commends CCAC for their cooperation in following the process. They met with the LRC and presented the project, which she states is a very good project. They approve of the masonry restoration with the mortar and color profiles to match the existing. They approve the sheet metal flashing and trim to be copper or terne coated. They would like to see the roof being slate or simulated slate; they do not support the asphalt shingles. They approve the fiberglass dormers and trim. The applicant did a lot of research on the cornice restoration, and the LRC does approve the restoration and the alternative fiberglass material. They also approve the replacement of the downspouts and boots. She states that overall this will be a good restoration.
4. Mr. Cluskey mentions that they do want to maintain the option of the asphalt shingle. He wants to mention another thing that he did not bring up at the meeting with the LRC, which **is that the sight lines from the street don't show the shingles** on the building unless you go farther away.
5. Mr. Hogan states that he did notice that, but the code and guidelines go by any visibility from the public right-of-way.
6. Mr. Cluskey states that he just wanted to mention that it is less obvious than a roof with a steeper slope. He also states that there is precedence in the area for asphalt shingles.
7. Mr. Hogan says yes, but generally those buildings already had asphalt and not slate.
8. Mr. Cluskey presents materials samples.
9. Mr. Hogan asks for any additional testimony; there is none.

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the renovations, with the alternate fiberglass dormer, the alternate simulated slate or slate, but not asphalt, and everything else as submitted.
 11. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 12. Mr. Falcone mentions the cornice.
-
-

-
-
13. Mr. Hogan says at this point they are seeking approval to repair the cornice with the simulated material.
 14. Mr. Serrao amends the motion to accept the alternate material to simulate the look of the 1898-1919 photograph.
 15. Mr. Hogan states that they are basically going to a corbelled overhang versus the aluminum pressed overhang.
 16. Ms. Peterson accepts the amendment.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

500-502 Avery Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Avery Street Properties, LLC
Duane & Holly Palmieri
237 Edward Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-S-97

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Duane & Holly Palmieri
237 Edward Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/12/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Refenestration at front and rear of building.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Duane Palmieri steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that his property fronts on Avery Street, with Virgin Way, an alley, along the back. They had the building re-zoned from commercial to multi-use. The original submission was for both the front and rear, but he has decided to concentrate on the rear for now. He shows photos of the existing conditions; the building was originally a foundry and has windows that were blocked up. He shows examples of some neighboring properties for context. He shows proposed rear elevations and photos that were edited to show window and garage door locations. The original garage door was seven feet high and eighteen feet long, but they have revised it to sixteen feet in length to agree with building code. He provides information about materials including the tilt and turn windows, security bars, and the garage door. He also states that he would like a double hung window approved as an alternate. He shows photos of other properties on the alley that have double-hung windows. He states that the property includes the original 1947 building as well as a 1952 addition.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks if he is proposing one garage door or two, as the drawings show two.
 3. Mr. Palmieri states that he has updated his plans to just have one garage door.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the interior of the building.
 5. Mr. Palmieri states that it was built out when he bought it. He states that the next step is to do renovations on the residential portion. The windows reflect the proposed organization of the interior.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that he noticed on the plans that they are not following the original window configuration. He asks about the garage door.
 7. Mr. Palmieri states that it is a standard roll-up metal door. The color will be black or bronze to match the trim on the existing building. The bars on the windows are
-
-

needed for security and will be three-quarters the height of the windows. The windows themselves will be seven feet off the alleyway.

8. Mr. Harless asks if the building has been converted into single family and if they have legal occupancy.
9. Mr. Palmieri says that it will be a residential rental. He states they will be constructing a firewall, which they are waiting for permits on. There is no dwelling there now and it will need an occupancy permit. He states that the building is at **the property line on three sides, so he can't have windows on the sides, and the front and back are the only options.**
10. Mr. Harless states that the window bars will need to be operable from the inside.
11. Mr. Palmieri says that they will be quick-release from the inside.
12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
13. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that the buildings are non-contributing in the district, and anything that is done to improve the building is fine.
14. Mr. Hogan asks about the garage door.
15. Mr. Kyriazi says that it is modern, but the building is modern.
16. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
17. Mr. Serrao states that it would be an improvement if they can work with the existing window openings.
18. Mr. Hogan agrees. He thinks they might be able to adjust the inside to fit with the existing openings.
19. Mr. Palmieri states that per code he could not put those large openings back in.
20. Mr. Serrao states that if it is all one block-and-lot, they count the whole building **and don't distinguish between the residential and commercial sides.**
21. Mr. Harless states he can look into it with the applicant.
22. Mr. Hogan states he would prefer to see a darker color on the windows.
23. Mr. Palmieri states that it will be the deep bronze color.

Motion:

24. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the rear façade renovation as submitted in the drawing dated 25 August 2015.
 25. Mr. Harless seconds.
 26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1002 Cedar Avenue

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Thomas Liang & Weiyang Mao
600 Chislett St
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-215

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Thomas Liang & Weiyang Mao
600 Chislett St
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 7/2/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations including window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Thomas Liang steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that the building was an apartment building with five units which had a fire. They are trying to finish the remodeling and convert it to a single family home. There are currently no windows in the front, and the openings were reduced and covered with aluminum siding. They are planning to enlarge the openings back up and use double-hung windows. He presents the spec sheet for the windows. They are also planning on fixing the brick in the back alley. They will be matching the windows on the neighboring property, using the same manufacturer and the same color. **He will also be painting in a similar color to the neighbor's.**
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if he is intending to reestablish the window openings on the front by installing a series of double-hung windows.
 3. Mr. Liang says yes for the front face, and the sides will have fixed-pane picture windows.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if there are plans for siding at the rear.
 5. Mr. Liang says yes, they are placing siding in a small area to repair what was burnt. They are proposing brown vinyl siding but will take any suggestions from the Commission.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 7. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. **He doesn't believe that the Commission has the authority to order that the front addition be removed.** He states that that would be the right thing to do. He states that it may be the case that 1002, 1004, and 1006 were identical at some point, and that would have to come off to be sure. **He states that if that isn't coming off, it doesn't matter what windows are put in. He hopes that someone will remove the addition in the future. He doesn't understand what is going on in the back of the house. He knows the houses next door had structural problems and they had to take the rear addition down and rebuild it. He states that the back of this property is currently brick, and he doesn't**
-
-

think there should be any siding over it to replace the brick.

8. Mr. Hogan clarifies that there was an area that needed to be reconstructed in wood between the two buildings, and that is the part that will be sided.
9. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none.
10. Mr. Harless asks if the applicant is adding windows to the rear.
11. Mr. Liang states that there are no windows there, and they will place windows in the existing openings.
12. Mr. Serrao states that he submitted a double-hung window, and asks if he intends to use those in the rear, and if so, if he could also use them in the front.
13. Mr. Liang says he would like to take their suggestion, but the front windows are very wide.
14. Mr. Serrao states that he can use two or three in a row.
15. Mr. Liang states that on the sides he would still like to use picture windows.

Motion:

16. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the window replacement with double-hung windows at all locations, front and back, except for the four sides of the porch addition which will be fixed picture windows. The color will be dark bronze or brown as submitted.
 17. Mr. Harless seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1739 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Andrew Stewart
Main Street Holdings
5812 Darlington Rd
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-318

Inspector: Jack Heath

Applicant:

Andrew Stewart
Main Street Holdings
5812 Darlington Rd
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 7/9/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of ADA ramp.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Suzan Lami steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She explains the project, stating that the only work is to install a handicapped-accessible ramp, which will involve changing the entrance to have a stair to one side and a ramp to the other side. She states that they are trying to keep it as simple as possible. The entry to the building is on a corner, so coming out of the building there would be a railing straight ahead, with three risers to the right and two steps going down towards East Carson Street, and the ramp would be on the left hand side and would go along 18th Street. The material will be concrete, so it will blend in with the sidewalk, and will have a simple black aluminum handrail.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. They did submit written comments as well. He states that this building is a great building and is very intact and very contributing to the district. He states that there are exemptions allowed for ADA ramps in historic districts, and they would like for the applicant to pursue that route and to deny this application.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for other public testimony; there is none. He acknowledges for the record an email received from the LRC dated September 1, 2015.
 5. Mr. Gastil states that he realizes that each case is unique, but he asks if the Commission has heard a similar case.
 6. Mr. Hogan says yes.
 7. Mr. Gastil states that he understands the exemptions and the request by the LRC, but states that he would be remiss to not consider the concerns of the city regarding accessibility, and he wonders how they should weigh these concerns as the HRC. He states that this is a proposal that he needs to have more information on, unless there is a very clear precedent that has been set already. He asks if the other Commissioners share the same concerns, and also raises the issue if it is in
-
-

their authority to make the judgment that they should seek an exemption because of the unique qualities of this building. He states that he would like to see if there is anything in the code that relates to this specifically.

8. Ms. Quinn states that there is nothing specific.
 9. Mr. Hogan states that this is one of the challenges that they are confronted with from time to time. He states that in this case there are some alterations being made to install the ramp; they are taking what is truly a corner entrance on a significant and intact building and altering the way the building is entered and creating a porch with the ramp going around. He states that they will also likely need an encroachment permit. He states that the closest case to this one, also on a significant piece of architecture, was the proposed installation of a front ADA ramp on the Allegheny County Morgue. He states that they worked closely with the applicant and denied the façade alterations because of the significance of the building. He states that this building is significant as it is located on a prominent corner and is very visible in the district. He is very cognizant of accessibility issues, and how to accommodate them is a challenge. He states that in some cases they have been able to figure things out by lowering and ramping interiors, but those **solutions do eat up a lot of floor space and don't always function well.** He states that the proposed ramp really alters the façade of this building in ways that they need to be careful of.
 10. Mr. Harless states that in one of the examples cited, there was an alternate accessible entrance available, which is not the case here. He asks for clarification from the drawings the clearance on each sidewalk.
 11. Ms. Lami states that there would be more than five feet of clearance on each side. She states that the rise is about 18 inches and there are two risers. She states that they are trying make it as unobtrusive as possible. Right now there is a landing with a curve that acknowledges the corner, and they have the same thing with the angled corner and instead of having the stairs straight ahead, they will have a stair towards East Carson and the ramp towards the side street. They have also kept the railing very simple so it becomes almost invisible. She states that her client is committed to making all of their facilities accessible, and it is not technically infeasible on this building.
 12. Mr. Harless states that, just so the Commission is aware, if it is a code requirement to provide an accessible entrance, the avenue for an exception or variance is that the design professional, owner, or applicant makes that submission to the state Department of Labor and Industry, either with a claim that it is technically infeasible, or as in this case using a decision from this body to bolster their argument. It is not a local decision. He talks about the landing in front of the entry, asking the applicant if it is possible to have the risers still access that entry from the corner rather than cordoning that area all off with railing and having the stairs on the other side.
 13. Ms. Lami states that they felt that was dangerous, because then there would be low stairs sticking out into the East Carson sidewalk for people to bump into. She states that technically, with the turning radiuses, this would make it more obvious that they are sticking the stairs out with the railings so architecturally it would not be as pleasing, and it would be more dangerous for pedestrians.
 14. Mr. Falcone states that he agrees that there is a matter of aesthetics to consider,
-
-

and this is a pretty significant departure.

15. Mr. Hogan states that these cases are hard, and sometimes they can find an easy solution that is non-**intrusive and doesn't disrupt the façade**.
 16. Mr. Serrao states that they also ran into this issue on a church on the Northside, where they denied the ADA ramps.
 17. Mr. Hogan states that they also denied another corner entrance building on East Carson Street.
 18. Ms. Lami adds that the landlord has a lease, that is waiting for this approval, for a medical use that must have wheelchair accessibility.
 19. Mr. Hogan states that that is not within their purview; they are only looking at the preservation of the façade.
 20. Ms. Lami asks if there is any type of ramp at the front of this building that they would find acceptable.
 21. Mr. Serrao states that he **doesn't know what the interior layout is, but he was** thinking about what they did with the Morgue, which is have them go through the back of the building.
 22. Ms. Lami says this is a tiny space, and it has no rear door.
 23. Mr. Hogan states that temporary ramp solutions can sometimes be provided as accommodations for visitors.
 24. Ms. Lami says they are not allowed to be this high.
 25. Mr. Gastil asks for more information about the layout. He states that there seems to be a rear entrance to the building itself.
 26. Ms. Lami says yes, it goes to the residential spaces above.
 27. Mr. Hogan states that in other cases, they have allowed rear windows to be compromised to add a ramp on the rear for accessibility.
 28. Ms. Lami states that she tries to make all buildings accessible, and she states it would not be desirable, especially in a building this small, to tell someone to go around the back. She states that this is a prominent building with a great corner cut and corner entry and to her, this very low, 18-inch high raised platform will not make much difference from the 18-inch high platform that is already there, it will just project more into the sidewalk.
 29. Mr. Hogan states that it will project significantly more into the sidewalk, and will continue down the 18th Street corridor. He disagrees that this would be an insignificant alteration to the building.
 30. Ms. Lami states that they would have the ramp going down 18th Street even if they put the entry in the rear.
 31. Mr. Gastil states that he would like to explore the window option and asks how large the window openings are.
 32. Ms. Lami says that she is not sure, but she thinks they are a little less than 36 inches; to make a 36-inch opening they would probably have to chop into the stone.
-
-

-
-
33. Mr. Serrao states that if the drawings are to scale, the openings are larger than 36 inches, even including the pieces of molding on the side.
 34. Mr. Gastil states that if there are options to explore, he would like to table this for 30 days. He thinks the proposal is well-done in terms of trying to work with what is there, and he realizes the difficulties, but thinks that the options presented should be explored.
 35. Mr. Harless asks if it would be acceptable if the proposal were to come back with a proposal using one of the existing masonry openings, or if there is a possibility that it would be denied.
 36. Mr. Gastil states that preserving the corner entrance is important.
 37. Mr. Hogan thinks that the community may be open to thinking about an alternative.
 38. Mr. Harless describes the size of the ramp if the side entrance works; it will still be **significant. He doesn't want to recommend a decision that would just be denied.**
 39. Mr. Serrao states that there is no ideal solution.
 40. Mr. Russ steps back to the podium. He states that he spoke with the design review committee of the Southside Planning Forum, who backed them up on their position to deny, but this is a difficult issue and they would like 30 days to review other options.
 41. Mr. Hogan agrees that he would like to see alternatives.

Motion:

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

2015 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

2015 E Carson LLC
361 Wealdstone Road
Cranberry Twp, Pa 16066

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-F-140

Inspector: Jack Heath

Applicant:

Brian Wilkes
361 Wealdstone Road
Cranberry Twp, Pa 16066

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/13/15

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Michael Trombley steps to the podium; he also introduces his business partner Brian Wilkes. They are the owners of the property. He explains the project, stating that the first work item is painting the building. The building is currently painted brick. He shows what they are planning for the color scheme. The second item is the door; they currently have a plexiglass door as their entry door, which is ugly and scratched. He states that they originally wanted to replace it with a fiberglass entry door, but after reviewing the district guidelines they decided they could also use a steel or metal door. He states that they also have a downspout that needs to be replaced; they plan to replace it in-kind and paint it. They also have the large awning on the façade, which is covered in functioning roof material. The previous owner told them that he added it himself in the 1980s. He states that it is an unattractive element, but it is existing and does protect the window from water so they have decided to keep it. They are proposing to improve the look of it by adding a metal, copper-colored roof veneer on top of it.
 2. Mr. Serrao states that there is a window under the awning.
 3. Mr. Trombley says that they are aware of the window, but there is a bathroom there with the shower in front of the window.
 4. Mr. Harless asks if they are cladding the lintels with metal.
 5. Mr. Trombley states that if they are approved for the copper roofing, they would like to extend that color over, whether it would be the same material or just paint.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that the material looks like it is currently painted stone. He also states that he thinks the front door they have selected is not appropriate.
 7. Ms. Quinn asks if they are keeping the cobblestone finish behind the gas meters, as **it isn't represented in the rendering.**
 8. Mr. Trombley says they are keeping it and will paint it.
-
-

-
-
9. Mr. Hogan asks if they have reached out to the Local Review Committee at all.
 10. **Mr. Trombley says unfortunately no, they didn't know that that is something they** should have done.
 11. **Mr. Hogan says he doesn't think the roof** is appropriate. He clarifies that what is before them is painting, re-roofing, and replacement of the door. He asks if they are doing anything in the rear of the building.
 12. Mr. Trombley states that they are proposing to replace some windows in-kind.
 13. Ms. Peterson asks about the mansard roof.
 14. **Mr. Trombley says that it is actually shingles, but they don't plan on doing** anything to it. He feels that the changes they are proposing are not major and he hopes that they can be approved.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 16. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. He states that they would like to have them at their planning forum and they could discuss possible funding sources as well. He states that if they want to just paint and keep the asphalt shingles they could discuss that as well. He states that this project was not in the **packet that was sent out by email so they weren't able to review it; they would like** another 30 days to review it and come back with some recommendations. From what he has seen here, he does recommend that paint samples be submitted, and since the roof is existing keeping it would be fine, but revamping it with metal siding should be debated. He does agree that the proposed is not appropriate.
 17. Mr. Trombley states that they did erroneously refer to a fiberglass door in their **application, but they would like to use a "simple metal-and-glass door" as outlined** in section E of the guidelines. He also refers to the part D, section 7 of the guidelines, which state that HRC will not prescribe paint colors.
 18. Mr. Hogan acknowledges the letter from the LRC requesting to table the application.
-
-

Motion:

19. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations as submitted, with a metal and glass door to be used.
 20. Mr. Hogan states that he is not comfortable with the door design.
 21. Mr. Falcone states that they are not approving cladding of the lintels.
 22. Mr. Hogan states that the house would have had a simple double-door system, which is gone, so they can look at some different designs.
 23. Mr. Gastil suggests that the door be reviewed by staff.
 24. Mr. Hogan states that the cladding should not be added to the awning and call more attention to it. He realizes they are trying to make it an architectural element, but he is not sure that it does any good to the district. He states that they could also use a darker color so it will blend in.
 25. Mr. Falcone feels that the application is incomplete and they need more information to make a decision.
-
-

-
-
26. Mr. Serrao states that most of what they are asking for is in-kind replacement.
 27. Ms. Quinn clarifies that the reason the application is before the HRC is the change **in materials of the awning roof, so if they don't do that, everything else can be reviewed by staff over-the-counter.**
 28. Mr. Harless states that they could conditionally approve the application so that modifications could go to staff.
 29. Mr. Falcone motions that the metal roof be denied, and if they want to replace it in-kind, they can go through staff.
 30. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 31. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

2017 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Kephalogianis Demosthenes
4346 Brownsville Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-F-141

Inspector: Jack Heath

Applicant:

David Liu
125 Sheridan Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15209

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 8/10/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Halo-lit signage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Liu steps to the podium; he is the general contractor for the project. He is proposing a halo-lit channel letter sign. He shows the drawings and photos of the channel letters.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the red signboard area.
 3. Mr. Liu states that it is PVC.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that they are looking at PVC with the sign mounted in the center, **and also the words “Steak Seafood Sushi Bar” underneath.**
 5. Mr. Liu says that the words underneath are not lit.
 6. Mr. Serrao asks what is in the signboard area now.
 7. Mr. Liu says he thinks it is wood.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 9. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. He states that they provided written comments. They think that the red area covering up the original signboard should be eliminated, and it does exceed the size limit for a wall sign. **They are fine with the main “M & J Bistro” sign although they are concerned about the transformer shown and if they would have to chop into the façade. They recommend that it be located inside the building instead. He is also concerned about the finish of the lettering. He states that the “Steak Seafood Sushi” area of the sign be eliminated as that type of sign has been denied in the past and is against the guidelines.**
 10. Mr. Hogan agrees that the red PVC should be eliminated, and states that in the past they have not allowed articulation of the product on the signage. He would recommend to approve the black halo part of the sign, and they would be able to paint the signboard red if desired.
-
-

Motion:

11. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the signage with the following conditions: the red PVC background and applique letters are not permitted, but the base black signage with channel letters is approved as shown on the drawings.
 12. [Second is inaudible]
 13. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the motion is for approval of the halo-lit primary sign of **“M & J Bistro” in black, with none of the red PVC or applique letters attached.**
 14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

2214 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

Perry Sigismund
2214 E Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 16th

Lot and Block: 12-L-11

Inspector: Jack Heath

Applicant:

David Bauer
3485 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 8/11/15

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations and demolition of rear garage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Grant Scott from KSBA Architects steps to the podium; he is representing the owner, Perry Sigismund of Perlora. He states that Perlora currently owns and operates a store at 2220 E. Carson Street, and they have recently purchased this property. He states that there are two parts to the project. The first is their proposal to tear down the garage in the rear, and the second is their proposal to restore the front façade. The property has three buildings connected in a series; the front building is three stories, and there are two two-story buildings behind it. The rear building is the garage, which has an apartment above it. He states that is building is in bad shape. He states that the cornice line on the front building is a bent metal, and they would like to use fiberglass to replace the pieces that are missing. On the lower level they are proposing to restore the woodwork to its original condition, and they did find one of the missing pieces inside the building. They are also proposing to clean the brick and repoint where necessary. The entry will stay, and they have worked with the owner to develop a concept to use that entry and handle accessibility on the inside of the building. He talks about the garage building, stating that it is in bad shape. The doors are narrow, which makes it difficult to park in. He shows various photos showing the condition of the building. He states that the quality of the garage building is a lot less than the front two buildings.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if they have any engineering reports regarding the condition and structure of the garage.
 3. **Mr. Scott says they don't. He states that there are issues with asbestos removal; the chimney needs to be removed as there is asbestos present. With regards to structural issues, they don't have anything that says it can't be reconditioned.** They want to be able to increase the amount of parking and will be able to add bike racks.
 4. **Mr. Hogan states that parking isn't in their privy; they are looking only at preservation of the district.** He states that the garage structure was in place when
-
-

the district was created, so they are asking to remove fabric from the district, which comes back to the physical condition of the structure and if it is indeed beyond salvage.

5. Mr. Perry Sigesmund steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he knows parking is not their issue, but they have over ten employees at the business and have a permit for only one parking spot. He states that the garage was a later add-on to the property. He states that the garage door is so narrow that you only have about an inch on each side when trying to get a car in, and there is a **telephone pole right behind the door making it impossible to back up. He doesn't** believe that it has any historical significance.
 6. Mr. Hogan is concerned that every time they approve demolition, they are setting a precedent. The garage is visible on the alley, and even though it might not be very contributing, it was in place when the district was created.
 7. Mr. Sigesmund states that the apartment above the garage is ready to fall in as well.
 8. **Mr. Hogan states that an engineer's report would be needed.**
 9. Mr. Serrao states that there is a higher burden of proof when demolition is involved. They are not questioning the issues, but all they have is their testimony and the photographs, **which don't show structural issues.**
 10. Mr. Scott states that they can have it reviewed by a structural engineer, but he states that if you look at the fabric on the alley, to the right and left of this structure the buildings are already gone.
 11. Mr. **Serrao states that they do understand, but they don't have a lot of wiggle room** on this.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. H acknowledges a letter from the LRC dated September 1st.
 13. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. He states that their **concerns echo the HRC's. He states that there are several** factors in the guidelines regarding demolition that should be put forth, structural reporting being one of them. They hope that the higher burden of proof is upheld and enforced. They ask that the application for the demolition be denied. They are fine with the front façade renovations but just want to clarify which front door is being used, as there are two in the drawings. They support the full-lite door shown in the elevation.
 14. Mr. Hogan states that the façade restoration is in keeping with the guidelines, and he agrees that the full-lite front door should be used. He states that they can approve the restoration and deny the demolition, and they can reapply or file a hardship case for the demolition.
 15. Mr. Harless asks if the garage is considered contributing or non-contributing.
 16. Mr. Hogan states that it was in the district at the time it was created, and the whole building was considered contributing.
 17. Ms. Peterson states that the garage may be from the 1920s or so.
-
-

Motion:

18. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations as submitted in the drawings, with the condition that the front entry door match the drawing labelled A2.1 and not the hand rendering, and to deny the demolition of the rear garage.
 19. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

115 Forbes Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

Lawrence & William Knapp
232 N Market Street
Ligonier, Pa 15658

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-D-132

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Franktuary Market Square LLC
3810 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/12/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Signage, lighting, addition of ceramic detailing on storefront.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Tim Tobitsch steps to the podium; he is the owner of the business. He explains that their proposal is for signage. He shows a photo of the existing conditions. They are proposing to replace the tile with a wood-grain tile; they are also proposing to remove the old damaged awning and use the wood-grain tile in that area as well to match. They will be removing the existing beer signs and replace them with lanterns. He explains the signage, and states that from a previous discussion they might not allow the descriptions below the business name, so they can work with that.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the material under the awning.
 3. Mr. Tobitsch says that it is his understanding that there is tile there also.
 4. **Mr. Hogan says he doesn't see it.**
 5. Mr. Tobitsch says **he doesn't see it in the pictures either but he knows it is not brick and not a window. He states that the building's owner is present and may have more information.**
 6. Mr. William Knapp steps to the podium; he is the owner of the building. He states that the material is plaster.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 8. Mr. Hogan states that his concern is the advertisement, and he is not a big fan of the lanterns—he would rather see inconspicuous up-and-down lighting. He states that above the storefront windows should be a glass transom, but since it is currently a white stucco finish he is inclined not to change it.
 9. **Mr. Harless states that they don't have enough information on what is behind the awning.** He states that they can approve removing the awning and painting what is there, or they can come back with more information. He states that they can approve the base sign without the signage that is underneath, and have them come
-
-

back to staff with alternate lighting.

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to **approve the main “Franktuary” sign with two logos only and** the ceramic below the window. The applicant should resubmit for the lighting and condition under the current awning and how they would like to treat it.
 11. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1244-1246 Buena Vista Street Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Dr. Grant Latimore
743 Cherokee Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-297

Inspector: Jeremy Garman

Applicant:

Margaret Ringel & Associates
55 Wyoming Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/14/15

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

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Margaret Ringel Baker steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She also introduces Dr. Grant Lattimore, the owner of the building, and Stephanie Truman, the project manager and owner's representative. She states that she is presenting a proposal for restoration of this property, known historically as the Drover Hotel. She talks a bit about the history of the building. She states that it has been vacant for years and was on the city demolition list; she states that they have convinced the city that they are going to restore it and it has now been taken off the demolition list. She presents photographs of the building. She states that the property contains two buildings, the corner building and the house on Buena Vista. She states that they are still in the research phase of the project.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that they have good information, but they will need to develop a more detailed plan.
 3. Ms. Ringel Baker states that they are still researching, but the plan is to restore the building back to its original condition, with the first floor to have a commercial use and the upper floors to be residential. She talks about the evidence they have found as far as the roofline and windows.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about their time schedule for the project.
 5. Ms. Ringel Baker states that they will work on this for however long it takes, and they are finding that out as they go. She states that they wanted to come before the Commission to let them know what their direction is. At this point, they do not have a contractor yet.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that their approach is good so far and they are headed in the right direction. He offers them some time to finalize their plan and materials, either 60 or 90 days.
 7. Ms. Ringel Baker states that they would like to come back within the 90 days and possibly earlier.
-
-

-
-
8. **Ms. Peterson states that she doesn't think any windows would have been six-over-nine; they would have been six-over-six.**
 9. Ms. Ringel Baker states that they will look at that, as they are still trying to finalize the window measurements.
-
-

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 90 days.
 11. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1014 Murray Hill Avenue

Murray Hill Historic District

Owner:

Larry Wasserman
1014 Murray Hill Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Ward: 14th

Lot and Block: 85-F-88

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Larry Wasserman
1014 Murray Hill Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Council District:

Application Received: 7/1/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Extension of front porch, alterations to side steps, addition of awning.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Larry Wasserman steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that his application consists of three small projects. The first project is the front porch; they have hired a carpenter to build a forward extension on it out of wood. He states that the application specified TREX material to be used, but they have decided to go with wood.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the type of wood.
 3. Mr. Wasserman says the carpenter specified pressure-treated wood, to be stained the same color as the porch. He only has the specifics that were provided by the carpenter. He states also that the existing wooden porch is falling apart, and the carpenter will be replacing that as well. The second item on his application is an awning for the front door, with the color to match the color of the house. They had initially proposed a round awning but would now like to go with a square fabric awning that will be flush with the overhang. The third item is the side stairs; they are currently concrete and they point forward, and they are proposing to put wooden stairs on top that point backwards, to lead towards the backyard.
 4. **Mr. Hogan states that he doesn't like bullnose decking as it looks too much like suburban decking.** He states that a tongue-and-groove TREX is available that would be more appropriate. He states that the house is an important piece of architecture that would not have had an extended front deck. He states that a flat brick porch may be more appropriate as well.
 5. Mr. Wasserman states that he went to wood for the porch and extension because he thought that would be most appropriate.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that he was concerned about the material profile, i.e. five-eighths, bullnose, wolmanized, because these are typical in deck construction and have been approved before for porches, but they have asked applicants to skirt it so **the edges can't be seen. The round edges of this type of decking aren't appropriate** for a house of this period. As for the material, wood is fine, but there are other
-
-

choices that could be appropriate as well. He states that they can give him three appropriate options via staff, and he could then price them and decide what to do.

7. Mr. Harless asks about the dimension of the porch extension and how close it will be to the front sidewalk.
 8. Mr. Wasserman states that it will be eight by sixteen feet. He states that the front lawn is quite wide so it will be at least ten or fifteen feet from the sidewalk.
 9. Mr. Hogan says it may not meet the required setback.
 10. Mr. Harless asks if it will be covered.
 11. Mr. Wasserman says it will not be.
 12. Mr. Gastil states that more information may be needed, and that perhaps the item should be tabled until next month.
 13. The Commission reviews the scope of work provided in the hard copy of the application.
 14. Mr. Harless asks if there are any issues in general with front yard decks.
 15. Ms. Quinn states that as far as she knows, it all relates to setbacks.
 16. Mr. Hogan states that as far as he knows, normally a thirty-foot setback would be required, but it could vary by zone and district. If it was a brick patio at grade within the front yard it would be one thing, but this will be an elevated structure to extend the front porch.
 17. Mr. Wasserman presents a photo with the proposing square awning superimposed on it.
 18. The Commission reviews the section on awnings in the district guidelines.
 19. Mr. Hogan states that usually awnings are fairly simple, fabric awnings. He states that an issue with the proposed awning is that it is running the full length of the porch, and they have pulled it down to be under the gutters. As a result, it has the wrong proportion and is masking the house inappropriately.
 20. Mr. Serrao references the guidelines, stating that arched awnings are permitted over arched openings.
 21. Mr. Gastil notes that the proposed awning is flat and also cuts off the arch of the door.
 22. Mr. Hogan states that the awning could be shrunk and moved up to be be more appropriate.
 23. Mr. Wasserman states that they moved away from the round awning as it did not connect to the porch and left a gap.
 24. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that the proposed awning is just too big because they are trying to cover that whole area, and the size also forces them to tuck it under the gutter and porch, which makes it too low for the door. They would like to see the awning shrunk to a size that puts it just beyond the gutter, so it can be pulled up to provide the appropriate height and proportion.
 25. Mr. Serrao provides a sketch of what they would like to see.
 26. Mr. Wasserman states that part of why they proposed this was to match with what
-
-

the neighbor has.

27. Mr. Hogan states that they did not make the decision on that awning, and it may have been in place before the district was created.
28. Mr. Gastil states that the issue is that the arched entrance is an architectural feature that contributed to the house being included in the district, and the awning as proposed would mask it.
29. Mr. Wasserman states that they can go with the higher, smaller awning.
30. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
31. Mr. Hogan states that they have recommended an awning alteration, and he **doesn't have a problem with the side stair as it will be fixing what is there. He also** thinks that replacement of the existing front porch in wood is appropriate. However, he thinks that the extension of the front porch is inappropriate.
32. Mr. Harless states that he may want to speak with zoning to see if the porch extension would even be possible per code.
33. Mr. Gastil states that he is fine with the side stairs, and thinks that the awning can be submitted to staff.
34. Mr. Hogan asks what the Commission wants to do procedurally.
35. Mr. Harless states that procedurally, they should deny the deck.
36. Mr. Gastil explains to the applicant what they are proposing. They can approve the side stair, a new awning should be submitted to staff, and the deck will be denied. The next step would be to check if the deck is possible per code, and if it is, they would need to work with staff to submit a new application.

Motion:

37. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion to approve replacement of the front porch with a new wood front porch, installation of an awning, an alterations to the side stair.
 38. Mr. Serrao motions to approve.
 39. Mr. Harless seconds.
 40. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

19-21 Oakland Square

Oakland Square Historic District

Owner:

Stephen Pellegrino & Mary Shea
17 Oakland Square
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-M-165,166

Inspector: Joe Motznik

Applicant:

Nathan Hart
3729 Parkview Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 7/24/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade and porch restoration, garage alterations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Nathan Hart steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He is also a resident of the district and was the nominator of the district years ago. He introduces the owner, Steve Pellegrino. He states that the property is a duplex and the owner owns both houses. They have scaled the application down a bit from the original, given the work that can reasonably be done within the next six months to a year. He presents the façade portion of work and states that most of the work will be on the porch roof. He states that it is in poor condition and has only been stabilized at this point. They are planning to take off the old rolled roofing and put on new asphalt shingled roofing to match the color of the old slate roofing, which is dark grey. They will also provide a new soffit and fascia, which will be wood. The vinyl on the peaked element between the two doors will be replaced with decorative wood latticework that matches other houses which they believe are in their original condition. The right-hand bay on the roof has the original exposed wood, which they are looking to replace in-kind only where necessary and repair and paint. The other bay is covered with vinyl, which they are proposing to remove and restore to match the right-hand bay. There is also a frieze band above the bay windows that is covered in siding; they plan to take the siding off and restore and replace as necessary as well as paint. The window on the left-hand side is more original and appropriate, and they will replace the right-hand window to match. At this point they are not planning to remove the siding on the peaked bay. The front porch also has at least one missing metal railing on the stair. They are proposing to install a matching metal railing to the one that is there. He also talks about the work on the rear garage. The garage was in poor condition and the roof came down.
 2. Ms. Quinn states that there was a Certificate issue for in-kind replacement of the flat roof, but there were changes made to the roof shape.
 3. Mr. Hart states that they want to make the garage as plain and hidden as possible. The roof has been replaced in-kind and they are asking for approval of the doors.
-
-

-
-
4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 5. Mr. Harless asks for clarification on the garage work.
 6. Mr. Hart states that the owner had a building permit, but was asked to stop work and come before the HRC.
 7. Mr. Harless asks if they are rebuilding the garage walls too.
 8. Mr. Pellegrino states that two of them collapsed.
 9. Mr. Harless states that they are looking to replace the garage in-kind.
-
-

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade and porch restorations and new garage alterations and roof.
 11. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

821 Liberty Avenue

Penn-Liberty Historic District

Owner:

Catholic Charities
212 Ninth Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-65

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Charles DiLoreto
38 W. Main Street
Carnegie, Pa 15106

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/14/15

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

Proposed Changes: ADA upgrades to existing ATM.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Kathy Echement steps to the podium; she is the director of facilities for Catholic Charities, the owner of the building. She states that there had previously been a bank in the building, and there is still an ATM on the exterior. She states that the ATM needs to be upgraded to be full service, and part of that is lowering it at least eighteen inches to make it ADA accessible. She introduces Chuck DiLoreto, the property manager.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if they are proposing to cut into the stone window lintel.
 3. Mr. DiLoreto says yes; there is no other way to do it. He states that the ATM is **already there and isn't going away.**
 4. Ms. Peterson asks if the entire area shown in the pictures would have to be covered.
 5. Mr. Serrao states that it looks like it would have to be because there is a vault behind. He states that the only issue for him is cutting into the stone.
 6. Mr. Falcone states that another issue for him is the increased size of the ATM; what they are proposing will be taller and wider.
 7. Mr. Hogan states that the significance of the building is its windows, which is an issue they ran into on their previous application for HVAC. They were able to come to a solution on that issue, but for this one, in order to get the accessibility, they have to go through the wall. Their proposal will significantly alter an important piece of the architecture of an architecturally significant building.
 8. Mr. DiLoreto states that they can work with the size of the ATM.
 9. Mr. Serrao says the issue still is that they want to cut the stone. They could work with the other things, but not that.
 10. Mr. Hogan suggests that an alternative solution might be to relocate the ATM to
-
-

the lobby, to be accessible via a card swipe.

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

Motion:

12. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application for the alteration to the ATM.

13. Ms. Peterson seconds.

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

218 Tennyson Avenue

Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:

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

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-216

Inspector: Joe Motznik

Applicant:

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

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 8/14/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

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

Discussion:

1. Mr. Cliff Rowe steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that this is his second time before the HRC; he had previously replaced some skylights without approval and they were determined to have too high of a pitch and the wrong color. It was his understanding that he was to go back and install skylights closer to the original ones, which he has done. He states that the new skylights are made of steel wrapped in copper and wire glass. He shows the dimensions of the new skylights. He states that the smaller one is not visible anymore, and they reduced the pitch on the larger one to minimize visibility.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if he has dealt with the air conditioners yet.
 3. Mr. Rowe says he has not.
 4. Mr. Hogan talks about the previous application and states that this is a dramatic improvement over the prior skylights. He states that the applicant still should have come before the HRC before making the repair.
 5. Mr. Rowe talks about the air conditioners. He states that the contractor was ready to apply for permits, but he knows he has to go through historic review first, which he will try to do in the next few weeks. He states that he most likely will have to lose the units on the left lower roof, and move the units on the right to the ground. He explains that **there are also three units on the main roof, one of which can't be seen right now, and they will locate the others where they can't be seen as well.** He states that he also may be applying for fencing
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 7. Mr. Mike Abney steps to the podium; he is a neighbor and expresses support for the project.
 8. Mr. Hogan notes for the record a letter received from Schenley Farms Civic Association expressing their support.
-
-

Motion:

9. Mr. Gastil motions to approve the application.
 10. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Card Carriage House

Historic Nomination

Owner:

David and Aliza Kashi

Ward: 14th

Lot and Block: 126-H-102

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Nominator:

Marie King

Council District:

Nomination Received: 7/20/15

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Nomination as a historic structure.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn makes a short presentation on the history, architecture, and significance of the property. She states that the property still retains integrity because, while there have been some unsympathetic alterations to the exterior, the form is unchanged. She recommends that the Commission find that there is viability to the nomination.
2. Mr. Hogan states that it is important that communities come together to look at preserving their historic fabric, and he commends the neighbors for doing that. He states that from what he has reviewed so far, the application appears to have merit. He states that it is also important to start looking at not just one structure, but the possibility of a district. He talks about the nomination process.
3. Ms. Quinn talks about the level of protection on the property, explaining that when the nomination was submitted any demolition was prevented, and if the Commission finds that the application has merit today, any work will need to be reviewed.
4. The nominators present some additional information about some of the building violations on the property.

Motion:

5. Mr. Falcone motions to find that the application has merit.
 6. Mr. Gastil lists the criteria for the record. He states that, subject to further review, the building meets **criteria #2**, identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related aspects of the development of the City of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States, **criteria #3**, exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship, and possibly **criteria #8**, exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or
-
-

settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction.

7. Mr. Gastil seconds.

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