



**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 February 3, 2016  
Beginning at 12:30 PM  
200 Ross Street  
First Floor Hearing Room  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<b><i>Members</i></b>	<b><i>Staff</i></b>	<b><i>Others</i></b>		
Joe Serrao	Sarah Quinn	Greg Maynes	Carole Malakoff	John Francona
Carol Peterson	Sharon Spooner	Pat Russell	Charles Heidlage	Darren Toth
Raymond Gastil		David J. Barton	Gregory D. Cox	Amy Bentz
Ernie Hogan		Paul D. Taylor	Brett Mahaffey	Ryan Kabana
Matthew Falcone		Kathleen Hagan	Taafui Kamara	Lindsay Patross
		Bob Baumbach	Joshua Speakman	Andrew Reichert
		Melissa McSwigan	Jim McMullen	Michael Albright
		Joel Bernard	Alissa Martin	Jeb Jungwirth
		Heather Kitson	Susan Brandt	Brian Bevan
		Tom Mangan	JoAnn Patross	Katy Sawyer
		David Conrad	Janine Jelks-Seale	Ryan Morden
		Abass B. Kamara		

### **Old Business**

#### **Mexican War Streets Art Guidelines:**

1. Ms. Quinn states that she repeatedly offered to help to get something together for the **Commission's** Jan 1st deadline, which has now passed. She states that she is looking for some guidance on how to handle it and suggests that they think about it for the next meeting. She states that Manchester is also interested in potentially updating their guidelines.
2. Mr. Hogan asks if all of the neighborhood guidelines will be updated.
3. Ms. Quinn says yes, that would be her hope, but it would need to come from within.
4. Mr. Hogan states that the Commission will need some guidance from staff to how to approach this as far as having discussions with the districts, etc.
5. Mr. Falcone asks if there was any response from the neighborhood.
6. Ms. Quinn says no, but she thought there had been some leadership turnover within the neighborhood groups.
7. Ms. Peterson suggests that staff try to contact them one more time now that the leadership has settled.

### **New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the November 2015 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Falcone seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. In regards to the December 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 December 2015 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. Peterson seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. In regards to the January 2016 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:**

1. Ms. Quinn presents the finding of fact for the ordinance revisions for the Commission members to sign. She will present to the Planning Commission shortly. She also talks about the latest grant applications.
2. Mr. Serrao suggests that it might be worthwhile to review future findings of fact with the legal department.
3. Ms. Quinn states that a public hearing will be scheduled at City Council for the Card Carriage House shortly.

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Serrao 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.**

**808 Western Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Alissa Martin  
808 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-16

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/11/16

---

---

**Applicant:**

Alissa Martin  
808 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

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

**Proposed Changes:** Alteration to size of two rear windows.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jeb Jungwirth and Ms. Alissa Martin step to the podium; they are the owners of the property. Mr. Jungwirth states that they are looking to expand the size of two rear windows. He states that they removed a permanently installed external AC unit and increase the height of the windows by ten inches, which matches their other windows.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks what point of view the provided photo was taken.
  3. Mr. Jungwirth states that it was taken from the side alley; there is no rear alley.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks what kind of windows they will be installing.
  5. Ms. Martin and Mr. Jungwirth state that they are looking to match the other windows on the rear, which they believe are metal. Ms. Martin states they have not purchased the windows yet and will follow the recommendation of the Commission.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He acknowledges a letter sent from the LRC dated January 31, 2016.
  7. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that it is an after-the-fact project. She states that the sills and headers of the windows now match the other windows. She states that the LRC looked at the other houses in the row and determined that of the eight buildings, six have small third floor windows and two have the larger windows. They determined that the windows will match the second and third floor large windows of other houses in the row. She states that in a phone conversation with Ms. Martin she stated that the windows would be wooden double-hung windows, which the LRC supports.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

9. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alteration and installation of two rear windows to match the existing windows on that façade.
  10. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  11. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the sill and the header are to match the other windows.
  12. Mr. Serrao amends his motion.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**909 Western Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

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

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-168

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

John D Francona  
1234 Resaca Place  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/14/16

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Alteration to previously approved storefront.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that when they got into the previously approved design they realized that the storefront glass was very large. They are proposing to break it up into smaller panes which they ended up preferring design wise as well. They are adding a transom bar in the large window that carries across from the existing transom above the door, and they will also be angling the entry.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks about materials.
  3. Mr. Francona states that it will be the same as before, a natural oak finish with a dark stain.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  5. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the LRC approves of the redesign.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none. He acknowledges a letter sent from the LRC dated January 31, 2016.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alteration as submitted.
  8. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**743 N. Beatty Street**

**Alpha Terrace Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Lucy Ware  
743 N Beatty Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Ward: 11th

Lot and Block: 83-G-138

Inspector:

Council District:

Application Received: 1/15/16

---

---

**Applicant:**

Brett Mahaffey  
37720 Amrhein  
Livonia, Mi 48150

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

**Proposed Changes:** Window replacement with composite material.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Brett Mahaffey and Mr. Ryan Kabana step to the podium; they are representing Andersen Windows. Mr. Mahaffey explains the project, stating that they will be installing 19 double-hung windows. He states that they will be done as inserts to preserve the interior wood trim. The material is a composite to look like wood and the windows are constructed like wood windows with mortice and tenon joinery. He states that the color will be a bone white rather than a stark plastic white color. He states that there are windows on the front that have stained-glass on the top sash, which they will be retaining, and they will replace the bottom sash with an operable awning; the windows will look like double-hung windows.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that since this is essentially a sash replacement, he asks how the exterior brick mould and sills, etc. will be treated.
  3. Mr. Mahaffey states that these elements have been neglected and need to be painted. He states that they will not be capping or changing anything, and the homeowners will have everything scraped and painted afterwards. He states that the sills on the house are wooden rather than cement and some have rotted, and those will be replaced and finished afterwards.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks which windows will be replaced.
  5. Mr. Mahaffey states that they will be replacing the second and third floor windows all the way around.
  6. Mr. Falcone asks for more details on the treatment of the windows with stained glass.
  7. Mr. Mahaffey shows additional pictures and reviews what they will be doing.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

9. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion to approve the second and third floor windows with the Renewal by Andersen composite.
  10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve.
  11. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**910 Cedar Avenue**

**Deushtown Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Charles Heidlage  
910 Cedar Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-224

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

Charles Heidlage  
910 Cedar Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/11/16

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Revised design for after-the-fact railing and window grate.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Charles Heidlage steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that this is an after-the-fact application. He talks about the railing that is currently installed, which is slightly different than the previous railing and which they were told was not original and was also not up to code with respect to its height. He states that the sandstone slab was slightly compromised when the old railing was removed, so completed removal of the current railing is not advisable. He talks about the currently installed railing and how they developed the design. He states that if they do need to revise the design, they have come up with a compromise design, which he explains. The changes would be done by the company that handled the original design and installation, and the revisions would not further compromise the sandstone slab. He talks about the window box, which was previously approved by the HRC, and states that as it matches the railing it would be revised as well.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that he still has an issue with the finial at the top. He states that the redesign, with the retention of the pickets and addition of the S-curves, does help get it closer to the original, but the original railing had a continuous design from the top bar down.
  3. Mr. Heidlage says that part of the reason that was added was to increase the height to meet code.
  4. Mr. Falcone asks if they have tried to find any historic photos.
  5. Mr. Heidlage states that they did find an aerial photo of the area, which shows that the stairs are there but it does not show any details of the railing.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a way to bring the curl in the design up to the top bar, which would keep the same language of the previous railing.
  7. The Commission members sketch out some options.
  8. Mr. Hogan explains his sketch, stating that the applicant could ask the contractor
- 
-

---

---

to take the top curl of the main S and replicate it to fit in the top bar.

9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
10. Ms. Kathleen Hagan steps to the podium; she is a member of the East Allegheny Community Council. She states that there is dissatisfaction in the neighborhood about the design that is there now and the fact that the original railing was removed. She states that there are no issues with the window grate.
11. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none. He asks for approval with direction for the applicant. He states that the final design can be submitted to staff.

---

---

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the modification of the railing as provided in the mark-up.
  13. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1006 Cedar Avenue**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Pinnacle Redevelopment  
145 27<sup>th</sup> 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 and is working with the owner, Matt Hicks, who cannot attend today. He apologizes that there were some after-the-fact rear renovations that were done. He states that the renovations included replacement of shingles on the rear ell, in-kind replacement of gutters, reconstruction of the rear façade, installation of aluminum-clad windows and a steel door, and installation of an ipe wood fence. He states that he did get approval for the front renovations in 2014, which were completed, and he was asked to help with the application for the rooftop deck, for which he was before the Commission in December. He was not involved with the project during the rear renovations. The owner stated that the rear façade partially collapsed during construction, which necessitated its removal and reconstruction. He shows photos of the rear façade before, during, and after construction. He states that the original brick was reused, and the shadow lines of the original windows were visible so they reconstructed them in the same place.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks about the deck and states that it looks like it would not be visible.
  3. Mr. Baumbach says no, it would not be visible from the street. The only part that may be visible would be the railing.
  4. Mr. Falcone asks if there are two sets of doors in the rear.
  5. Mr. Baumbach says yes, there are two residences and two entrances with a privacy fence in between. He states that the ipe fence is to give some privacy from Moravian Way. On behalf of the owner, he states that the masonry work and windows were done in short order in 2014 in response to the wall collapsing, and the owner apologizes for not coming before the Commission. He believes that the owner had the best intention in choosing the materials for the fencing and paving as well.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  7. Ms. Kathleen Hagan steps to the podium. She raises a concern about a rooftop
- 
-

---

---

deck in this small area being a nuisance to neighbors.

8. Ms. Peterson states that it would not be a concern of the Commission.
9. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that further after-the-fact work has been done. He states that they should address what is in front of them, which is the deck. He states that staff should file a 311 complaint and have PLI take a look at the after-the-fact work.
10. Ms. Quinn asks if it would be appropriate for the Commission to approve the application today and have staff hold off on issuing a Certificate until an application is received.
11. Mr. Hogan states that these are two separate issues and that he would rather close the application and have enforcement deal with the additional after-the-fact elements.

---

---

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the application, including the deck and door.
  13. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

***Allegheny Stables***  
***836 W. North Avenue***

***Individual Landmark***

---

---

**Owner:**

Stables Development, LP  
322 N Shore Drive, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-N-135

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

Stables Development, LP  
322 N Shore Drive, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/15/16

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Renovation and construction of an addition.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Andrew Reichert steps to the podium; he represents the development team. He gives an overview of the project. He states that the property is outside of the Allegheny West Historic District and was nominated for individual historic status in 2007. He states that it has been mostly vacant, but they are planning to develop it and an adjoining vacant parcel into a residential development. He describes the existing stable building and briefly describes the proposed addition and new construction. He states that the new construction on the existing vacant land will be a four story structure that will connect to the existing building. They will also be adding a fourth story to the existing building. He states that they did pull the addition back and changed the materials to reduce the impact on the existing building.
  2. Mr. Jim McMullen from JMAC Architects steps to the podium. He describes the proposal in further detail and goes over the floor plans. He talks about how they pulled the addition back to both lessen its impact and to create some outdoor space. He shows the elevations, stating that there are trying to replicate the fenestrations of the historic structure and maintain the appearance of the historic entryway. He states that they looked to developments such as the Heinz Lofts and the Macy's building which developed over time with several additions that had similar typeologies and materials but did not exactly match. He states that replicating the historic building would be a mistake, but they want to use elements of it while clearly showing that the building grew over time. He states that they have replicated the strong cornice line above the third floor and have pulled the fourth floor back to lessen its impact. He talks about the materials, stating that the addition will not be brick like the existing building but rather a non-metallic and non-masonry material, probably a composite. He states that the type of fenestrations and material for the new building will be brick, and it will have appropriate detailing and banding. He shows photos with the proposed building and addition added to show the impact on the street. He talks further about the
- 
-

---

---

materials, showing specs for the wooden windows, cementitious siding, which will probably be batten, and the cleaning and repointing of the brick. He talks about the railings, stating that they are looking to use as transparent of a railing assembly as they can, so they are looking at a metal cable railing.

3. Mr. Serrao and Mr. Hogan ask for a picture of the existing building without the added windows.
  4. Mr. Hogan expresses some concerns about the windows as presented. He also states that the code is specific in that any addition on a roof should not be seen from any public right-of-way, and this one clearly can be seen.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  6. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the LRC did meet with the applicant twice. She talks about the history of the structure and its nomination. She states that this is a challenging project as it needs to express its history as a stable as well as keep the character of the surrounding 19th century warehouses. They feel that this design does not accomplish this. They suggest that the windows on the existing building that can be seen from the public right-of-way be double-hung six-over-six wooden windows. They recommend that all the door and window openings remain the same, as well as the historic signage on the building. She states that the large arched window has two large vertical muntins that should be retained. They do not want to see a fourth floor addition on the building. She states that visually, the building is confusing in that it is not clear about if it is going to be one structure or two.
  7. Mr. Serrao points out that sooner or later, the lots will have to be consolidated, and this will be considered an addition.
  8. Ms. Malakoff states that in that case, the addition should be clearly less important and less detailed than the existing building. She states that they feel that this is not ready for approval and that the applicant should be tabled.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
  10. Mr. Hogan states that the setback of the addition is appropriate; however, he states that the materials should be very different from the historic fabric. He thinks that the rhythm, articulation, and openings of the addition should be in scale and appropriate. He states that the fourth floor addition is visible and thus not appropriate.
  11. Mr. McMullen asks if the addition would be approved if it was not visible.
  12. Mr. Serrao states that they would have to prove that it was not visible, and on this building it would be impossible.
  13. Mr. Hogan states that if they want to develop a higher density on the new addition that is up to them, but they have to respect the historic structure, including the window fenestration, rhythm of the windows, the original muntins, and the stable doors. He states that they could then weaken those elements in the addition to make it clear that they are not trying to replicate the original building. He does give them credit for taking on the project as it is not an easy one; the neighborhood is important and this is an important piece of the fabric of the neighborhood. He states that the Commission is not going to create a new precedent by approving a visible roof addition.
- 
-

- 
- 
14. Mr. Falcone agrees.
  15. Mr. Serrao agrees. He states that the addition is a separate item and should be visibly different from the existing structure and more modern.
  16. Mr. Hogan states that they can table the application so that the applicant can go back and make changes.
  17. Mr. Reichert states that they would appreciate that. He states that they will have to possibly eliminate the fourth floor addition and will have to change their plan for egress.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

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

**Connelly/Energy Innovation Center**  
**1435 Bedford Avenue**

*Individual Landmark*

**Owner:**

Pittsburgh Gateways  
1435 Bedford Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 3rd

Lot and Block: 9-R-194

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

Renaissance 3 Architects  
48 S 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/15/16

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of roof-mounted exhaust stacks.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Patrick Russell with Renaissance 3 Architects steps to the podium. He explains that most of this project is interior, but it will necessitate exterior exhaust stacks on the roof. He states that an analysis was done and the stacks do have to be as high as they are showing—31 feet—to be sure that they are able the exhaust all the air that they need to and prevent air from circulating back into the building. He states that they did look at other options, but this was the best solution. He states that this is a conservative solution, but is needed for safety in case something were to go wrong. He states that they are proposing three stacks on the roof, with guy wires to stabilize each stack. At the rear of the building, they will have to have the exhaust run up the outside of the building before going to the roof.
2. Mr. Hogan asks about the original exhaust system and if there was a chimney for the boiler. He states that a lot of the schools have massive smokestacks.
3. Mr. Russell states that he believes there was a smaller chimney or vent at one time on the other end of the building. He states that a lot of the exhaust also went through vents at the rear of the school, over the cliff and road.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any danger of clustering the stacks together rather than having the three separate stacks.
5. Mr. Russell states that they need to be separate until they exit the building, but after that they could be put closer together.
6. The Commission discusses various options.
7. Mr. Hogan states that many of the schools have historically extremely tall chimneys for exhaust.
8. Mr. Falcone asks if they have any historic photos of the building.
9. Mr. Russell states that there are, but he hadn't noticed a chimney.

- 
- 
10. Mr. Gastil states that he thinks the applicant should explore grouping the stacks together and bring the application back to the Commission or staff for final review.
  11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
  12. Mr. Serrao agrees with Mr. Gastil but that they should come back to the Commission.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion.

---

---

**Motion:**

14. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
  15. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  16. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**Westinghouse School**  
**1101 N. Murtland Street**

**Individual Landmark**

---

---

**Owner:**

Pittsburgh Public Schools  
341 S Bellefield Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 12th

Lot and Block: 125-D-200

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

Greg Maynes, AIA  
438 S Main Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/14/16

---

---

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

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

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Greg Maynes steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the school is beginning a new program that will require housing a fire engine, so they are proposing an addition. He shows photos of the existing conditions, stating that there are three existing garage doors on the side of the building where an auto body shop was at some point. He states the doors were reduced when the building was renovated. He states that they are also proposing levelling a playground adjacent to the proposed addition and constructing an ancillary building for storage. He shows the plans and elevations of the proposed addition. He states that the elevation will look the same as the existing building but will just be extended out. They will be using the same detailing as is on the existing school building; it will be limestone-clad masonry as will be the ancillary building. They will use the same fenestration and detailing including the banding and base course. The garage door on the addition will be closer to the original, as they are talking it back to its original height. They will be modifying the other two garage doors but not taking them back to the full height.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks where the addition is in relation to the front of the building.
  3. Mr. Maynes states that it will be on the far side of the building. It will be minimally visible from the street.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for more details on the windows and masonry.
  5. Mr. Maynes states again that they are just extruding the existing facade out, with fenestration pattern to match and limestone masonry to match.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of an addition as submitted.
  8. Ms. Peterson seconds.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1430 Page Street**

**Manchester Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Pittsburgh Public Schools  
341 S Bellefield Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 7-B-202

Inspector:

**Applicant:**

Michael McNamara  
1305 Muriel Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/8/16

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of a parking lot.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Mike Albright steps to the podium; he is with Gateway Engineers, who is working with IKM on behalf of the Pittsburgh Public Schools. He explains that the proposal is part of Conroy School. He presents the project materials as well as a letter of support from the community group. The school does not currently have any parking facilities and relies on street parking. He explains the proposal, stating that the property is currently vacant land. They will reconstruct the sidewalk and add landscaping as a screening buffer, including rain gardens to help with storm water runoff.
  2. Mr. Hogan clarifies that there is just landscaping and no fencing or other structures.
  3. Mr. Albright confirms that is correct.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He acknowledges the letter of support from the community group dated January 13, 2016.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve construction of a parking lot.
  6. Mr. Falcone seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION

- - -

IN RE: Historic Nomination  
Albright United Methodist Church  
486 South Graham Street

- - -

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

- Ernie Hogan, Acting Chairman
- Raymond Gastil, Director of Planning
- Joe Serrao
- Carol Peterson
- Matthew Falcone
- Sarah Quinn

The within meeting of the City of Pittsburgh  
Historic Review Commission, Reported by Nina  
Warren Biehler, a Notary Public in and for the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was convened at the  
Robin Civic Building, 200 Ross Street, First Floor  
Hearing Room, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219,  
commencing at 2:50 o'clock p.m., on Wednesday,  
February 3, 2016.

- - -

NETWORK DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC.  
SUITE 1101, GULF TOWER  
707 GRANT STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15219  
(412)281-7908

- - -

1 PRESENT:

2 Nominated by:

3 Lindsay Patross

4 On behalf of the Property Owners:

5 Bentz Law Firm, P.C.  
6 David J. Barton, Esquire  
7 Suite 200  
8 The Washington Center Building  
9 680 Washington Road  
10 Pittsburgh, PA 15228

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 - - -

2 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

3 - - -

4 MR. HOGAN: So the next item is  
5 nomination of 486 South Graham Street for  
6 historic designation.

7 MS. QUINN: I have a few loads of  
8 stuff to pass out to you guys.

9 MR. HOGAN: So a couple things,  
10 as far as process here, just so that I can  
11 get everybody up to speed. What we like to  
12 do with this is any time a property is  
13 nominated or a district is nominated the  
14 first step is for us to determine the  
15 validity of the application with regards to  
16 the historic status of the building and if it  
17 at least meets one of the criteria. With  
18 that we will then make a determination to  
19 schedule the public hearing for this  
20 property, to which we will take testimony.

21 Today we would like to review,  
22 with staff's discussions, the status of the  
23 application and staff review with regards to  
24 the valor of it meeting one of the ten points  
25 of historic designation and the completeness

1 of the application.

2 MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, if I  
3 may, good afternoon, my name is David Barton,  
4 I'm the attorney for the property owner.

5 At some point we'd like to have  
6 the opportunity to give comment on the  
7 initial validity of the nomination, whether  
8 it's an appropriate nomination, and I do have  
9 some testimony that we would offer to the  
10 commission on that, essentially,  
11 jurisdictional subject.

12 MR. HOGAN: At this point  
13 usually, with regards to the merit of the  
14 application, we -- to my knowledge, it's been  
15 perfected, otherwise it would not be on my  
16 agenda, and has been reviewed internally.

17 So this is not for us to  
18 determine, you know, the validity of that  
19 application, other than for the historic  
20 statute that we are governed by, which is,  
21 does it meet the standard of historic  
22 preservation.

23 MR. BARTON: Essentially, the  
24 owner would be offering that under Chapter 11  
25 of the City Code the nomination is improper,

1 and we have some evidence to offer to the  
2 commission today.

3 MR. HOGAN: I understand your  
4 position, as well as read the documents, and,  
5 clearly, there's been a determination made  
6 that this is in standing and should be  
7 considered. And I think that, basically, to  
8 my knowledge, and based on the letters that I  
9 have read, which you sent us all, the  
10 acknowledgment of abandonment as a religious  
11 facility.

12 MR. BARTON: I think it is a  
13 religious structure under the City Code, it  
14 remains to be a religious structure.

15 MR. HOGAN: According to all your  
16 letters, it actually recites that it is the  
17 building that housed the formerly known as  
18 Albright United Methodist. That it  
19 acknowledged that in November of '13 the  
20 congregation of the United Methodist Church  
21 of Albright ceased using the church building  
22 as a place of divine -- the exact wording  
23 was, divine worship, and at that point it was  
24 abandoned.

25 MR. BARTON: Well, the

1 declaration of abandonment, if you will, in  
2 quotation marks, was a matter of church law.

3 But, in fact, I have testimony --  
4 witnesses today that will testify that  
5 religious worship is ongoing and has been.

6 MR. HOGAN: Yeah, that's out of  
7 my privy to determine.

8 MR. BARTON: The difficulty with  
9 that is, religious worship is ongoing at the  
10 site, which renders it a religious structure.

11 MR. HOGAN: Again, this is out of  
12 my privy, from that standpoint. My  
13 standpoint as the commission is to review  
14 this as does this application have merit for  
15 historic standing.

16 MS. QUINN: Can I interject for a  
17 second?

18 MR. HOGAN: Sure.

19 MS. QUINN: We've had this come  
20 up before and, at this point, it's really the  
21 owner's responsibility to say whether they  
22 support the nomination or not based on the  
23 criteria for review under Title 11 of the  
24 City Code. So that's what -- that's what we  
25 would be hearing -- the commission would be

1 hearing today is of things related to Title  
2 11 of the City Code and not the legal matters  
3 relating to how the nomination came to us.

4 MR. BARTON: We'd also have  
5 testimony with respect to that.

6 MS. QUINN: Okay. There will be  
7 time for that.

8 MR. HOGAN: That's applicable.

9 MR. BARTON: Thank you.

10 MS. QUINN: You guys ready?

11 MR. FALCONE: Can I say, before  
12 we start, please?

13 MR. HOGAN: Sure, go ahead.

14 MR. FALCONE: I just want to say,  
15 before we actually start with this, I would  
16 like to disclose that Preservation Pittsburgh  
17 has been heavily involved with this  
18 nomination. I'll be working -- I should  
19 say, I'm also president of Preservation  
20 Pittsburgh.

21 There's been a committee within  
22 the organization that has helped the Albright  
23 folks research and record their history over  
24 the past several months and also develop or  
25 complete the nomination form.

1                   You'll see that as president of  
2                   Preservation Pittsburgh my signature is on  
3                   the page for a form for error.

4                   That's it.

5                   MS. QUINN: Well, the property in  
6                   question for today is known as 486 South  
7                   Graham Street, also known as the Albright  
8                   United Methodist Church and parsonage. It's  
9                   one property on -- well, it's on one parcel,  
10                  so everything included within that parcel  
11                  will be up for consideration today.

12                  The owner of the property is the  
13                  United Methodist Church of Western  
14                  Pennsylvania.

15                  The property was nominated by  
16                  Ms. Lindsay Patross and the nomination was  
17                  January 20th, 2016.

18                  The dates of construction are,  
19                  roughly, 1905 and 1906.

20                  The building at 486 South Graham  
21                  Street sits on a small knoll overlooking the  
22                  intersection of Centre Avenue and South  
23                  Graham Street at the nexus of several East  
24                  End neighborhoods, Bloomfield, Friendship and  
25                  Shadyside. The building is one of the few

1 unaltered structures remaining from the  
2 neighborhood's early period of development.

3 The building is constructed of  
4 masonry and wood. And the church is a  
5 roughhewn Cleveland bluestone. The stone  
6 cladding appears on three elevations visible  
7 from the street. And the parsonage and the  
8 rear of the church are of orange brick and  
9 simply detailed.

10 And you guys -- you have a copy  
11 of the nomination form I just provided you.  
12 The architectural description in there is  
13 extremely detailed and complete, so we'll  
14 just leave that for something for you all to  
15 read.

16 Okay, the history of the church  
17 is, Albright United Methodist Church is one  
18 of the city's oldest congregations, formed in  
19 1843 and organized in 1845 as the Zion Church  
20 of Pittsburgh of the Evangelical Association.  
21 The building at 486 South Graham Street is  
22 only the third permanent home of this  
23 172-year-old congregation.

24 In the spring and summer of 1905  
25 architect Chancey W. Hodgdon prepared plans

1           for a new stone church in Pittsburgh's  
2           burgeoning East End. On August 11, 1905 the  
3           Zion Evangelical Church purchased a lot  
4           measuring 120 by 145 feet at the intersection  
5           of Centre Avenue and South Graham Street for  
6           \$19,200. This is the location for the  
7           church.

8                        On Page 4 there is a list of  
9           criteria for designation for a historic  
10          district or structure within the City of  
11          Pittsburgh. Criteria 1 through 10, those are  
12          listed there, for your review. And, in  
13          addition, the ordinance says that the  
14          property must maintain architectural  
15          integrity, which means that it retains the  
16          character and defining features of what makes  
17          the building what it is.

18                       Each of these criteria -- and  
19          I'll go through them individually, listing  
20          the ones that I feel apply in this case.

21                       I feel that Criteria 3,  
22          exemplification of a distinguished  
23          architectural type, style or design does  
24          apply in this case.

25                       Of significance, the Albright

1 building owes a great deal of debt to  
2 Richardson and his design sensibilities, but  
3 it is not a direct imitation.

4 Each of the stained glass  
5 windows, which are 39 in total, can be  
6 directly attributed to Pittsburgh's S.S.  
7 Marshall & Brothers, founded in 1872 in  
8 Allegheny City. S.S. Marshall & Brothers is  
9 one of the oldest art glass studios in the  
10 country that continued to manufacture pressed  
11 flint and lime glass, an older method of  
12 creating stained glass. This labor-intensive  
13 process required the completion of individual  
14 molds.

15 The design of the art windows is  
16 keeping with Lutheran design principles  
17 popular at the time and emphasizes geometric  
18 and curvilinear designs with symbolic  
19 representation interspersed to connote a  
20 room's specific function.

21 The building meets historic  
22 significance under Criteria 4, which is the  
23 work of an architect, engineer, designer or  
24 builder.

25 The building is among the best-

1 known existing works of architect Chancey W.  
2 Hodgdon. Also one of the few to remain  
3 largely intact, unaltered and functioning in  
4 its original intended capacity as a community  
5 space.

6 In comparison to some late 19th,  
7 early 20th century Pittsburgh-based  
8 architects, Chancey W. Hodgdon is relatively  
9 unknown today. His lack of notoriety,  
10 however, should not be a reflection on his  
11 caliber or quality of his work. A host of  
12 engineering and architectural journals  
13 document many of his commissions. He  
14 designed everything from modest row houses to  
15 well-appointed single-family homes, from  
16 commercial store fronts to industrial garages  
17 and warehouses. Much of what remains today  
18 of his work is his ecclesiastical buildings.

19 The majority of his known  
20 buildings span from 1889 to 1925. The  
21 Albright building appears to be one of his  
22 first known commissions for an ecclesiastical  
23 building. It is one with which Hodgdon was  
24 clearly pleased. This building served as  
25 inspiration for many of his later

1 ecclesiastical works. Hodgdon was a regional  
2 architect, designing buildings as far south  
3 as Canonsburg, Pennsylvania and as far north  
4 as Mars and Tarentum.

5 The building also meets the  
6 significance Criteria No. 10, which is a  
7 unique location and distinctive physical  
8 appearance or presence.

9 The building is a distinctive  
10 feature of the Baum/Centre corridor and of  
11 Pittsburgh's greater East End. For 109 years  
12 it has visually anchored the corner of Centre  
13 Avenue and South Graham Street. The building  
14 imparts a sense of place to its section of  
15 the East End otherwise consumed by cars and  
16 meritless commercial store fronts.

17 Under the aspects of integrity,  
18 the exterior of the building looks much the  
19 same as the day it was dedicated, exhibiting  
20 the soot-blackened stone that has become a  
21 hallmark of any historically meritorious  
22 Pittsburgh building.

23 The only visible modern changes  
24 to the building have been the addition of an  
25 ADA compliant entrance on the ground level of

1 the South Graham Street facade and an asphalt  
2 composite shingle roof installed on the main  
3 church structure.

4 Because this property meets at  
5 least one criteria for significance, and it's  
6 only required to meet one, and the property  
7 maintains its historic integrity, I recommend  
8 that this nomination be held for -- the  
9 nomination should be considered potentially  
10 viable and, therefore, should be voted in the  
11 affirmative.

12 MR. HOGAN: So at this point I'd  
13 like to say, if the nominator would like to  
14 speak on behalf of the application.

15 MS. PATROSS: Yes, I would.

16 Thank you. Thank you all for the  
17 work you're doing.

18 And I have sat through several  
19 Historic Review Commission meetings and I'm  
20 aware that these are long and sometimes  
21 uncomfortable, I know it's a little warm in  
22 here, but I appreciate the work you're doing  
23 and I care very deeply about the historic  
24 nature of this neighborhood.

25 And that's what brings me here

1           today, as I'm honored to have an opportunity  
2           to talk to you about the building located at  
3           486 South Graham Street.

4                       My name is Lindsay Patross. I'm  
5           a life-long Pittsburgher, I grew up in  
6           Squirrel Hill and Point Breeze and I now live  
7           in Shadyside, so this is very much part of my  
8           neighborhood.

9                       I come here and I've nominated  
10          this building for two reasons.

11                      One, this is a 109-year-old  
12          building that houses much more than 109 years  
13          of history and very significant architecture.  
14          There are pieces of this building that were  
15          part of the original church that was located  
16          downtown, so there are a number of elements,  
17          if you look at the history of the City of  
18          Pittsburgh, as people moved from downtown to  
19          the East End, that are part of this building.  
20          It also houses the largest collection of S.S.  
21          Marshall glass.

22                      In a moment I'm going to yield my  
23          time to Justin Greenawalt, who can speak  
24          point by point on some of the elements of  
25          this building, because we're here to talk

1           about history.

2                       The second reason that brings me  
3 here is about the fabric of our  
4 neighborhoods. And one of the reasons people  
5 come to Pittsburgh and want to live in this  
6 city are architectural. And I'm very  
7 concerned about what transformations have  
8 occurred in the city, particularly in the  
9 Baum corridor area, and so I think it's very  
10 important to me to see a conversation and,  
11 hopefully, a historic designation for this  
12 building.

13                      I first walked into Albright five  
14 years ago to volunteer at the community  
15 Thanksgiving dinner. And when I walked in  
16 the door I thought, are there really any  
17 hungry people in this neighborhood? What's  
18 really the need here? And what I learned is  
19 there are a lot of -- there is a lot of need  
20 in this neighborhood. Not only are there  
21 hungry people, but there are people that need  
22 a place for fellowship.

23                      But just because this building  
24 does not serve a purpose on Sunday mornings  
25 doesn't mean it should be torn down and that

1           it can't function -- continue to function as  
2           a community space. And I think we have an  
3           incredible opportunity, especially given that  
4           the building sits technically in Bloomfield,  
5           that this is actually where Bloomfield meets  
6           Friendship and Shadyside, so it's the  
7           intersection of three neighborhoods and it's  
8           the intersection of a lot of different  
9           Pittsburgh communities, some that are very  
10          much changing. It's a walk away from UPMC,  
11          there are a bunch of high-rising that houses  
12          seniors and students.

13                        There's a lot of opportunities  
14          and Pittsburgh had a tremendous amount of  
15          success recently in church re-purposing. The  
16          Union Project in Highland Park is just one  
17          example, Mr. Small's in Millvale, Neu Kirche  
18          on the North Side, the Nyia Page Community  
19          Center in Braddock.

20                        Some of the greatest inspirations  
21          for thinking about re-purposing Albright  
22          comes from the Methodist church. The Toy  
23          Lending Library is housed in the church next  
24          door and has been a great example of a  
25          community church re-purposing, as well as

1 Calvary United Methodist Church, which is  
2 located on the North Side, which is another  
3 excellent example of neighbors coming  
4 together to rethink about how these buildings  
5 fit into their community.

6 I personally have created Friends  
7 of Albright. I'm not a member of the  
8 congregation.

9 I have met with a number of  
10 leaders in both the neighborhood and around  
11 the city, around historic preservation, but  
12 what are the needs for the neighborhood.  
13 Talking with Councilwoman Grose, I learned  
14 that there is not a senior center in  
15 Bloomfield and people need to get in their  
16 cars and drive. So there are no places for  
17 people to walk and have lunch.

18 I have met with the executive  
19 director of the Union Project several times,  
20 there is a need for artist and visiting  
21 lecture housing. The parsonage, up until a  
22 year ago, was rented as housing and could be  
23 ready to go.

24 There are additional needs in  
25 terms of I talked with Reverend Randy Bush,

1 from East Liberty Presbyterian Church; talked  
2 with Mark Heckmann, the chair of the board of  
3 the Union Project and a number of other  
4 organizations, with both people talking about  
5 community spaces and re-purposing historic  
6 buildings.

7           Albright is in exceptional shape  
8 and, actually, a little bit ahead of its  
9 time. In the '90s it was remodeled and that  
10 is when they added the entrance on Graham  
11 Street, making it a much more usable  
12 community space, the basement no longer  
13 became a basement, but a street-level  
14 entrance. It was upgraded with an elevator  
15 and office space and, actually, PULSE, the  
16 Pittsburgh Urban Leadership Service  
17 Experience, which has since expanded, was  
18 originally housed in one of the rental  
19 offices in the union -- in this building. It  
20 was some of the PULSE alums that went on to  
21 found the Union Project and restore that  
22 building.

23           Before I hand this over to Justin  
24 I want to mention two things.

25           One, the Friends of Albright has

1           put together a feasible, financially-  
2           sustainable plan for not only -- for really  
3           capitalizing on the opportunity of this  
4           historic building serving as a community  
5           space. We're here to talk about history, but  
6           I can answer any questions about that  
7           individually.

8                        I have a stack of letters of  
9           support, as well as a petition. When I  
10          printed it before I came here it was at 301  
11          signatures, more people have signed and I  
12          will forward that to you.

13                      I want to read one of the  
14          comments from the petition signers. We've  
15          had even a neighborhood resident who is  
16          currently living in Prague sign the petition.

17                      But I'll end on this, one of the  
18          tremendous benefits of living in this area is  
19          the presence of historic buildings with  
20          character, such as Albright Church, so easy  
21          to tear down, impossible to replace.

22                      I will be happy to take  
23          questions.

24                      We're going to have Justin  
25          Greenawalt walk you through the specifics of

1 the historic nature of this building.

2 There's a lot of exciting things here.

3 MR. GREENAWALT: Good afternoon,  
4 Commissioners, my name is Justin Greenawalt,  
5 and I'm an architectural historian and I meet  
6 the Secretary of the Interior's professional  
7 qualification standards for the evaluation of  
8 historic structures.

9 A lot of what I had to say Sarah  
10 has already said, so I'm going to try not to  
11 restate, you know, anything that's already  
12 been put out there.

13 But one of the key things that I  
14 really feel that needs to be realized is that  
15 the Albright building illustrates an often  
16 untold story in Pittsburgh, you know, the  
17 late 19th and early 20th century migration of  
18 religious and educational institutions from  
19 downtown to the East End.

20 And, you know, with completion of  
21 the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1852 and 1853  
22 and the subsequent development of the East  
23 End, many Pittsburghers decided to relocate,  
24 and the those major institutions just  
25 followed them. Among those were the

1 University of Pittsburgh, Chatham College,  
2 St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Andrew, Third  
3 Presbyterian, First United Methodist, Rodef  
4 Shalom, Tree of Life and many, many others.  
5 And in 1905 the Zion Evangelical Church chose  
6 to do the same.

7 Moving forward -- I mean, I  
8 would -- a lot of what I had to say has  
9 already been stated, so, I mean, I would  
10 really just say that to replicate this  
11 building would not only be impractical, it  
12 would be impossible. And, fortunately, for  
13 the Albright building, the integrity, as  
14 we've discussed, is good.

15 You know, I'd like to quote one  
16 of our supporters in saying that the  
17 viability is not a question, the building is  
18 viable, very viable and pretty much  
19 immediately.

20 As Lindsay said, changes for  
21 immediate use, you know, it's been made ADA  
22 compliant with ground-level entrance, there's  
23 an elevator that serves all floors, all major  
24 systems have been upgraded, the stained glass  
25 windows have been meticulously cared for and

1 many show evidence of recent preventative  
2 maintenance.

3 Now, some of our opponents would  
4 argue that there has been some water damage  
5 in the building and, yes, that is accurate.  
6 A roof leak caused some damage in the corner  
7 of the sanctuary, a leaking waterline caused  
8 some damage in the basement, the fellowship  
9 hall, that volunteer help helped to clean  
10 that up last year. These issues are  
11 isolated, they've caused no significant  
12 damage or irreparable damage to the structure  
13 of the building.

14 In stark contrast, a request for  
15 proposals was recently issued for the former  
16 Saints Peter and Paul, in Larimer, a building  
17 that is exponentially larger and is in a far  
18 more dire state of disrepair. Now, I fully  
19 understand that not every building can or  
20 even should be saved, but if there's hope for  
21 Saints Peter and Paul then there's surely  
22 hope for Albright.

23 You know, I'd like to conclude by  
24 saying that the goals of historic  
25 preservationists and the real estate

1 developers, they need not be mutually  
2 exclusive. It's time that we work together  
3 to build a community that we both want to  
4 see, and that starts with historic  
5 designation.

6 So I would just ask that you  
7 advance this nomination.

8 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

9 MS. PATROSS: Can I give you a  
10 copy of that petition and letters of support?

11 MS. QUINN: Yes.

12 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

13 All right. At this point, if you  
14 would like to proceed.

15 MR. BARTON: Thank you.

16 Mr. Chairman, good afternoon  
17 again. My name is David Barton, counsel for  
18 the United Methodist Conference in Western  
19 Pennsylvania, the owner of 486 South Graham.

20 And at this point I would like to  
21 offer, as evidence, a copy of the deed that's  
22 filed of record.

23 MR. SERRAO: Are there multiple  
24 copies here?

25 MS. QUINN: Yes.

1 MR. SERRAO: Okay.

2 MR. BARTON: The owner today of  
3 this structure is asking this commission to  
4 simply follow the City Code, in that churches  
5 require the consent of the owner to be  
6 nominated. There's a reason why this  
7 requirement was put into the City Code, and  
8 I'll touch on that in just a little bit.

9 First, I would say that, as I  
10 think the commission may be aware, the owner  
11 is not in favor of this nomination and, in  
12 that regard, I would offer copies of the  
13 letter of September 15th from Amy Bentz to  
14 Assistant City Solicitor Daniel Friedson.

15 MR. HOGAN: We have the copies of  
16 those records and we will note, after your  
17 testimony, for the record, to admit them.

18 MR. BARTON: And I brought extra  
19 copies, so if I could ask to have them --

20 MR. HOGAN: We have them all.

21 MS. QUINN: I just handed them  
22 out today.

23 MR. HOGAN: We have them, all  
24 four letters. A letter dated January 26th;  
25 November 23rd, 2015; September 15th, 2015;

1 and September 15th, 2015.

2 MR. BARTON: Thank you.

3 MR. SERRAO: I think you sent it  
4 to us under separate cover, correct?

5 MR. BARTON: Yes.

6 MR. SERRAO: Okay.

7 MR. HOGAN: We have it.

8 MR. BEVAN: Members of the  
9 Commission, I apologize for interrupting, my  
10 name is Brian Bevan --

11 MR. HOGAN: You have to --

12 MR. BEVAN: My name is Brian  
13 Bevan, I am counsel for some members of the  
14 congregation of Albright --

15 MS. BENTZ: There is no  
16 congregation.

17 MR. BEVAN: Former members of the  
18 congregation.

19 I guess I'm just -- I'm making a  
20 point here is, I'm a little -- it's my  
21 understanding, based upon what you said  
22 before we admitted any testimony about the  
23 historical nature of the building, that the  
24 issue of religious structure versus  
25 non-religious structure was not going to be

1           discussed. It sounds like they're going down  
2           the road of discussing that, and I guess --

3                       MR. HOGAN: Yeah, so, I would ask  
4           that you retain your thoughts at this point.  
5           At this point we would -- I'm going to allow  
6           the owner to sort of state their position and  
7           their document, of which we need to evaluate  
8           will be based on what we know to be fact in  
9           the law and what we are guided by.

10                      MR. BARTON: Well, I would just  
11           add, then, that since I -- I have prepared  
12           some statements in favor of that, so I would  
13           like a chance to respond.

14                      MR. HOGAN: So let me just back  
15           up about process.

16                      So at this point this commission,  
17           I don't believe, was in a position to have  
18           the full hearing today, a public hearing,  
19           because we are, at this point, determining  
20           the fact, does it meet the historic criteria  
21           to move forward.

22                      We can take additional testimony,  
23           which would most likely happen at our March  
24           meeting, on the public comment period of  
25           this.

1                   So I ask you to retain your  
2                   thoughts at this point so that we could at  
3                   least get through both the petitioner and the  
4                   owner, and that way we can then take into a  
5                   fact what is in front of us. Okay?

6                   MR. BEVAN: Thank you.

7                   MR. SERRAO: There is no vote  
8                   today.

9                   MS. PATROSS: As the submitter, I  
10                  would like to add that I nominated this as  
11                  not a religious structure and that was  
12                  included in my nomination.

13                  MR. HOGAN: No, we know that.  
14                  Thank you.

15                  MR. BARTON: Thank you,  
16                  Mr. Chairman.

17                  Continuing on, I want to address,  
18                  though, one thing briefly. As the chairman  
19                  indicated, this commission is going to listen  
20                  to some facts and make some determinations  
21                  based on those facts and the law.

22                  And, you know, there's an  
23                  argument out there Ms. Patross has made that  
24                  it's no longer a church because no divine  
25                  worship is taking place there. That is

1 incorrect, and we'll have some testimony for  
2 that in just a moment. Worship, in fact, is  
3 taking place there.

4 And this would be a good time  
5 just to pause for a moment and talk about  
6 some important legal principles. And we're  
7 all vaguely familiar with the concept of  
8 separation of church and state. And I just  
9 want to note that Pennsylvania was founded on  
10 the principles of freedom of religious  
11 worship, and how they apply in today's laws.  
12 So the state constitution applies, the United  
13 States constitution applies.

14 And the fundamentally important  
15 thing here is that it's not for the  
16 government, the commission, any government,  
17 to say what is or isn't religious worship.  
18 That's clearly over the line for any  
19 government to say what you're doing  
20 constitutes or doesn't constitute religious  
21 worship.

22 And the pastor will testify that  
23 religious services took place through the  
24 fall of 2015 and into 2016. The Methodist  
25 Church has maintained the property throughout

1 the winter and secured it.

2 In fact, there's been some theft  
3 and the Pittsburgh police are investigating  
4 those thefts of some of the architectural  
5 elements, I suppose, would be a fair  
6 representation, from the structure.

7 Some, but not all of the  
8 religious services were conducted by Reverend  
9 George Porter, of First Church, a Methodist  
10 church not far away at all, close to the  
11 Graham Street neighborhood and serving many  
12 former parishioners who once worshiped at  
13 the -- a lot of times referred to as the  
14 Albright Church.

15 The nomination form, I would  
16 submit, contains a fraudulent statement  
17 designed to trick this commission into  
18 believing that the nomination is proper. It  
19 states, The last recorded use of the property  
20 was residential. That is plainly false.

21 Now, we'll offer testimony to  
22 indicate and to prove to this commission that  
23 there is a parsonage on the site, connected  
24 to the church, and it was occupied by a  
25 seminary student, who also served as a pastor

1 to a local church, Emanuel United Methodist  
2 Church, in the West End.

3 And we think that that notation  
4 of the last use as being residential is just  
5 plainly false and I think it's designed to  
6 induce the commission to think this isn't a  
7 religious structure under the City Code so  
8 that this nomination might proceed forward.

9 A religious structure, under  
10 Chapter 11 of the City Code, is defined as  
11 any of the following, church, cathedral,  
12 mosque, temple, rectory, convent, comma, or  
13 similar structure used as a place of  
14 religious worship.

15 And at Albright there is worship  
16 services going on currently.

17 Even if it wasn't being used  
18 currently, and although that's not the case  
19 here, the wording of the City Code, I think,  
20 provides that it is a church until a contrary  
21 use is established. In fact, that's a  
22 fundamental principle of land use law and  
23 zoning law.

24 But fundamentally, in my  
25 estimation, it all comes back to, look, it's

1 not for the government to say what is or is  
2 not religious worship, that is plainly over  
3 the line and the founding fathers of our  
4 commonwealth and the constitutional provision  
5 of Pennsylvania, which traces directly, with  
6 very few changes, back to the constitution of  
7 1776, is a fundamental part of our  
8 commonwealth's law.

9 With that, I would next call upon  
10 Amy Bentz, B-e-n-t-z, who is chancellor of  
11 the Methodist Church for the Western  
12 Pennsylvania area.

13 Ms. Bentz.

14 MS. BENTZ: Thank you.

15 I believe there was some  
16 discussion at the beginning here that you  
17 have received the correspondence. But since  
18 we do have a court reporter present, I would  
19 like to make sure that you have all of my  
20 correspondence.

21 I do serve as chancellor and  
22 legal counsel to the Methodist Conference in  
23 Western Pennsylvania. In that regard, that  
24 geographically consists of about a 1,000  
25 churches in Western Pennsylvania. The gap is

1 from, essentially, West Virginia up to Erie  
2 and over almost to Harrisburg, and all of the  
3 Methodist-related organizations.

4 MS. QUINN: I did provide them  
5 with the envelopes that you had mailed.

6 MS. BENTZ: Great. Thank you.

7 MS. QUINN: So they have  
8 everything.

9 MS. BENTZ: And I appreciate  
10 that. Thank you.

11 It's very important to know, and  
12 I think there's no dispute, that the  
13 conference of the Methodist Church owns the  
14 property.

15 MR. HOGAN: Correct.

16 MS. BENTZ: And, as Mr. Barton  
17 stated, the City Code is very clear that a  
18 religious structure may not, under any  
19 circumstance, be designated as historic  
20 without the owner's consent.

21 I'm here to tell you that in my  
22 numerous items of communication and  
23 correspondence, copies of which you have, the  
24 conference, I stated, opposes this property  
25 as a religious structure.

1                   It cannot be designated as a  
2                   historic landmark without our consent.

3                   And just for the record -- and  
4                   these letters, by the way, were written to  
5                   Attorney Dan Friedson, who is the assistant  
6                   city solicitor for the City of Pittsburgh,  
7                   who I believe can serve as your counsel in  
8                   some capacity. And they clearly articulated  
9                   that the conference opposes the designation  
10                  and does not consent.

11                  Secondly, with regard to the  
12                  error in the nomination form about the  
13                  residential listing, as Mr. Barton pointed  
14                  out, there's a parsonage that's attached to  
15                  it currently serving Emanuel United Methodist  
16                  Church, a Methodist church, is the pastor,  
17                  and that pastor is in that parsonage.

18                  We are using the church for  
19                  religious worship. We don't have to be.

20                  Chapter 11 of your City Code --  
21                  our City Code provides very clearly that a  
22                  religious structure is a church, a cathedral,  
23                  a mosque, a temple, a rectory, a convent,  
24                  comma, or similar structure used as a place  
25                  of religious worship.

1                   I put the word, comma, in there  
2                   so you can see common English interpretation,  
3                   the doctrine of English Law and all  
4                   applicable law says that you may not, under  
5                   any circumstance, designate the structure as  
6                   an historic landmark. It doesn't matter if  
7                   the people in the community want to use it  
8                   for that purpose, it cannot be used for that  
9                   purpose.

10                   And we have the free exercise  
11                   clause of the United States Constitution that  
12                   tells us that. It would be a wholly improper  
13                   separation or merging of church and state for  
14                   you to tell us that this can be an historic  
15                   landmark.

16                   And I will tell you that the  
17                   United Methodist Conference is prepared to  
18                   take this up through the courts and will.

19                   And, finally, I'd like to point  
20                   out, well, actually a couple of things. It's  
21                   very important that -- to the Methodist  
22                   Church that a structure not be designated as  
23                   historic without our consent, and let me tell  
24                   you why. Because the Methodist Church  
25                   codifies, in its rules, a procedure for any

1 of its properties to be designated as  
2 historic. And it has to go through our  
3 archives and history. It has to go through  
4 several steps to be approved.

5 And the reason that is is because  
6 we have a religious asset, we want to marshal  
7 our assets for our mission, our religious  
8 mission, which is feeding the poor and  
9 helping those in the community, among other  
10 very important tasks.

11 Because historic designation of a  
12 church has the potential for affecting how  
13 the church may marshal its assets and, in  
14 turn, pursue its mission, we take this very  
15 seriously. So we are repeatedly opposing  
16 this.

17 Improperly granting this as an  
18 historic landmark creates a constitutional  
19 conflict. I cannot say that any clearer.  
20 Now, you may say that's not for today, we  
21 don't have it here on our nomination. I  
22 wrote to you all and said it should not be  
23 there. I also indicated that the owner  
24 opposes it.

25 It is being used as a religious

1 location, and even if you interpret the City  
2 Code differently to say that the worship has  
3 to be going on, which it doesn't, it is.  
4 Reverend George Porter, who serves First  
5 Church in Pittsburgh, is holding weekly  
6 worship services and Bible studies there.  
7 Reverend John Wilson, conference secretary,  
8 has had key religious experiences there.

9 You may not, with all due  
10 respect, designate this as historic over our  
11 opposition. Not only do we not consent, we  
12 oppose it.

13 So, in conclusion, this is a  
14 church. Under your City Code it may not be  
15 designated without our consent and we oppose  
16 it.

17 Secondly, there's religious  
18 activity going on there, too.

19 And, third, please stay out of  
20 the areas where you are not permitted to be  
21 in. This is a matter where it's a religious  
22 structure, it may -- they may feel it's  
23 important for historical significance, but  
24 under RLUIPA, which I might point out is the  
25 Religious Land Use and Institutionalized

1           Persons Act, which is a federal statute, and  
2           the City Code, to designate this would be  
3           improper.

4                         Thank you.

5                         MR. BARTON: Next, Mr. Chairman,  
6           briefly, the owner would call Reverend Paul  
7           Taylor.

8                         MS. QUINN: Should we start  
9           timing for public comment?

10                        MR. HOGAN: Yes.

11                        MS. QUINN: Four minutes? Four  
12           minutes or three?

13                        MR. HOGAN: Three.

14                        MR. BARTON: Can you state your  
15           name and spell your last name for the court  
16           reporter, Reverend?

17                        REV. TAYLOR: Yes, Paul D.  
18           Taylor, T-a-y-l-o-r.

19                        MR. BARTON: And how are you  
20           currently employed, Reverend Taylor?

21                        REV. TAYLOR: I am the Pittsburgh  
22           District Superintendent for the Western PA  
23           Conference of the United Methodist Church.  
24           And I have responsibility for the churches in  
25           the Pittsburgh region.

1                   MR. BARTON: And are you aware of  
2                   whether there have been any religious worship  
3                   services at 486 South Graham Street, at the  
4                   Albright Church, in the second half of 2015  
5                   or so far in 2016?

6                   REV. TAYLOR: Ah, yes. Yes, I am  
7                   aware. I do know that our conference  
8                   secretary, John Wilson, has worshiped in that  
9                   space September, October and November of 2015  
10                  and every week in the month of December of  
11                  2015. And so far in 2016 George Porter has  
12                  led a group of persons, on a weekly basis,  
13                  worshiping in the space.

14                 MR. BARTON: Okay. And are you  
15                 aware of who has been residing in the  
16                 parsonage?

17                 REV. TAYLOR: Yes, Matt --  
18                 Matthew Dean, who is appointed pastor at  
19                 Emanuel United Methodist Church, lived in  
20                 that facility while, number one, he was  
21                 completing his work, seminary training, at  
22                 Union Theological Seminary, and subsequent to  
23                 graduation he was appointed as pastor at  
24                 Emanuel, on the North Side, and he and his  
25                 wife resided in that property as the

1 parsonage for Emanuel United Methodist  
2 Church.

3 MR. BARTON: Is there anything  
4 else you'd like to add that I didn't ask?

5 REV. TAYLOR: We -- in my role as  
6 Pittsburgh District Superintendent, I can say  
7 that we've had numerous conversations with  
8 the people here and when I became district  
9 superintendent, on July 1, 2014, the Albright  
10 congregation, which was still functioning at  
11 that time, had already begun steps to sell  
12 the property and to list the property and  
13 also had received three offers on that  
14 property.

15 And at a charge conference we  
16 approved the discontinuance of that place as  
17 a congregation.

18 MR. HOGAN: Excuse me, is there  
19 currently a sales agreement in place on this  
20 property?

21 MR. BARTON: There is, yes.

22 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

23 MR. BARTON: Lastly, the property  
24 owner would call Reverend Greg Cox.

25 Good afternoon, Reverend Cox.

1                   Can you state your name and spell  
2                   your last name?

3                   REV. COX:    Yes, it's Reverend  
4                   Gregory Cox, C-o-x.

5                   MR. BARTON:   And how are you  
6                   employed, Reverend Cox?

7                   REV. COX:    I'm the Director of  
8                   Connectional Ministries in the Western  
9                   Pennsylvania Conference of the United  
10                  Methodist Church, working alongside of our  
11                  bishop and our district superintendents.

12                  MR. BARTON:   Can you explain what  
13                  some of your duties are briefly?

14                  REV. COX:    My role and function  
15                  within the annual conference is to give  
16                  direction and oversight to the overall  
17                  ministries, that include not only our camping  
18                  and outreach ministries, but also our  
19                  missional outreach, that encompasses all of  
20                  our congregations in Western Pennsylvania,  
21                  including those within Pittsburgh and in  
22                  Allegheny County.

23                  MR. BARTON:   And do you have an  
24                  opinion as to what effect it would have if  
25                  the Albright Church was designated historic

1 by the Historic Review Commission?

2 REV. COX: Any historic landmark  
3 designation prevents the annual conference  
4 from fulfilling a larger vision for ministry  
5 and outreach within Western Pennsylvania,  
6 particularly within the boundaries of the  
7 city. Our discipline is clear that any time  
8 that ministry assets from a former  
9 congregation or former membership are to be  
10 designated for urban ministry.

11 We're currently developing plans  
12 within that area, within our parish and  
13 community development and also our ethnic and  
14 local church concerns team at developing  
15 strategies that is consistent with our multi-  
16 cultural, multi-ethnic and also African-  
17 American new church plans. Planting zones  
18 are a part of that conversation, and that's  
19 language that we use within United Methodist  
20 circles to describe ways in which new  
21 ministries can exist.

22 Unfortunately, the present  
23 building does not provide an opportunity for  
24 relevant and cultural ministry to continue in  
25 that area.

1 MR. BARTON: Thank you.

2 In conclusion, and I won't be  
3 repetitious too much more, as is obvious, of  
4 course, the Western Pennsylvania Conference,  
5 the owner of the property, does oppose this  
6 nomination.

7 And I would urge that caution to  
8 the commission, because an interpretation of  
9 the City Code that says it's not a religious  
10 structure involves an improper determination  
11 by the commission or, as I said before, any  
12 level of government, what is or isn't  
13 religious worship. In fact, the testimony is  
14 that religious worship is taking place. By  
15 definition under the City Code it's a  
16 religious structure, which can only be  
17 nominated by the owner.

18 With that I would respectfully  
19 request that the correspondence and the deed  
20 that I offered to the commission be moved  
21 into evidence and, in conclusion, would  
22 respectfully request that the commission make  
23 the determination that this nomination is  
24 inappropriate under the City Code and that it  
25 be dismissed.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

3 So from a procedural standpoint,  
4 I just want to formally acknowledge, as to  
5 Attorney Amy Bentz noted, the letters as so  
6 noted into the record. One addressed to  
7 Director Gastil.

8 So I'd like to just acknowledge,  
9 for the record, the letter dated  
10 January 26th, to Director Gastil, from Amy  
11 Bentz, arguing the fact that they don't  
12 believe that there's standing for this  
13 nomination.

14 Letter dated November 23rd into  
15 the record, to Attorney Daniel Friedson,  
16 Assistant City Solicitor, arguing how  
17 religious structure is noted.

18 Letter dated September 15th, to  
19 Daniel Friedson, attorney, Assistant City  
20 Solicitor, further articulating how, through  
21 abandonment, the deed transferred to the  
22 congress.

23 MS. BENTZ: Conference.

24 MR. HOGAN: The conference, I'm  
25 sorry.

1                   And then, lastly, a letter dated  
2                   September 15th, which first outlined that  
3                   which was the supplemental letter that I  
4                   believe you sent on the thing.

5                   Also to be acknowledged is a  
6                   letter dated November 13th, 2015, that was  
7                   provided us that further questions the  
8                   nomination.

9                   The initial nomination document,  
10                  I would like to acknowledge for the record.

11                  The petition provided by the  
12                  petitioner of 301 signatures, to date, in  
13                  support of the nomination in historic -- 301,  
14                  as well as 24 individual e-mails and records,  
15                  to be a part of the record, also showing  
16                  support for the nomination.

17                  At this point I'd like to open it  
18                  to public testimony at three minutes -- oh,  
19                  and the deed.

20                  MR. SERRAO: Don't forget the  
21                  deed.

22                  MR. HOGAN: The deed that shows  
23                  that the conference is the noted owner.

24                  Lastly, again, I'd like to just  
25                  sort of go forward. As far as a process, we

1 will take three minute testimonies, from the  
2 point -- I would ask that if you could stress  
3 the point of the application, at this point,  
4 which is does it meet the historic standards  
5 that are set out in Chapter 11.

6 And from there we will move  
7 forward.

8 Also, I do want to just note for  
9 the record and remind everyone that  
10 Commissioner Falcone noted his involvement in  
11 the nomination.

12 Our code is very clear in that  
13 we, as commissioners, have the right to  
14 participate in nominations, nominate  
15 buildings and structures and districts, and  
16 also participate in those votes.

17 And that he's also noted that  
18 there was no remuneration or benefit to his  
19 organization as part of that process in  
20 providing historic preservation material or  
21 data or facts on that.

22 So with that, can I take the  
23 first public testimony?

24 MS. BENTZ: Just one quick  
25 question, if I may?

1 MR. HOGAN: Um-hum.

2 MS. BENTZ: Amy Bentz again,  
3 chancellor for the United Methodist Church  
4 and the owner of the property.

5 My only question, for the record  
6 is, I understand that a nomination can be  
7 made by a member of the board -- or the  
8 commission, my only question, for  
9 clarification is, if this gentleman will be  
10 participating in a vote or recommendation,  
11 and, if so, I want that noted on the record.

12 MR. HOGAN: He will be  
13 participating in the vote.

14 MS. BENTZ: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. HOGAN: As per the code  
16 allows him to.

17 MR. BEVAN: My name is Brian  
18 Bevan, I'm counsel for some of the former  
19 members of the congregation of Albright.

20 I just want to make a few points  
21 in response to arguments made by the owner.

22 You know, they emphasized a lot  
23 about separation between church and state.  
24 You know, I would just say, about those  
25 arguments, that those are arguments that, I

1 think, are not proper for this forum. I  
2 think that is something that they should take  
3 up with city council. City council enacted  
4 the ordinance.

5 And I will say that the Historic  
6 Review Commission, on two prior occurrences  
7 in 2008, with the Malta Temple and with St.  
8 Lawrence's Academy in Lawrenceville, and this  
9 was part of an addendum submitted with a  
10 nomination, did make the determination that  
11 what was formerly a religious structure is  
12 now no longer a religious structure and,  
13 thus, the consent of the owner is not needed  
14 to designate it an historic structure under  
15 the City Code.

16 So I emphasize to you that you,  
17 as a commission, do have the authority, under  
18 the ordinance, to designate what was formerly  
19 a religious structure, a non-religious  
20 structure.

21 And they've emphasized these  
22 points. While there may be some merit to  
23 them, I don't think there's merit here. They  
24 should go to city council and try and get the  
25 ordinance amended, if they take issue with

1           that.  It shouldn't be brought up here.

2                         And I would just emphasize that  
3           the arguments that were made, as to the Malta  
4           Temple and the St. Lawrence Academy, it was  
5           opinion offered at meetings from the city  
6           solicitor's office.  And so what is important  
7           is what is the current and most immediate use  
8           of the structure.

9                         When the nomination was submitted  
10          I was unaware of any actual religious  
11          activity that was taking place there.

12                        There may have been a seminarian  
13          living there, he was providing services at a  
14          property not Albright.

15                        And, you know, someone has  
16          testified that apparently some services are  
17          taking place there.  I think it would be more  
18          credible if the person actually providing  
19          those services or anyone who attended and had  
20          records of those services presented them, I  
21          haven't seen any of that submitted.

22                        So what I would say is that the  
23          current most immediate use, as far as we  
24          know, has not been anything close to  
25          religious activity.

1                   You do have the authority to  
2           designate it non-religious and to move the  
3           nomination forward. I point you to the  
4           letters from -- letters that have been  
5           submitted, one, August 21st, 2015, from  
6           Attorney Barton, to Attorney David Tule;  
7           one letter from the conference, dated  
8           January 28th, 2015, recognizing the  
9           abandonment vote, and in both statements they  
10          recognize that no divine worship, as  
11          identified, that language is specifically in  
12          the ordinance, it's says no divine worship  
13          has happened at Albright since November 2013.  
14          We're now two years and three months from  
15          that point. This is their language.

16                   MR. SERRAO: You need to wrap it  
17          up, your three minutes are up.

18                   MR. BEVAN: I point to that, as  
19          well as Attorney Barton's statement in an  
20          article in the Post-Gazette reaffirming that  
21          no divine worship has taken place.

22                   MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

23                   Next speaker.

24                   MR. KAMARA: My name is Abass B.  
25          Kamara, A-b-a-s-s, middle initial, B., last

1 name, Kamara, K-a-m-a-r-a.

2 Out of respect for the board,  
3 A, many of us appreciate your time and  
4 attention to this matter. I'll be as brief  
5 as possible.

6 This has been a very informative  
7 meeting. I was unaware of these services  
8 going on at Albright. As a former member of  
9 the congregation, we look forward to an  
10 invitation to attend or observe in the  
11 future.

12 My understanding is that this  
13 hearing is to seal up the historic nature of  
14 the building. I think those issues have been  
15 brought to light repeatedly in terms of the  
16 years that the building has existed at that  
17 corner, some of the important architectural  
18 history that is connected to the building.

19 I know that a large crux of this  
20 conversation concerns abandonment, which I,  
21 as a member of the congregation, was told  
22 this building was no longer fit for religious  
23 services. Again, this is interesting and  
24 heartwarming news to hear today.

25 And I think it's important to

1           remember how important this building is to  
2           the fabric of the East End. It was mentioned  
3           earlier that there's a lot of dramatic  
4           changes going on in the East End and I think  
5           a facility, religious or otherwise, that can  
6           be a tool for as many folks, as the  
7           conference mentioned, reaching out to the  
8           poor, for society, is a great help.

9                        And if you give me a quick point  
10           of personal privilege, I'd like to enter some  
11           names into the record, Zainabu Kallon Kamara,  
12           Lillian Treece, Tom Treece, members of the  
13           Albright congregation who have passed whose  
14           memory we are trying to keep alive.

15                       Thank you.

16                       MR. HOGAN: Next.

17                       MR. BARTON: Thank you.

18                       Mr. Kamara mentioned a point of  
19           personal privilege, which is actually why  
20           I arise for no more than 60 seconds, and  
21           that is that Mr. Bevan mentioned my letter  
22           to Attorney Tule, using the phrase  
23           abandonment --

24                       MR. HOGAN: You know, sir --

25                       MR. BARTON: Just 15 seconds, if

1           you would.

2                         And that is that abandonment is a  
3           church law concept, versus religious  
4           structure under the City Code, and they're  
5           not the same.

6                         That concludes my comment.

7                         MR. HOGAN: All right, thank you.

8                         But can we keep it, please, to  
9           the public testimony at this point. I really  
10          don't want to get into --

11                        MS. BRANDT: Good afternoon, my  
12          name is Susan Brandt, I live at 300 Liberty  
13          Avenue, and I'm a member of Preservation  
14          Pittsburgh, speaking on behalf of Albright  
15          Methodist Church.

16                        The Albright Methodist Church has  
17          served Shadyside and Bloomfield for 199  
18          years. It continues to be a landmark in the  
19          fast expanding Baum/Centre corridor. 275  
20          units of residential housing are about to be  
21          built within two blocks of the church.  
22          Sitting on a knoll above the surrounding  
23          area, the Albright Church visually anchors  
24          this corridor.

25                        Built for \$37,885 at the

1 beginning of the 19th century, the building  
2 now stands empty and threatened by  
3 demolition. What fate will that building be?

4 We are asking for your help today  
5 to ensure its welfare, adding it to the  
6 impressive list of City of Pittsburgh  
7 landmark properties.

8 There is no doubt that this is a  
9 valuable piece of real estate. The windows  
10 alone, created by Pittsburgh's S.S. Marshall,  
11 are priceless. There are also no doubt that  
12 this building, of such magnificence, would  
13 not be built at 486 South Graham Avenue  
14 today. Economics, however, is not the  
15 purview of this commission.

16 When a religious function can no  
17 longer be viable, these spectacular religious  
18 buildings can be adapted for new users. The  
19 wonderful spaces that the architect created  
20 for the Albright Church are full of light and  
21 open spaces and lend themselves to adaptive  
22 reuse, whether for a congregation or two, or  
23 a new use entirely.

24 Diana Nelson Jones writes in  
25 November 2015, In the early 19th and 20th

1 centuries those qualities impelled church  
2 congregations to build for majestic results.  
3 They built the most fitting tribute to God  
4 they could. But as time and life trial  
5 shifted and the society around the  
6 congregations dwindled, merged or disappeared  
7 the congregations were forced to leave.

8 That is exactly what happened to  
9 Albright.

10 During the middle of the 20th  
11 century, people and planners no longer cared  
12 about the Richardsonian Romanesque  
13 architecture, new and shiny was their model.  
14 Tear down and build new was their slogan.

15 As preservationists, we believe  
16 there is a better way, a more sustainable way  
17 to recycle our religious properties. Modify  
18 use and go forward, save your historic  
19 building.

20 St. Peter and Paul, in far worse  
21 condition than Albright, is ready to begin  
22 its new life, finally. For this spectacular  
23 building, the East Liberty Development  
24 Corporation has received a substantial grant  
25 to begin --

1                   MR. SERRAO: You need to wrap up,  
2                   your time is up, as well.

3                   MS. BRANDT: Albright U.M.  
4                   Church, with your nomination of this  
5                   magnificent building can endure to serve the  
6                   growing neighborhood.

7                   MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

8                   MS. QUINN: Can I ask, if you  
9                   want to provide public comment, please que up  
10                  behind there so we can all move forward.

11                  MS. HAVEN: Hi, my name is  
12                  Jennifer Haven. I had submitted a letter  
13                  from the Friendship Community Group. I'm  
14                  also here on my own behalf, I live a few  
15                  blocks from the Albright Church.

16                  "The Baum/Centre corridor has  
17                  served for decades as the backdoor to East  
18                  End communities. Recent development has only  
19                  continued this trend.

20                  "With proper planning and design  
21                  we can create a unique urban community that  
22                  will become a focus for research, retail  
23                  residential and artistic development. I  
24                  envision a corridor that is planned by all of  
25                  the adjacent communities to connect and build

1 a new East End."

2 That was spoken by Bill Peduto  
3 when he was council -- when he was the  
4 councilor for District 8 in 2003. I don't  
5 think anything has changed and, if anything  
6 at all, things have gotten more -- more  
7 desperate in the corridor. We have a lot of  
8 buildings coming down and replaced with new  
9 construction that can't possibly replace the  
10 significant historical importance of the  
11 buildings that lived a hundred years before.

12 I ask that today you listen to  
13 the over 300 community members that supported  
14 this nomination and their desire to carry out  
15 their mission of feeding the poor and helping  
16 those in the community, as evidenced by their  
17 annual Albright Thanksgiving dinner, and the  
18 list of petition signatories, you can see  
19 that we're a very multi-racial, multi-  
20 cultural and just an incredible mix of people  
21 that do support this nomination.

22 Thank you so much.

23 MR. MANGAN: Good afternoon, my  
24 name is Tom Mangan, I live on the 400 block  
25 of South Graham, so I'm probably one of the

1           closest people to the church.

2                       I walk by the church almost every  
3           single day, I walk my dog there. And I find  
4           it interesting because I've never, since I've  
5           been here in ten years, in the past few years  
6           I've actually never experienced or heard a  
7           church service going on, never seen the  
8           lights on, I don't even see them shoveling  
9           the snow, so I'm a little curious of when  
10          these church services are happening.

11                      But one of the things that drew  
12          me to the Friendship neighborhood is the  
13          architecture, it's the property values, it's  
14          the architectural style that you don't get  
15          anywhere else. And, sure, you might, you  
16          know, tear down the church and build  
17          something new, but it's kind of like, let's  
18          tear down a hundred-year-old oak tree and  
19          plant a seedling. I guess, what, it's not  
20          going to -- we're never going to experience  
21          that sort of magnificence again. And it's up  
22          to us to preserve those things, because  
23          that's what brings the property value --  
24          keeps the property values where they are.

25                      Our neighborhood, in the '60s and

1 '70s, had a pretty rough time, people were  
2 tearing -- or converting the homes from these  
3 grand Victorian homes into -- you know,  
4 chopped up into apartments, you know, some of  
5 them four, five, six, eight units and some  
6 even more. And now the neighborhood is  
7 taking those back, reconvertng them back  
8 into single-family homes, to get that  
9 character, to get that charm.

10 And if we don't have these  
11 churches around then we fail to have that  
12 experience.

13 History for us was a draw. For a  
14 lot of people coming into this neighborhood,  
15 history is a draw. Suburbia is everywhere,  
16 we don't need to tear down stuff and we can  
17 go anywhere else to go to a Chuck E. Cheese  
18 or a coffee shop. You know, we've got this,  
19 it's irreplaceable, let's keep it and keep  
20 the value that's there.

21 Also, it's a very walkable  
22 neighborhood, it's got so much that we can  
23 offer. Again, what we do not want to  
24 experience is just this neighborhood, this  
25 area turning into the neighborhood over

1           there, the neighborhood over there, that you  
2           can get anywhere else. This is a  
3           one-of-a-kind asset, as people mentioned.  
4           It's the intersection of three tremendous  
5           neighborhoods here, you don't get this  
6           experience anywhere else, that's the draw.  
7           Our property values continue to increase  
8           because of that experience, not in spite of  
9           it.

10                         So we should do our best -- I ask  
11           the gentlemen and ladies here do your best to  
12           maintain that, to preserve that, because once  
13           it's gone again it does not come back.

14                         Thank you for your time.

15                         MS. McSWIGAN: Hi, I'm Melissa  
16           McSwigan, 40131 Bigelow Boulevard, 15,213.

17                         Perhaps it's just the circles  
18           that I travel in, but without much or any  
19           provocation on my part, many people, many who  
20           pay attention to historic preservation, are  
21           complaining in the rapid pace of development  
22           in Pittsburgh, lack of affordable housing,  
23           work quality, the construction materials and  
24           design and the fear of losing Pittsburgh's  
25           unique character. This character is a lot of

1           what attracted the development in the first  
2           place.

3                       Not everyone seems to be wowed by  
4           the maximum profit per square foot of much of  
5           the housing being built in the city. It  
6           feels to me and others that we are losing  
7           community control of our neighborhoods to  
8           money and power.

9                       And it seems to me that the  
10          situation with Albright fits right in there,  
11          with the church to be torn down for a drive-  
12          thru Starbucks and not a house of worship.

13                      With so much development going on  
14          in our city, it's important that we provide  
15          proper protections to the places that make  
16          Pittsburgh special and allow community groups  
17          to have a say in how Pittsburgh grows, and  
18          this is why I'm supporting the nomination.

19                      Thank you.

20                      MS. SAWYER: Hello, my name is  
21          Katy Sawyer, I'm chair of the board of  
22          directors of the Young Preservationists  
23          Association.

24                      I'm here simply today to express  
25          that the YPA supports the nomination of the

1 former home of the Albright Methodist Church  
2 as a city historic landmark. We believe that  
3 it meets the basic criteria for the Historic  
4 Review Commission to discuss and decide  
5 further.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

8 MR. MORDEN: Hi, my name's Ryan  
9 Morden, I live at 6600 Northumberland Street  
10 here in Pittsburgh.

11 And I just want to echo the  
12 support for advancing this historic  
13 nomination for the reasons mentioned earlier.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. HOGAN: Next?

16 Okay. Well, there will be a  
17 public hearing next month, so.

18 So, at this point I think we --  
19 the commission should take into account the  
20 thought and the nomination and the materials  
21 in front of us to make a determination of  
22 does this move to us holding a public  
23 hearing. Out of courtesy today, we took  
24 testimony from the individuals who took time  
25 out of their day so that we could start to

1 form the record.

2 I think we heard very loud and  
3 clear, you know, as our city progresses and  
4 develops the fabric of our city becomes even  
5 more critical to its future. And I think  
6 that as we move forward in how our city was  
7 and has evolved, structures like the Albright  
8 are important pieces that codify how  
9 Pittsburgh has progressed and the rich fabric  
10 that came from the people that used these  
11 facilities and worshiped and played in their  
12 neighborhoods.

13 Once again, I think, you know, we  
14 don't take these processes lightly. There's  
15 been a lot of information provided, which has  
16 brought us here today, but I also do think  
17 that, as we, a city, move forward, and you  
18 heard pretty clearly that there is  
19 significant opportunity to celebrate our  
20 history and, in many cases, good examples of  
21 re-purposing our history into new lives for  
22 its future. And I think, really, the point  
23 of where there has been significant  
24 investment already in the Baum/Centre  
25 corridor, once again this particular piece

1 becomes an important component in that fabric  
2 as we move forward.

3 I want to say, as far as I'm  
4 concerned, I believe that the materials  
5 provided today are very true and in keeping  
6 with the information necessary for us to be  
7 able to move to the next step, which would be  
8 saying that this building does, in my  
9 opinion, codify and represent the historic  
10 structure and that it does meet at least the  
11 two noted criteria from exemplifying the  
12 state and the form of architecture that this  
13 building celebrates and how that architecture  
14 has been preserved, as well as preserving  
15 further --

16 MS. QUINN: It was three  
17 criteria, architect and the visual.

18 MR. HOGAN: With regards to the  
19 architect who created the building, the -- so  
20 item -- it's Item 3, right?

21 MR. SERRAO: 3, 4 and 10.

22 MR. HOGAN: 3, 4 and 10. So  
23 we're saying that Item 3 is exemplification  
24 of the distinguished architecture type, style  
25 and design. Clearly this was a very rich and

1 opulent building as it was constructed, A, by  
2 the price tag alone.

3 Two, the work of the architect,  
4 engineer and designer in order to really sort  
5 of codify and really create such a robust and  
6 elegant structure.

7 And then, lastly, the unique  
8 location and destination and physical  
9 appearance and how it commands its site and  
10 projects what the fabric of that corridor was  
11 and continues to be.

12 So does anyone else have any  
13 other --

14 MR. GASTIL: I'd only add to say  
15 that I think if you look at 3, 4 and 10, I  
16 think some of the things we've heard today,  
17 including the overall quality of design,  
18 detail, materials and craftsmanship -- I just  
19 want to note that on the items in the  
20 criteria for designation, when we think  
21 simply of the glass work alone, Item No. 3  
22 seems to be really quite relevant in terms of  
23 quality of design, detail, materials and  
24 craftsmanship.

25 I'd also say that I think we can

1 really make a case of -- I really think that  
2 all three of these items, the unique location  
3 and the distinctive physical appearance; the  
4 identification as the work of an architect,  
5 designer or engineer or builder with work  
6 significant in the history and development of  
7 the City of Pittsburgh, as well as I  
8 mentioned already in 3, I'd like to echo that  
9 I think that that case has been made.

10 MS. PETERSON: I've come across  
11 this architect before in various research  
12 that I've done, so I do think that he has  
13 some significance, at least in the Pittsburgh  
14 region, Southwestern Pennsylvania.

15 MR. SERRAO: I'll concur. I  
16 think, especially, also, to pick up the  
17 points that the building is in very -- it's  
18 pretty much intact. That's one of the things  
19 that also give it the certain quality, that  
20 it hasn't been altered too greatly, if at  
21 all. And that historic fabric has been  
22 maintained and it comes through.

23 MR. HOGAN: Anything else?

24 MS. PETERSON: I think it's  
25 potentially also significant under criteria

1           8, exemplification of a pattern of  
2           neighborhood development or settlement.

3                   MR. GASTIL: I think that both 7  
4           and 8 are potentially --

5                   MR. HOGAN: I would want to  
6           understand that a little more.

7                   MR. GASTIL: I think 3, 4 and 10  
8           are the strongest.

9                   MR. HOGAN: Yeah. I think if  
10          there is a case to be made it would be  
11          helpful to understand that a little more.

12                   I would agree with you, I think,  
13          once again, if we look back at the way the  
14          street scapes of our city have come to be,  
15          that this was a significant emulation of how  
16          that pattern was developed.

17                   MS. PETERSON: Yes. And there  
18          was testimony as to, you know, linking this  
19          with other congregations and institutions  
20          even from downtown to the East End.

21                   MR. SERRAO: Well, I think it  
22          goes back to the idea that East Liberty was a  
23          religious center in general, with all the  
24          different religious structures, that there  
25          was a tremendous amount of them and they're

1 all of excellent quality.

2 MS. PETERSON: Yes.

3 MR. HOGAN: All right. So with  
4 that, we, at this point, believe the  
5 application complete with regards to does  
6 have merit of historic standing and is  
7 warranted of a public hearing to be held in  
8 the March commission.

9 So I would ask if someone would  
10 propose a motion to codify that the  
11 nomination, as submitted, does meet the  
12 historic standard -- the points --

13 MS. PETERSON: So move.

14 MR. HOGAN: Is there a second?

15 MR. SERRAO: I'll second.

16 MR. HOGAN: It's been moved and  
17 seconded.

18 All in favor?

19 (Thereupon, there was a chorus of ayes.)

20 MR. HOGAN: Is there any  
21 abstentions?

22 The motion carries unanimous.

23 So the next meeting of the  
24 Historic Review Commission will be in March,  
25 the first Wednesday, of which we will further

1 debate the value.

2 And we would ask that if at  
3 that meeting you could come prepared to argue  
4 the fact that if this -- if you do feel that  
5 this commission, with regards to the historic  
6 content and the value of the historic nature  
7 of the code, we would look forward to those  
8 comments.

9 Again, we will hold public  
10 testimony to three minutes during that  
11 period.

12 And from that point, then, we  
13 will deliberate and make a decision and  
14 recommendation if it extends beyond to the  
15 planning commission.

16 So can I have a motion to  
17 adjourn?

18 MR. SERRAO: So moved.

19 MR. FALCONE: Second.

20 MR. HOGAN: All in favor?

21 (Thereupon, there was a chorus of ayes.)

22 MR. HOGAN: Motion approved.

23 - - -

24 (Thereupon, at 4:04 p.m., the hearing  
25 was concluded.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, Nina Warren Biehler, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of my stenotypy notes taken of the hearing of the Historic Review Commission of the City of Pittsburgh, held at the 1st Floor meeting room, 200 Ross Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219, on Wednesday, February 3, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nina Warren Biehler  
Notary Public in and for the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
My Commission expires:  
September 19, 2017

- - -