



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 December 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	Jason Wirick	Carole Malakoff	Richard Wallace
Carol Peterson	Sharon Spooner	Tom Smith	Susan Brandt	Max Mavrovic
Raymond Gastil		John Francona	Jeffrey Davis	Carmen Gong
Ernie Hogan		Lindsay Patross	Sandra Massimino	Julie Polletta
Matthew Falcone		Lisa Carver	Ray Marks	Evelyn Jones
Joe Serrao		Bob Baumbach	Jeff Martin	Todd Reeves
		Melissa McSwigan		

Old Business—None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the October 2015 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. Peterson seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the November 2015 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Gastil seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Application for Certificate of Economic Hardship—1812 E. Carson Street:

1. Mr. Tom Smith with United American Savings Bank steps to the podium. He thanks the Commission in advance for hearing their case. He states that when they looked at the value of the property, they asked the appraiser to look at it from three different perspectives: one as-is, one with the demolition of the building completed and parking put in, and one with the house renovated as a rental. He states that, under the as-is value, the report states that the building is in poor condition and is not habitable and therefore does not contribute to the as-is value of the property. He states that in the renovation section, the report states that after an estimated \$402-472,000 is spent on the renovation, the rental value of the property would be \$2,000 per month which would increase the value of the property by \$185,000 per year, which to him does not seem like a good deal. He states that they will have a negative return on their investment no matter how they look at it, and with upkeep of the building it would take them 20 years to recap their investment. He states that they do a lot of rehab and **take pride in it; they just don't feel that they could obtain a return on this property that would make it economically viable.** He states that they also talked to their insurance company about the steps in this house, and he has not received a clear answer as to how they would deal with those. He states that they are very steep and narrow, and whether they could insure them or not they are an accident waiting to happen. They believe that if they did have the property inspected they would have to replace the stairs, and they have factored that cost in to the renovation cost. He states that if someone were to bring the rehab project

to their bank for financing, they would not consider it and no other bank would either. They have decided that selling the building would not be an option, as this building is built **around the bank building, and they would lose the parking spaces and access to the bank's back door** as well as add security concerns with sharing a common wall of the bank with an outside party. He talks again about the security concerns created by the alcove of the building; they have found needles and other paraphernalia from over the weekends. He reiterates that the project is not economically viable and introduces Max Mavrovic, the architect for the project, who can also answer questions.

2. Mr. Harless states that at the last presentation they included a structural assessment, and asks if this is the same one.
3. Mr. Smith states that it is the same one.
4. Mr. Gastil asks if they can define hardship as part of the discussion.
5. Ms. Quinn reads the definition of economic hardship from the ordinance.

1101.06 - CERTIFICATE OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.

(b) Standard to be applied.

(2) Demolition, New Construction, Additions, and Relocation. The Commission shall only approve an application for a Certificate of Economic Hardship upon a determination that the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness, except in the case involving a Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration, has resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and/or return from the property.

6. Mr. Hogan reads further.

(c) Consideration of evidence. In applying this standard, the Commission shall consider among other things any evidence presented concerning the following:

(1) Any estimates of the cost of the proposed alteration, construction, demolition or relocation and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendations of the Commission for changes necessary for it to be approved.

(2) Any opinions from a licensed engineer or architect with experience in renovation, restoration or rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures or objects on the property and their suitability for continued use, renovation, restoration or rehabilitation.

(3) Any estimates of the market value of the property in its current condition; after completion of the proposed alteration, construction, demolition, or relocation; after any expenditures necessary to comply with the recommendations of the Commission for changes necessary for it to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness; and in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing property for continued use.

(4) In the case of a proposed demolition, any estimates from architects, developers, real estate consultants, appraisers, or other real estate professionals experienced in rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of restoration, renovation or rehabilitation of any existing structures or objects.

(5) Any and all applicable zoning provisions, the possibility of modifications to zoning provisions and incentives available to the applicant.

7. Mr. Hogan states that the appraiser values the building at \$185,000 as renovated, and the value based on the rental income and the value to rehab to livable standards \$402-472,000 **depending on if you are looking at the appraiser or contractor's estimate. He states that there are also questions of structural integrity.**

8. **Mr. Harless talks about the engineer's report that** discusses the condition of the building. He states that in his opinion, the report indicates that there is substantial renovation that needs to take place, but it does not indicate that the building is structurally unsound.
9. Mr. Hogan states that he feels that the focus of their case is economic, that the return on investment is not there. **He doesn't know of any programs or** even historic tax credits that would help bridge that gap.
10. Mr. Gastil asks about the rent estimates.
11. Mr. Smith states that they asked someone that does rehab on the lower end of the scale to take a look at the building, and he came up with the \$1300 figure. They feel, however, that \$2000 would be attainable, since they would do a more high-end rehab.
12. Ms. Peterson states that she feels that the numbers provided for the rehab are overestimates; she states that she has rehabbed and restored houses that are roughly the same size as this one, and she would be in big trouble if she took numbers like this and tried to get projects done. She states that maybe the contracting company, while reputable, is not the right fit for a smallish house of this type. She questions some items that are not normally done on houses of this type, such as \$22,000 for a sprinkler system.
13. Mr. Mavrovic states that the sprinklers would be required by city building code as it is attached to a commercial building, they are both on one property, and they share a party wall.
14. Mr. Harless disagrees, stating that sprinklers would not be retroactively required for a single-family home, as long as there is proper fire separation between the two separate buildings.
15. Mr. Mavrovic states that they were required to do that for another project that had apartments above.
16. Mr. Harless says yes, because it is a mixed-use building.
17. Ms. Peterson also cites the \$31, 320 figure for electrical work and states that for rewiring a similar size house she has gotten a figure of \$5000 from a registered electrician. She states that a cynical person might say the numbers are higher to make it seem like the project is unviable when it is not.
18. Mr. Hogan states that she raises a lot of good points. He states that the applicant has submitted evidence, and it is a question of whether the Commission wants to accept the evidence. He states that even so, they are stating that they are at \$223 per square foot, and even at \$200 per square foot he thinks it would not be economically viable.
19. Mr. Gastil suggests that they look at the difference between the demolition and parking use value and the restoration and rental value. He states that parking value was stated as 4 parking spaces at \$3000 each for a total of \$12,000 a year, and the demolition cost was stated as \$184,000. He states that they should look closely at how this is all spelled out in the documents.
20. Mr. Hogan states that with the figures as stated, they would need to be able to do the rehab at \$100 per square foot.
21. Mr. Gastil states that they can do the same thing for the parking.
22. Mr. Falcone says for the parking they would have a 15 year ROI versus a 20 year ROI for the rental.

23. Mr. Gastil states that that is what he is getting at. He states that if they accept all the figures as correct, it seems like it is a difference between a 15 and 20 year ROI, unless they are reading something incorrectly.
24. Mr. Smith states that that is essentially correct but adds that the reason that they intend to spend so much on the parking area is not only visual but also for security reasons. They want the area to add to the neighborhood, and while they could certainly find cheaper ways to tear the building down and add a parking lot, they are concerned about the neighborhood **and aesthetics and don't want to do that.**
25. Mr. Harless wants to clarify what they are looking at. He states that the last application was for demolition and construction of a new parking lot. This case before them today is for economic hardship, and he wants to clarify that this includes the parking lot as well as the demo.
26. Ms. Quinn says yes, they are seeking approval of the demolition and new construction based on hardship.
27. **Mr. Hogan states that normally they don't look at economic return on investment; it is only in hardship cases that they are allowed to consider it.**
28. Mr. Harless refers to the ordinance and the definition of economic hardship as "denial of all reasonable use of and/or return from the property."
29. Mr. Gastil states that there is a use, which is **residential, but the "reasonable" part of the case** will be financial.
30. Mr. Hogan states that it is actually more cost effective to renovate a larger structure than a smaller structure like this because of economies of scale.
31. Mr. Harless asks if the design for the new parking lot is included in this packet. It is not, so the Commission views the application packet from last month. He asks what standards for screening the Commission has required for parking lots in the past.
32. Mr. Hogan states that the wrought-iron look fence and the brick pilasters have been standard, which is similar to what they are proposing. Zoning also requires a landscape buffer.
33. Mr. Gastil asks for clarification on the demolition costs and where that is included in the figures.
34. Mr. Hogan asks if the improved value for the renovation includes improvement of the existing parking lot.
35. Mr. Mavrovic states that small enhancements to the parking area were included.
36. Mr. Gastil asks Ms. Quinn what the procedure will be if they approve or deny.
37. Ms. Quinn states that if approved there is nothing else that has to be done. If denied, it would be up to the applicant if they wanted to move it beyond Commission.
38. Mr. Hogan states that they could go to the Court of Common Pleas.

39. Ms. Quinn reads from the ordinance regarding the determination by the Commission.

The determination by the Commission whether the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness has or has not resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property or in substantial hardship to the owner shall be made within forty-five (45) days following close of the public hearing and submission of all information, documentation or evidence requested by the Commission. The determination shall be accompanied by findings of fact and a report stating the reasons for the decision.

She states that this means they have additional time to make the decision if they need it. She states that this could be considered the public hearing, or they could hold an additional hearing.

40. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He states that based on the ordinance, it seems to him that the applicant has met several of the standards. He asks for a motion.

41. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the Certificate of Economic Hardship.

42. Mr. Harless seconds.

43. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Harless, Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Serrao are in favor and Ms. Peterson, Mr. Falcone, and Mr. Gastil are opposed. The vote is tied and considered a denial. Motion fails.

44. Mr. Mavrovic asks what the next step is.

45. Mr. Hogan states that the application was complete and was denied. The next step is not with the HRC.

46. Ms. Quinn states that she will send information out to them. She reads from the ordinance:

(h) Disapproval by Commission. If the determination of the Commission is to disapprove the application for a Certificate of Economic Hardship, the applicant shall be notified within five (5) business days. The notice shall include a copy of the findings of fact and report.

(i) Determination of economic hardship.

If the determination of the Commission is that the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness has resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property or in substantial hardship to the owner, the Commission shall consult with the Director of the Department of City Planning to provide incentives that may include, but not be limited to, property tax relief, loans or grants from the City of Pittsburgh or other public or private sources, acquisition by purchase, building and safety code modifications to reduce cost of maintenance, restoration, rehabilitation or renovation, changes in applicable zoning regulations including a transfer of development rights. The Historic Review Commission may at its discretion permit variations from the provisions of this Chapter and its design guidelines in conjunction with these incentives. [this section was read at the meeting but does not apply.]

Other Business:

1. None.

Adjourn:

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Gastil seconds.

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

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

930 Beech Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

John & Melissa Tingue
931 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-57

Inspector:

Applicant:

John & Melissa Tingue
931 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/13/15

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

Proposed Changes: Construction of a rear fence.

Discussion:

1. Mr. John Tingue steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that they recently purchased the house and moved in with two dogs, so they needed to construct a fence. He states that the fence has already been constructed. He states that it is six feet high across the rear of the property; it is constructed of cedar planks and has a gate in the center. There were pre-existing fence posts, and according to the previous owners there was a fence there at one time. He states that they did look around the neighborhood at other fences to make sure they were in line with what was in the neighborhood.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks if they will be keeping the natural finish.
 3. Mr. Tingue says yes; the LRC did suggest that they stain the fence but they will have to wait to do that.
 4. Mr. Harless asks if they received a stop-work notice.
 5. Mr. Tingue says no, he learned from neighbors that he had to get approval, so he went to the LRC and now here to do that. He states that he did have to construct the fence to keep the dogs in.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 7. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that they did meet with the applicants and they do recommend approval.
-
-

Motion:

8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a rear fence as submitted.
 9. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

808 Ridge Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

CCAC
800 Allegheny Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-159

Applicant:

Radelet McCarthy Polletta Inc
100 First Avenue, Suite 300
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade restoration including door replacement.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Julie Polletta steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She shows a plan of the site and photos of the existing entrance. She states that the main objective of the project is to replace the stone stairs in-kind, but depending on funding they would like to add additional work items. These would include restoration of the cheek walls on the side, replacement of the two existing pole-mounted light fixtures, replacement of the existing entrance doors, and restoration of the existing stone curb between the building and the sidewalk.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for more information on the doors.
 3. Ms. Polletta shows a picture of the existing doors and what they are proposing for the new doors. She states that the existing doors are bronze metal, full-glass doors that are set into an existing transom. They are proposing to replace them with a glass-door system that is exactly like what was approved at West Hall next door. The existing transom will remain; they will clean it and then match the color of the new door to it. She talks about the light fixtures and shows photos of the existing and what they are proposing. They measured to make sure the sizes are comparable, and they also looked at other fixtures in the district. They are proposing to use LED lamps.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that they met with the owner and applicant, and they found that most of the plans are straightforward in-kind replacement. They find the light fixtures appropriate although they would like to see soft lighting. She states that the doors are the same as what was approved at West Hall, and they are happy to see the ornate ironwork transom being retained. She states that they do support the project.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for addition testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade restoration, including the door replacement, step replacement, replacement of light fixtures, and in-kind restoration of the fence curb.
 8. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

930 Western Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Dr. James J. Worry
2745 Amman Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15226

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-136

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/12/15

Applicant:

John D. Francona
1234 Resaca Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

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

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. James Worry steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he intends to restore the property to a single family home to live in, and he is very excited about the project.
 2. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they have made some changes based on the recommendations of the LRC. He states that the property is currently a double house, and they are going through the process to separate them into two separate properties. He shows the elevation, pointing out the porch, the windows with stained glass, and the painted terracotta mansard roof. He talks about the work items, stating that there is quite a bit of wood that they will repair, replace, clean, and paint. He states that they are planning to clean and repaint the terracotta roof, although the LRC indicated that they would like to see the paint removed and the terracotta restored. They are also proposing to clean and repaint the previously painted brick. They have decided to keep the original windows and refurbish them; if they are not weathertight they will install storm windows on the inside. They will also be installing new painted wood windows on the first floor and in the dormer, and they will be cleaning and repainting the existing front doors. They are proposing to build a wood screen to separate the front porches; they have based the design on existing lattice and beadboard elements on the porch.
 3. Mr. Hogan requests that they use a vertical and horizontal lattice rather than the diagonal.
 4. Mr. Francona agrees that will be appropriate. He talks about the rear of the house, which is in disrepair. He states that you can see that there used to be porches, and they are proposing an eventual new porch, of which they are just constructing the base right now, as well as in-kind window replacement and a new door and transom. They will also construct a painted wooden fence around the yard, with color to be determined, and are saving space for and eventual garage.
-
-

-
-
5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 6. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that this is a fantastic project for one of the last vacant houses in the neighborhood. The LRC made three recommendations, which the applicant has taken into consideration. The first was the terracotta roof; she states that they know they are allowed to repaint, but they recommend cleaning them and leaving them unpainted, as they are a rare and important architectural feature in the neighborhood. The second suggestion, which the applicant did take, was restoration of the stained glass windows. The third suggestion is to use two-over-two windows in the rear.
 7. **Ms. Peterson states she agrees with the LRC on the roof, but doesn't think they can require that.**
 8. Mr. Hogan states that they can suggest it, but he thinks it is obvious that the owner and applicant are restoring the property in a sensitive way, and he believes that they have gone above and beyond to ensure its integrity for a long time to come.
-
-

Motion:

9. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the building renovations as submitted with final color selections to be submitted to staff.
 10. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 11. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the approved proposal is the one submitted to the Commission today, including restoration of the front three stained-glass windows, installation of wood windows in the rear to match, and cleaning and painting of the terracotta, although if the terracotta can remain unpainted that would be preferred.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1006 Cedar Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Pinnacle Redevelopment
145 27th Ph H Street
New York, Ny 10016-9039

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-213

Inspector:

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of a rear rooftop deck.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the proposed roof deck will be situated on the rear ell roof about 50 feet back from the property line on Moravian Way. The rear ell is two stories, so the roof deck would connect to the third floor. He states that they are proposing to recess the deck into the roof to minimize visibility. He states that only the top portion of the railing would be visible from Moravian Way.
 2. **Mr. Hogan states that based on the drawings, it looks like the fencing won't exceed the peak of the roof.**
 3. Mr. Baumbach says yes. He states that the deck will have a bit of a plinth to rise above the roofline, and this will be clad in horizontal cedar boards. The pickets will be flat boards between a horizontal top and bottom rail.
 4. Mr. Harless asks about the work being done in the photo.
 5. Mr. Baumbach states that he included a current photo which shows the rear finished with brick.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that they never approved any rear alterations.
 7. Mr. Baumbach states that he did present changes to the front façade in 2014 but was not involved in the rear work.
 8. Mr. Harless states that he is concerned about the full extent of work that was done to the structure.
 9. Mr. Gastil asks if they should table the application pending further information.
 10. Mr. Harless agrees and states that they need a full accounting of the work that was done.
-
-

Motion:

11. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application pending further investigation on the scope of work that was done.
 12. Mr. Harless seconds.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

620 Cabot Way

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Sandra Massimino
620 Cabot Way
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-F-39

Inspector:

Applicant:

Sandra Massimino
620 Cabot Way
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 10/21/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Rear fencing and awning, front stoop replacement.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Sandra Massimino steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that she is looking to make improvements to the front and rear of the house primarily for safety and security reasons, but also for appearance. On the front, she needs to replace the concrete stoop; she believes that the straight-out, three-step old stoop is underneath, and if so she will restore it, if not she will replace what is there. The old iron railing was removed due to rust but she will add a new one to **match the neighbor's. The next work item on the front of the house** is the basement window; it is currently covered with plywood with venting coming out of it. She is proposing to replace the window with glass block and proper vent openings. The next item is the brickwork; they are proposing to clean the brick and repaint, with colors to be determined. She talks about the work on the rear of the houses, stating that the back of the house is falling off due to a rotted beam. They have replaced the beam but much of the first floor needs to be replaced. She is proposing to change a rear window to a door and to add an awning over the new rear door due to water issues. They are also proposing a rear wooden fence, which they did have to start constructing because of security issues.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 3. Mr. Serrao states that awnings are required to be cloth instead of metal.
 4. Ms. Massimino states that she did see that in the guidelines for facades, but she states that this awning will be in the rear and minimally visible.
 5. Mr. Hogan states that glass block is not permissible on the front of the building.
 6. Mr. Falcone suggests that she use a multi-paned window with one pane out to allow the venting.
-
-

Motion:

7. Mr. Falcone motions to approve with the condition that the front basement window not contain glass block but instead have a two or four part glass window with one pane removed for an exhaust vent.
 8. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1731 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

1731 East Carson St Associates
1 PPG Place, Suite 1640
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-315

Inspector:

Applicant:

Morgan Architecture + Design
3308 Perrysville Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15214

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Morgan steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that this building is currently a post office and is a fairly simple mid-century building. He states that the objective for the project is to divide the building into two separate tenant spaces, one of which will remain the post office and one which will house a new restaurant tenant. They are proposing to just update the glass in the post office side, and then they will divide the spaces aesthetically by raising the front roofline on the restaurant side to match the roofline in the rear. He states that he reviewed the original proposal with staff and revised the design for the restaurant space to be better in keeping with the district guidelines. They were originally going to remove the metal band on the façade and build the roofline up above in brick, and since the brick would not match they would paint the existing brick to match. Since painting brick is not permitted in historic districts, they have revised that plan. They also were proposing an overhead garage door, which they found out is not appropriate for the district. He states that the revised elevation includes a continuation of the metal cornice all the way across. They would still like to extend the roofline up to the height of the rear building, but they will clad it in a simple metal panel in a solid color. In lieu of the garage door, they are proposing to keep the window pattern but use a bifold operable window system. They will replace the post office entrance with a single door, and will add a recessed entry door to the restaurant space in a similar style with double doors. He also presents the rear changes including painting of the metal bands, construction of an entry door, and construction of an accessible ramp. They will also fill in the existing openings with salvaged brick from the front. He gives more details on the materials.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks why they are proposing the roofline change.
 3. Mr. Morgan states that there is a very low roof right now and the tenant wanted more space. He states that they can see from the building next door that there was a building at that height there previously as well.
-
-

-
-
4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He acknowledges a letter from the LRC, which only had a chance to review the previous plans; some of their concerns have been addressed, but they did have some issues with the roofline change.
 5. Mr. Hogan states that it makes sense for the post office to downsize and for another tenant to go in that space. He states that the building is also non-contributing. He states that he is not opposed to the metal panels but would like to hear community input on this plan. He is concerned about changing the roofline, as the building is still part of the streetscape, and respecting the existing architecture is important to him. He thinks the new entrance was done well.
 6. Ms. Peterson agrees.
 7. Mr. Falcone agrees.
 8. Mr. Gastil states that he has no issue with the roofline.
 9. Mr. Serrao states that he can see both sides, but he does see how it should read as one façade and not two.
 10. **Mr. Morgan asks if there is any other alternative. He states that that he doesn't want to get into "fake historic" options. He suggests that he could carry the height all the way across.**
 11. Mr. Hogan feels that he should work with what is there. He states that the Commission could vote on it or table the application.
 12. Mr. Morgan states that he can eliminate that piece for now, and could resubmit and come back if the tenant still wants to go ahead with it.

Motion:

13. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the building renovations without the modification of the parapet; other front renovations per drawing #5 and rear renovations are approved.
 14. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

**4021-4029 Butler Street
Naser's Tavern**

Individual Landmark

Owner:

John Pergal
Lawrenceville Holdings
4025 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Ward: 9th

Lot and Block: 49-F-9,10,11

Inspector:

Applicant:

Lisa Carver
PWWG Architects
408 Boulevard of the Allies
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Rear addition/infill construction.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Lisa Carver steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She explains that the property was originally three parcels that have been consolidated. She shows the layout of the buildings and states that they are proposing to retain the existing exterior perimeter wall of all three structures and infill the existing courtyard to accommodate the expansion of the music venue and retail. She shows the elevations of the building and states that the entire structure was included in the historic designation, including a rear garage building with apartments above **and several row house apartments. She shows photos of the interior of Naser's Tavern**, stating that it does need extensive renovations. She shows photos of the interior courtyard, where there are structural issues and where they plan to do some demolition. She states that this area is not visible from the street or alley. She also states that they believe that the rear structure has been refaced with new brick and the openings have been modified; they feel that a lot of the historic significance has been stripped from it. She shows the floor plans with the addition added. She shows a historic photo from 1909 showing the light and dark color scheme that they are proposing to bring back. They will work with staff to come up with a final color scheme. They are proposing to repaint the already painted brick, and they will replace the windows with two-over-two windows as shown in the historic photograph. They will restore the storefronts, maintaining the same rhythm. On the 41st Street side, she points out the infilled, arched top openings; they are proposing to take out the brick and infill them with Hardie board or something smooth to create a recess and express those openings. She states that they could be used for venue advertisements.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that they should not place advertisements or anything in those recesses.
 3. Ms. Carver states that they are using the same strategy for the garage door and
-
-

first man-door in the rear garage building. They will also be replacing upper floor windows on this side of the building with two-over-two windows. On the rear of the building, they are proposing to infill the non-original first floor windows and replace the second floor windows with two-over-two windows. Only a sliver of the new wall will be visible from the rear.

4. Mr. Hogan asks about the material.
5. Ms. Carver states that they are proposing vinyl siding because it has so little visibility. She states that they can use Hardie plank if preferred. She states that they are planning to paint the rear building, which has been refaced and is not original brick, in order to create a unified structure. They did consider removing all the paint, but as seen in the historic photo, the building has always been painted and they would like to maintain that.
6. Ms. Peterson asks about the removal of the four chimneys.
7. Ms. Carver states that they will be gutting the second story for renovation of apartments, which is why they are proposing to remove the chimneys.
8. Mr. Falcone asks about the lighting.
9. Ms. Carver states that they will be replacing or refurbishing the lights on the front. On the side they will be replacing what is there in-kind.
10. Mr. Hogan talks about the infill of the arched windows on the side and asks if they considered restoring the windows there and blacking them out.
11. Ms. Carver states that they met with neighborhood groups, expressing the openings was seen as satisfactory.
12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

13. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the rear addition and infill construction with the condition that all vinyl siding be replaced with Hardie panel and the four existing chimneys be retained at current heights.
 14. Mr. Hogan adds that the window openings are to be restored with flat panel infills and are not to have advertising of any nature.
 15. Mr. Serrao accepts the modification.
 16. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

**1 Schenley Drive
Phipps Conservatory**

Individual Landmark

Owner:

Phipps Conservatory
One Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-S-150

Inspector:

Applicant:

FortyEighty Architecture
4 Smithfield Street, Sixth Floor
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Rehabilitation of warehouse and garage, installation of panel arrays.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jason Wirick with Phipps Conservatory steps to the podium. He explains that they are proposing renovation of their exhibit staging center, which was a former Department of Public Works site.
2. Mr. Jeffery Davis from FortyEighty Architecture steps to the podium. He states that they will be rehabilitating the warehouse structure that was used by Public Works and constructed in the 1950s. The structure is a one story, concrete masonry building that is painted brown. One of the goals of the project is to connect this building with the landscape of the lagoon and create an edge for the hillside landscape. He states that the building is currently used for service and maintenance and will remain so. He shows an overhead view and states that the building is already covered with photovoltaic panels that generate electricity for other buildings. He states that this building will need to be designed to have a net positive energy output and will need an additional energy source, so they are going to install photovoltaic arrays on the hillside for that purpose. He states that the only new construction on the exterior of the building will be a small vestibule entrance. They intend to extend the existing lagoon boardwalk to this new entrance. The exterior of the building will be clad in vertical panels of weathering steel. They intend this building to be a backdrop to blend in with the landscape and not call too much attention to itself. The base of the façade will be clad in sandstone veneer, which is also found in the landscape around the lagoon. On the west side of the building there will be a screen wall that will be planted for screening of the maintenance activities. There will be a folding wall on the building that will open up into a small landscaped area. The south side of the building is the service area and will have a service door. The building will also have a glass corridor and a deck for employees. There will be a green roof on the new construction portions of the building, and other parts of the roof will retain the photovoltaic panels.
3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the rehabilitation of the warehouse and garage and the installation of panel arrays.
 5. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

260 Forbes Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

GMS Commercial, LP
95 W Beau Street Suite 600
Washington, Pa 15301

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-184

Inspector:

Applicant:

Chad Wheatley
95 W Beau Street Suite 600
Washington, Pa 15301

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/13/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Modifications to previously approved façade and open space plans.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Chad Wheatley steps to the podium; he is with Millcraft Investments, the owner and developer of the property. He states that the project was previously presented in March of 2013, and they have a few modifications that they are proposing today. He shows the rendering of the Forbes Avenue façade, which shows that there are two previously approved framed openings, and they are proposing to add a third. They will be using the same materials, which will be an aluminum panel glazed into a curtain wall system. The new material will be the Nanawall system. He states that the other changes will be to the open space; the areas along Fourth Avenue are the open space areas for the project. On Fourth Avenue they will be making changes by removing two trees and adding three cement planters. They are also proposing to change the bike parking area by adding a pervious surface.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the lighting.
 3. Mr. Wheatley states that it has not changed from the previous submission.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the modifications to the façade and open space plans as submitted in the documents.
 6. Mr. Harless seconds.
 7. 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:

Applicant:

Margaret Ringel & Associates
55 Wyoming Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/13/15

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 explains the restoration project, which they did present to the Commission three months ago, and they have brought the specific plans and materials today. She states that they did find evidence of six-over-six windows, so they will be using those throughout the house. They found that this building is from 1858, and while they have no photographs of the original condition, they do have photos of a house in Indiana from 1848 that has many similarities. She talks about the brickwork, stating that there have been many repairs over the years. They do plan to remove the paint and restore or replace the brickwork as needed. She states that they believe that there was a gable on the roof, which they plan to restore. As she said they will be replacing the windows with wooden windows, and they will also restore the shutters; the windows on the first floor are larger than those on the second, so they will use six by nine windows there. She states that on the N. Taylor side they will add an accessible entrance with a simple ramp and railing. She talks about the materials that they will be using for the restoration, which are all included in the packet.
 2. Ms. Peterson asks for more details on why they think the roof was originally gabled and not hipped.
 3. Ms. Ringel-Baker states that they looked at the fireplace and chimney on the end on the second floor. If you look up through the fire-damaged ceiling, you can see that there was new construction and the chimney was cut off. She also thinks that the N. Taylor side may have been shortened and the parapet added when adjacent houses were built.
 4. Ms. Peterson also states that there would not have been six-over-nine windows on a building like this; the windows should be six-over-six with larger panes. She asks if the shutters will be operable.
 5. Ms. Ringel-Baker says that they will be.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

7. Ms. Peterson motions to approve with the condition that the windows be six-over-six instead of six-over-nine.
 8. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

524 N. Taylor Avenue

Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Justin Kennedy
132 Lincoln Street Suite 2R
Boston, Ma 02111

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-209

Inspector:

Applicant:

Richard Wallace
4026 Gibsonia Road
Gibsonia, Pa 15044

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/10/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Change of roofing material and installation of skylights.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Richard Wallace steps to the podium; he is the contractor for the project. He states that the house has a standing seam roof that the owner originally wanted to replace with another standing seam roof; however, when he inspected the roof he found that it is not flat and would not be able accept a new metal roof. He states that he gave the owner the options of slate or a dimensional shingle; most similar roofs in the neighborhood do have shingles. He states that the owner also wants to install skylights, which he thought would not be allowed, but the owner showed him skylights on several neighboring properties. They are looking to add three skylights in the back corner, which is on Monterey Street.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the roof color.
 3. Mr. Wallace states that it will be slate gray. He states that he is also looking to reline and paint the box gutters and asks about the paint colors.
 4. **Ms. Quinn states that if the district doesn't have paint color requirements, they just need to make sure they are in harmony with the neighborhood.**
 5. Mr. Hogan reads the paint color guidelines from the district guidelines. He suggests that they scrape the paint down to see what color was there originally and try to match that.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 7. Mr. Hogan states that it would be nice to retain a standing seam roof, but he understands the limitations. He states that the proposed skylights are on a main street and visible, and he would not recommend approval for those.
-
-

Motion:

8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the new roofing material in the slate grey color and repainting of box gutter and trim in an appropriate color. He motions to deny the installation of skylights on the Taylor Avenue façade.
 9. Mr. Harless seconds.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

201 N. Bellefield Avenue **Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

Owner:

Western PA School for Blind Children
201 N Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-287

Inspector:

Applicant:

Lisa Carver
PWWG Architects
408 Boulevard of the Allies
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Council District: 4th

Application Received: 11/13/15

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

Proposed Changes: Construction of a pedestrian bridge.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Todd Reeves steps to the podium representing the School for Blind Children. He explains the reasoning behind the project and how it is very needed for the students.
 2. Ms. Lisa Carver steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She explains the project, stating that the school consists of the original building from 1894 and several later additions from the 70s and 80s, and their proposed bridge would attach to the 1987 entry addition. They looked into the most efficient way of crossing the road and connecting the two buildings, and they came up with this connection from the second floor of the building in question to the third floor of the building across the street. This will allow for a four foot elevation change and will keep the slope below ADA requirements. They are proposing to remove most of the entry structure while keeping the structural bones of it and adding a vegetative roof. The bridge will land on it and enter the building. The materials will be glass which will be fritted below a certain height, as well as metal panels and painted steel.
 3. Mr. Serrao asks why they are proposing the fritted glass.
 4. Ms. Carver states that it is to provide a level of visual security for the low-vision students. They are also looking into options for blinds that could be lowered. They are looking to make it as transparent as possible.
 5. Mr. Falcone asks what other options they considered, such as an underground walkway.
 6. Ms. Carver states that it was always going to be an elevated structure, they were just considering different connection points and different heights. There was also a traffic study done a few years ago for an at-grade crossing.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He acknowledges a letter of support for the project from Councilman Gilman.
-
-

Motion:

8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve construction of a pedestrian bridge as submitted.
 9. Mr. Harless seconds.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Discussion on Ordinance Revisions

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn steps to the podium. She states that today they have to move forward with providing recommendations or comments to City Council regarding the proposed amendment to the ordinance. She reads the section from the ordinance that addresses this, which is Section 1101.11, Amendments: “City Council may, by ordinance, amend, supplement, or change this Chapter after requesting and receiving recommendations from the Historic Review Commission and the City Planning Commission upon such amendments and after conducting a public hearing.” **She hands out a sheet showing what the proposed changes are, which she** also provided at the last meeting. The other sheet she provided last time indicated what the changes are and how they relate to legal issues and other precedents. She has updated it based on the recommendation from Mr. Hogan that she look at other cities to see what they have done. The cities that she looked at were Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

She found that Baltimore has a land lease system with city that is quite a bit **different and didn’t really apply**. **She states that in addition to looking at these** cities, she also took a look at what is recommended in **Pittsburgh’s preservation** plan. She states that an overall strengthening of the preservation program is recommended as well as revising of the ordinance to make it more readable. She states that on the chart, most of the things she identified last time have not **changed other than identifying what sections would be “contrary to strengthening the ordinance as identified in the city’s cultural heritage plan.”** Additionally, in the case of nomination of a historic district, she has included information from Durham and Greensboro, NC, and Brookhaven, NY, petitions in this city require 25 percent or so of property owners in support.

She talks about the nomination section, which states “Nomination of an area, property, site, structure, or object...may be submitted by any of the following:” **and** the proposed change is that a nomination may only be submitted by the owner of record. She states that in both Cincinnati and Philadelphia, any person can **nominate a property, and she doesn’t believe there** is even a residency requirement, whereas a nominator has to be a resident of Pittsburgh for one year. Regarding other petition requirements for district nominations, as she said Durham and Greensboro have a 25 percent requirement, Eustace, FL is 35 percent, 30 percent of the parcels, including rural districts, and Cincinnati and Philadelphia have no petition requirement listed for district designation. They do have an extensive public process in these two cities as Pittsburgh does.

The next proposed change is that “the Commission shall conduct a public hearing and take comments from any subject party...rules and procedures adopted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.” She states that **the HRC has its own rules and procedures**. Philadelphia also has its own rules and procedures to the point that they identify in them how properties are nominated and designated rather than that being something included in the ordinance. She states that a lot of the changes recommended in the ordinance revisions relate to how the cultural heritage plan sees the preservation program progressing in the future.

The next proposed change is “the HRC may not consider a proposed amendment or rescission of designation within one year of its previous designation.” She states that there is no mechanism in the ordinance for rescission of a designation. Philadelphia and Cincinnati both do, but what they say is that the rescission process would be handled in the same way as a nomination. Cincinnati also requires a “very strong justification” for approval by the Commission. She clarifies that there is no recommendation to add a process for rescission in these ordinance revisions, but the language does mention “rescission.”

2. Mr. Serrao states that a process for rescission might not be a bad thing to have so if things change, there is a way to rescind.
 3. Mr. Falcone states that it would be unusual.
 4. Mr. Serrao says yes, but one of his issues is the massive amount of demolitions in certain districts, such as Manchester, and the little fabric that is left in certain areas.
 5. Mr. Hogan states that this played into the Mexican War Streets district expansion, as they tried to nominate areas with no existing fabric in order to control what gets built there, which is not appropriate.
 6. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that this Commission is not the Planning Commission or a development commission.
 7. Ms. Quinn states that the state has considered adjusting the boundaries of the Manchester National Register district to reflect actual integrity.
 8. Mr. Harless wants to clarify what is on the table as far as rescission.
 9. Mr. Hogan clarifies that this particular amendment is that no new action can happen on a district for one year.
 10. **Ms. Quinn states that as it stands now a failed nomination can’t come back for five years, and the rescission part is new. She states that the next change is the inclusion of a “qualified land-use attorney” on the Commission, which is something that is not identified in any other ordinances.**
 11. Mr. Hogan states that the Commission is not a land-use body, it is a preservation body.
 12. **Ms. Quinn also points out several items in Cincinnati’s and Philadelphia’s ordinances that are not in Pittsburgh’s and are much stronger. For example, Cincinnati has a stay on all demolitions in historic districts as well as a clause on demolition by neglect and a much more contextual look at historic properties and planned districts through planning or zoning. Philadelphia also has a clause for demolition by neglect, and their ordinance has been revised within the last 18 months.**
 13. Mr. Hogan asks what the preservation plan’s requirements were as far as strengthening the ordinance.
 14. Ms. Quinn states **that some of the recommendations are “to organize sections in a logical sequence”, “clarify definitions”, “establish sequencing of Historic Review Commission members”, “provide a stronger legal and technical footing for design review in historic districts that do not have district guidelines”, “compile design**
-
-

guidelines that are more specific; “stagger terms of HRC members”, “conduct annual trainings”, and “prepare a policy document that clearly explains the role of public comment in the process.”

15. Mr. Hogan states that it sounds like it recommends more policy and procedure changes.
 16. Ms. Quinn states that there is also a recommendation for a strategic demolition policy to combat demolition by neglect.
 17. Mr. Hogan states that there are other proposals being thought about for neighborhood about how speculation might be addressed through assessment changes.
 18. Ms. Quinn states that based on the ordinance, they do need to take public comment, which they also did last time. There is nothing specific about taking a vote, they only need to make a recommendation. She will need to supply to City Council a finding of fact, as is done for nominations, as well as the minutes from the meeting.
 19. Mr. Hogan states that they will take public comment now, and then the Commissioners will make statements and move toward a recommendation to Council.
 20. Ms. Quinn states that she did have a briefing scheduled with Planning Commission next week, which she can reschedule to give them more time.
 21. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
 22. Ms. Melissa McSwigan steps to the podium; she is from the Oakland **neighborhood. She missed last month’s HRC meeting but she did forward her** comments by email. She states that when Councilman Burgess proposed these amendments, it made her reflect on the existing ordinance, which is a good thing to do from time to time. She believes that the Councilman proposed these believing that the ordinance is a burden on the homeowner, but she believes that it strikes a balance between recognizing the rights of the homeowner as well as the rights of the community to have a say. She has property in three different areas of the city, and one of them is in a locally designated historic district in Oakland. She states that the local district is good in that it has a process for how things are developed and changed, and in the other two areas there have been issues that could have been avoided had there been a local designation. She states that she was further energized by the preservation conference a few weeks ago and **Donovan Rypkema’s economic study on the benefits of historic districts for** property owners.
 23. Ms. Susan Brant steps to the podium; she is the vice president of Preservation Pittsburgh. She states that the best evidence of a historic district working and neighbors working together was the Allegheny West LRC at the hearing today. She states that Ms. Malakoff spoke three times in support of projects because they were able to work things out at the local level. She and her organization would like to see a better local process, which was talked about earlier, but she does not think a change in the law is necessary.
 24. Mr. Sean Carter steps to the podium; he is the legislative assistant for Councilman Burgess. He states that the reasoning behind this is simple; the Councilman is opposed to third-party nominations. He states that there have been instances
-
-

where third-party nominations have been used capriciously to punish property owners whose plans for their property was opposed by the community. He states that there are some errors with the changes as discussed today. The provision tying **the HRC's process with the Zoning Board process was something they intended to omit.** The other provision they intended to omit was the land-use attorney. The provisions that the Councilman is dead-set about are the elimination of third-party nominations and the raising of the threshold for nomination of historic districts to 70 percent. Given the layers of review and prohibitions on properties that are in historic districts, the Councilman feels that an overwhelming amount of owners should be in favor. He talks about the 2008 nomination of the Malta Temple/Salvation Army, where the city declared that a religious structure was not a religious structure and designated it over the objection of the owner and despite the provision in the ordinance against nominations of religious structures when **the owner objects. He doesn't believe that has happened since, and he believes a similar nomination failed to get started based on that provision in the ordinance.**

25. Mr. Hogan asks for additional testimony; there is none. He states that he does want to thank the Councilman for the proposal as he thinks it is healthy to reevaluate the ordinances, rules, and laws on occasion to make sure that they are truly representing the interests of the city. However, he states that the architectural integrity of Pittsburgh is one of its cherished qualities and something to be preserved. He states that other cities have lost a lot of fabric and have become very homogeneous. He states that they do have to be careful as residential property owners can be impacted by districts, but the ordinance as written does contain provisions which allow the HRC to ease the burden on residents, and there are programs in the city that assist homeowners as well. He states that it is well documented that historic designation in residential districts has significantly increased and maintained property values. He sees designation as a tool in preserving community. He cites the case of the Iron City Brewery; although the owner at the time did not oppose the nomination, if nominated today designation would be opposed by the current owner, and third-party nomination would give those who have a sense of the value of the historic building a say rather than the owners who seem to value the scrap metal inside. He also cites the Union Trust Building, which is a significant piece of downtown architecture although it is not protected by city **ordinance at this time. He states that if the developer didn't have sensitivity and if it were not under federal ordinance, it might undergo different alterations that are not within certain standards.** He states that the Goodwill building on the Southside is another example of how ordinances work.

Speaking for himself as a Commissioner, he believes that the amendments as proposed would make it difficult to preserve our city and the jewels and the historic fabric that make up the city. He states that having to prove 70 percent support or obtain owner support could put many of our valuable historic structures at risk. He is uncomfortable creating such a high standard, especially when research is showing that 25 percent support and third-part nominations are standard. He does feel that the Commission needs to set some policies and procedures that might further clarify how they, or the Mayor, City Council, etc. might make nominations. He feels that there should be a threshold because they are stewards. He worries that the amendments as proposed go too far and would prevent formation of any further historic districts because no one would be able to obtain 70 percent support. He states that even neighborhood improvement

districts and bid districts require 25 percent of objectors to come forward rather than 75 percent of supporters, which is less onerous than what is being proposed. He states that he does not support the proposed amendments and would like to challenge the thinking behind it. He agrees with some of the testimony that the ordinance does work, although they could do better on cleaning up some of the operations of the Commission and put some internal controls in place.

26. Mr. Serrao agrees. He adds that there is a process, and it is not an easy process. There are many meetings, including HRC, Planning Commission, and City Council, and it is City Council that has the ultimate say. He does understand the position, and he states that if you want to look at certain cases, there were issues that happened, but he also states that it is a very small percentage of cases. He states that the process as-is, with nominating either a structure or a district, has enough hurdles that once it gets to Council, it has been properly vetted and has had enough input both pro and con. He thinks the proposed amendments would be overkill.
27. Ms. Peterson agrees with Mr. Hogan and Mr. Serrao. She identifies an unintended effect of historic designation that she thinks is positive—it can be a disincentive to **housing speculators or “flippers”**. **Right now in her neighborhood, which is not** a historic district, it is pretty much impossible for potential homeowners to compete with the all-cash buyers that want to put additions or other things that they would have to get HRC approval for in designated districts. She states that historic districts make it harder for flippers to come in and do business in their typical way. She states that her neighborhood is becoming more homogenous because of this frenzy of speculation.
28. Mr. Falcone states that what he loves about historic preservation as we have it now is that it is egalitarian. All residents of the City of Pittsburgh are treated equally and have the same voice and access regardless of social standing, means, or whether or not they own property. He sees that the people that will be impacted by the proposed changes are those that do not own property, and that bothers him because he feels that everyone should have a voice in their community. He states that the changes will mean that only people that own property, regardless of residency, would have a say over what is historic, even over the advice of HRC and **Council. He doesn’t see how this furthers historic preservation as a public good**, which is something that is at its core.
29. Mr. Harless states that he tends to be more sympathetic to the spirit of the proposed changes. He feels that property owners have a right to develop their property as long as they are in compliance with the laws that are in place. He feels **that it shouldn’t be up to a neighbor or** anyone else to stop a property owner from enjoying their own property. He has felt in some ways that nomination can stop an owner from exercising their rights on the property, and he feels that nominations have been abused in some cases. He states that nomination of a district also affects the rights of all of the owners in the district, even if they object to it. There was public testimony at the last hearing that 70 percent may be a bit aggressive, but perhaps a simple majority is more appropriate, and he tends to agree with that.
30. Mr. Hogan states that they will be preparing a finding of fact or a recommendation, which he will be happy to review once it is drafted and which they can circulate to all members to make sure all points were captured, and from there they will get it out.
-
-

31. Ms. Quinn states that they will transcribe the minutes from this discussion and last months' and pull from there.

Motion:

32. No motion.
