



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 April 6, 2016
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>		
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Chad Melberg	Carole Malakoff	Bill Wise
Erik Harless		Scott Bowfinger	Julie Polletta	Rich Schlegel
Raymond Gastil		Robert Eckenrode	Joshua Speakman	Ben Kronk
Ernie Hogan		Steve Watson	James Secosky	Susan Brandt
Matthew Falcone		Stephen Connell	Robert Mowl	

Old Business-None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the March 2016 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Falcone seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the March 2016 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Gastil seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Other Business:

1. Ms. Spooner mentions the tentative dates for Albright Church to go before Planning Commission.

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.

100 Fifth Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

Pittsburgh Properties
33 N 3rd Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 1-D-125

Inspector:

Applicant:

The Yard
100 Fifth Avenue, 2nd Floor
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/11/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Mike Allen steps to the podium; he is the owner of the Yard. He states that they are proposing new windows for the Market Square location. He states that **when the project was before the Commission last month, the Commission didn't** like the center mullion in the large window so they removed it. That window will now be fixed and the others will open outward. The new windows will be the same thickness as the existing windows.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the window replacement as submitted in the drawings with the noted exception that the center window in the six-panel window will be a single-pane fixed window.
 4. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. He states that the color should be the same as the existing windows.
-
-

808 Ridge Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

CCAC
800 Allegheny Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-159

Inspector:

Applicant:

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

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/18/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of a railing.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Julie Polletta steps to the podium; she is with Radelet McCarthy Polletta, the architects for the project. She explains that they received approval in December for work on the building including repairs to the main entrance. She states that since then they have been informed that they need to have a handrail at the entrance, which is what they are submitting today. She shows photos of the existing condition and drawings and renderings of what the new handrail will look like. She states that they took cues from the ornamental iron fence that surrounds the entire site. She shows the cut sheets for the railing.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that they met with the applicant last week, and they do approve of the handrail and think it is appropriate.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the handrail installation as submitted.
 5. Mr. Harless seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

911 Galveston Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Delta Foundation
PO Box 100057
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233-0057

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-151

Inspector:

Applicant:

David Morgan

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/12/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Building renovations to remedy after-the-fact work.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Morgan steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that they were before the Commission last month and were asked to make changes. He states that the Commission asked for a drawing that shows better how the existing storefront differs from the new one. He shows the drawings, stating that he went out with a contour gage and measured the portion of the original storefront and what was replaced to be able to show the exact profiles. He explains the drawings to the Commissioners. He states that the profiles are fairly close, but some additional pieces are needed to match them more closely, and the greatest difference between them is where the glass lies. He talks about the base of the storefront where glass was located and plywood is now. He states that he has shown two options; the first option would be to keep the plywood and add trim to match the original profile. The second option would be to keep the stud frame and insert a piece of opaque glass in a sash, which would not be operable but would mimic the original proportions and material. He states that on the option two proposal, they are proposing to keep the existing entry door for cost reasons.

He states that the other item requested by the Commission was a different garage door. A flush panel garage door was installed, and they were advised to add trim to give it a panelled look, which the drawings show. He shows a light fixture on the drawings and requests that they can work with staff to find a more appropriate fixture. He talks about the windows on the side elevation and states that they plan to replace the trim to match the original. He talks about the ADA ramp on the front facade and states that the owner would like to have the ramp for accessibility rather than trying to receive an exemption. He states that they are trying to keep the railing as simple as possible so as to not block the façade.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about the side of the building. He asks if they are proposing to match the brick mould, etc. exactly.
 3. Mr. Morgan says yes, they are replacing the windows with wood windows and
-
-

moulding to match.

4. Mr. Hogan asks about the trim on the garage door and if they will be chamfering the edges.
 5. Mr. Morgan states that they are planning to chamfer the edges and can provide details as a condition of approval.
 6. Mr. Hogan talks about the storefront. He states that the issue is that an original storefront was removed, and the Commission could require it to be replaced exactly, but they are trying to come to a compromise. He states that the drawings do help, and he feels better about option two, where a window sash would be installed to mimic what was there as part of the infrastructure. He states that the issue is that they are not getting the same profile with regards to the window glass, and it does read significantly differently.
 7. Mr. Gastil states that option two was the installation of opaque glass.
 8. Mr. Hogan says yes, and right now there is plywood with applied wood. He also states that he thinks that the transom windows need work.
 9. Mr. Falcone agrees. He asks about the specific type of opaque glass.
 10. Mr. Morgan states that it would be a back-painted glass. He states that the glass was all opaque in the original 2012 condition.
 11. Mr. Serrao states that the glass is so far back the shadow line will make it read very differently.
 12. The Commissioners discuss the windows.
 13. Mr. Gastil clarifies that the difference they are talking about is an inch and three-quarters, which will look different, but they may be able to make it work.
 14. Mr. Harless clarifies that for the ramp, they will need handrails on both sides and edge protection at the bottom.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 16. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the LRC did not review the project as the plans were just submitted yesterday. They did come up with some comments and corrections. She states that on the Dounton Way side, there is still a metal man-door showing, which they do not support. She states that other metal doors have been denied in the district; they ask that this metal door be denied and required to be replaced with a wood door, with security if necessary on the inside. With respect to the garage door, she states that they would prefer an actual panelled door versus the door with applied trim. She states that they are in favor of the replacement vinyl windows with wooden double hung windows. They are also asking for the harsh lighting to be shielded and for the security cameras to be camouflaged. She talks about the Galveston façade and states that the kick plates were originally painted wire glass, which they would like to be replaced. They would like the transoms above the storefront to be treated the same way as the glass in the storefronts. She states that the plans state that the trim be replicated “in proportion”, which they think is vague; they would like to see **the wording that it match the “profile.” They would like to see this tabled again to incorporate the suggestions.**
-
-

-
-
17. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none.
 18. Mr. Gastil states that they could have some of the items mentioned as conditions of approval or subject to staff follow-up. They could also table the application. He states that the paramount issue is the windows on the Galveston storefront and if they feel the after-the-fact corrections are acceptable. He notes again that an inch and three quarters could make a difference, but he feels that the treatment could also be successful in maintaining the character of the building. He states that replacement of the metal door should be a condition of approval, and he states that the garage door should be discussed further as well.
 19. Mr. Serrao agrees on the metal door.
 20. Mr. Gastil asks if he thinks the garage door should be replaced.
 21. Mr. Serrao says no, he thinks at this point the compromise of the trim is acceptable.
 22. Mr. Hogan agrees and states that they should focus on the Galveston side, with compromise as necessary on the alley side. He states that the garage door with applied trim, if done well, can look appropriate and will last longer than a wood door. He states that the metal door does stand out and a wooden door would go a long way toward helping unify that side.
 23. Mr. Gastil asks if some of the alterations could go to staff review.
 24. Mr. Hogan states that if they could go with option two for the lower portion, it may not matter if it was wire-glass or not originally since it was painted, although it could go a long way with the neighbors if they used wire glass. He states that his issue is if the rendering gets them to the right profile for the upper-sash windows. He states that it is close but not reading appropriately as they are not independent windows with the same spacing, profiles, etc. He states that he could live with the **glass position if they can work on the other issues. He isn't sure if this is something** they want to put on staff.
 25. Mr. Gastil states that they will need to have the right language for staff and the applicant to be able to follow it.
 26. Mr. Hogan agrees. He states that the closer they can get to the original profiles the better, and they should get to an appropriate profile for the garage door applique.
 27. Mr. Serrao asks if there are enough small issues that they will need to come back.
 28. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is how much more time the Commission need to take to get this right. He states that if they had come before the Commission prior to alterations, they most likely would not have allowed the alterations. He states that these are difficult cases as the work has already been done.
 29. Mr. Gastil questions the applicant on the possibilities of changing the metal man-door, improving the garage door, and changing the upper transoms. He asks the other Commissioners for the specific language on the transoms.
 30. Mr. Falcone asks if it should be recessed further.
 31. Mr. Hogan says no, the transom is in the right position, which matches the original. The issue is how it has been molded. He states that the glass would look like it is sitting in a sash and there would be a reveal line around the sash. A faint
-
-

chamfer would help it to look like a sash.

32. Mr. Morgan states that the changes would be acceptable.
33. Mr. Hogan states that they might be able to get to a solution although it isn't perfect, and he hopes that the LRC may find it acceptable, as the Commission does value the community's input.
34. Mr. Morgan asks about the use of wire glass versus tempered glass in the base of the storefront and code.
35. Mr. Harless states that wire glass would be acceptable per code.
36. Mr. Morgan states that they will use wire glass.
37. Mr. Falcone asks if for the transom windows they could add coloration to the molding.
38. Mr. Morgan says yes.
39. Mr. Hogan states that it will look better once the storefront is painted.
40. Mr. Falcone asks that the applicant work with staff on an appropriate light fixture.
41. Mr. Harless confirms that option two includes keeping the front entry door as-is.
42. Mr. Morgan confirms.
43. Ms. Malakoff steps back to the podium. She asks that staff review the wood panelled side door as well. The applicant should look around the neighborhood for examples or use the side entrance as an example.
44. Mr. Hogan talks about the options for the ramp.
45. Mr. Harless states that there are two options for the railings; they can attach it to the storefront or post-mount it.
46. Mr. Morgan states that they will post-mount it.
47. Mr. Hogan talks about the curbing for the railing. He provides a marked-up drawing for staff to be able to review.

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the storefront and side elevation renovations and redesign with the following conditions: along Galveston Avenue, that the existing kneewall be modified to include wire glass panels to match in style in profile to the 2012 elevation, as well as the transoms to match in profile and style to the 2012 elevation. The existing door will remain as-is. On the Downton Way elevation, the metal door is to be replaced with a wooden door, the garage door is to have paneled applique installed, and the existing light fixture is to be reviewed by staff. The windows are approved as submitted with brick mould and material to match as noted in the drawings.
 2. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan clarifies that wherever possible the transom trim should be chamfered. Paint and light fixtures are to be approved by staff.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

831 Western Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Chris Fetter
831 Western Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-50

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/18/16

Applicant:

Chris Fetter
831 Western Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

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

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Chris Fetter steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He explains the project, stating that the first item will be to remove the cinderblock porch. He believes that the stoop at the side of the building is the original stoop as it matches **the neighbor's, so he is proposing to move it back to the front. He is also proposing** to strip and repoint the front of the building and to repoint the foundation. He states that there are boards covering the brackets under the eaves, which he is proposing to remove. He states that they are proposing to replace all the windows with double hung wooden windows; they will be two-over-two as they were originally. He states that is now proposing to replicate the second-floor headers for the first floor by doing a casting. He states that the stone threshold is disintegrating and will be replaced. The overhang over the front entry was damaged by a later porch addition, but he states that there is evidence of decorative molding and brackets. He states that the handout shows a possible option for corbels. He states that they are proposing to replace the chain-link fence with a decorative metal fence, and he is proposing to match the fence currently between his and the neighbor's property.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the homeowner gets it and that every part of the project is appropriate. She states that they did suggest that they use a historically appropriate fiberglass or resin to replicate the headers. She states that the applicant is lucky that the original stoop was preserved at the side of the house. She states that they do support the project.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the building renovations including demolition of the cinderblock porch, with the replacement of the existing stoop, repointing and repair of the brick and mortar, reinstallation of roof brackets, reinstallation of wooden windows with true divided lites, installation of historically appropriate
-
-

fiberglass headers, replacement of the header above the front entrance, installation of a stone threshold, painting and trim on the door, and installation of an iron fence as submitted.

5. Mr. Falcone seconds.

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

501 Avery Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

N. Davis Enterprises LLC
400 Island Avenue
McKees Rocks, Pa 15136

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 8-D-172

Inspector:

Applicant:

William G. Nest, Jr.
406 10th Street
Oakmont, Pa 15139

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/18/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Building renovations including window replacement and garage door.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bill West steps to the podium; he is the developer for the project. He also introduces Mr. Scott Bowfinger from Lami Grubb Architects. He explains the background of the project, stating that they have had the church under option since mid-November, and they intend to develop it into a multi-family residential project. He states that the building has been vacant for years and has some damage inside. They are proposing twelve residential units, which is what they need to make the project work economically and also with parking needs. He states that they are proposing to add parking in the basement of the church. He states that they are looking for approval to their approach to parking as well as the replacement of some stained glass panels with vision panels.
 2. Mr. Scott Bowfinger steps to the podium. He states that they are excited about the project and think it is an appropriate reuse of a historic building. He shows photos of the site and the building. He states that the biggest change to the exterior of the building would be the introduction of a garage door on the Lockhart façade. They are proposing a decorative aluminum gate that picks up on some of the detailing of the stained glass windows. They would need to remove two existing windows and widen the opening. They would be able to set the garage door itself back one bay from the building edge or about fifteen feet. He shows the floor plans for the parking plan and explains their interior parking proposal. He states that there is a ten to twelve foot grade change from Lockhart up to Avery, which is part of why the entrance is on that side. He talks about the windows, stating that the bottom portion of the windows are operable stained glass hoppers that they would like to replace with clear glass for the proposed apartments. He shows the Lockhart facade and explains their proposal for the garage door. They will be leaving the window head and extending the opening to either side, and they think it is a sensitive way of addressing the garage door. The decorative doors will camouflage a garage door that is recessed about fifteen feet back.
 3. Mr. Gastil asks if the front entrance door on that side will be operable.
-
-

-
-
4. Mr. Bowfinger says yes and shows the floor plans. He states that the Avery entrance will be the main entrance as it will have the lift. He shows a drawing for an alternate design for access to the garage from Avery, which he states is not viable. He states that they would also not be able to do a decorative gate on the Avery side.
 5. Mr. Serrao states that this is a very significant change to a historically significant façade.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if they could preserve the look of the Lockhart façade and have the facade on a hangar door that flips up. He states that they have to be creative in how they treat the preservation of the church infrastructure in the city, and if this is a way to reuse a structure that will benefit the community and maintain the integrity of the building, it will be a win. He states that economics don't play a part in their decision, but they do recognize that if nothing comes of the plan, the building could deteriorate and be lost.
 7. Mr. West steps to the podium. He states that they did talk about putting the windows in the gate, but were concerned about damage.
 8. Mr. Serrao states that if they did a hangar door, they could use thin brick and basically substitute the real material for lighter materials attached directly to the door.
 9. Mr. Hogan states that Sienna Mercato in Market District did the same thing. As far as the windows, he states that he is not sure he would support the replacement of stained glass with clear glass. He states that overall they are on the right track for the project.
 10. Mr. West states that **there won't be much difference in the look of the stined glass** versus clear glass panels when the windows are open. He states that the stained glass also needs to be repaired anyway. He states that the stained glass is not a deal breaker on the project, but they just wanted to discuss it.
 11. Mr. Hogan states that the stained glass, when restore appropriately and cleaned, will be an asset to their project. He states that they would probably want to install a thermal window internally.
 12. Mr. Falcone discloses that he did attend the community meeting a few months ago as this is in his neighborhood. He asks about the **applicants' plans for the cover** glass that is on the church now.
 13. Mr. West states that they would probably do storm windows on the outside and probably some protection of the inside as well.
 14. Mr. Falcone states that there is a product for cover glass that is operable and commonly used.
 15. Mr. Gastil states that as it looks like the Avery entrance is not under consideration. He asks what is being asked for today.
 16. Mr. West states that they are mostly looking for guidance. He asks if they could do what is on Sienna, if that would be appropriate.
 17. Mr. Falcone asks about the ramp on the Avery side, and if they had considered a car elevator.
-
-

-
-
18. Mr. West doesn't know if the cost would work for them.
 19. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 20. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium representing the East Allegheny Community Council. He states that the board was generally supportive but did not get to take a formal vote. He states that as the building sits vacant and deteriorates, the neighborhood is getting more and more concerned about it. He thinks that the addition of the gate with the ghost windows is appropriate as it doesn't take away from the building. He states that he thinks that the clear glass is appropriate as it is a small accommodation for residents in order to save the building. He states that parking is a significant issue.
 21. Ms. Suzanne Parks steps to the podium. She is a neighbor. She has concerns about the parking and how it would be assigned and what it would cost.
 22. Mr. Hogan asks how much time the applicants would need to take the recommendations into account.
 23. Mr. West states that they would need to close on the property before Labor Day, and their option goes through July. He thinks they could come back with something by the May 4th agenda.
 24. Mr. Hogan requests that they photograph the streetscapes on both sides of the building. They should also think about openings in the building and mechanical units. The Commission needs to know what is visible from the public right-of-way and what is not. He states that they can table the application for 60 days and they can decide when they are ready to come back.

Motion:

25. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 60 days.
 26. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 27. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

729 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

JCWS, LLC
PO Box 13444
Pittsburgh, Pa 15243

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-F-16

Inspector:

Applicant:

JCWS, LLC
PO Box 13444
Pittsburgh, Pa 15243

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 3/14/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of a rear addition.

Discussion:

1. Mr. James Secosky steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that they are proposing an addition to the existing building. He shows photos of the front and side of the building. He states that the storefront framing was changed and two large panes of glass were put in; he states that the original building had a central mullion with two smaller glass windows on either side, and they are proposing to restore those original proportions. He states that they are also planning to replace the front windows with smaller windows and replace two double doors with single doors. They will keep the moldings over the windows as well as the sills and brick moulds.
 2. Mr. Serrao asks why they are lowering the windows
 3. Mr. Secosky states that it is because of the ceiling heights. He states that above the windows are wood panels. He states that they could keep the existing windows and doors; he did feel that the existing door were very narrow. He talks about the side elevation and shows the part of the building that was original. He states that several portions of the rear of the building were later additions. He states that they are proposing smaller windows for the side elevation as well. He shows the proposal for the addition.
 4. Mr. Gastil asks for clarification on which windows are being resized.
 5. Mr. Secosky points them all out in the drawings.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks about the material of the siding on the addition.
 7. Mr. Secosky states that it will be vinyl siding.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for comments from the Commissioners.
 10. Mr. Gastil states that the resizing of the windows is an issue.
 11. Mr. Hogan states that the entire approach to the project is an issue. He states that
-
-

reviewing the guidelines for the historic district is a good place to start. He states that altering the window sizes and vinyl windows are completely unacceptable. He states that vinyl siding is also inappropriate on anything that can be seen from the street. He states that he would argue that the storefront is actually the original storefront and it should be preserved and enhanced. He states that alteration to any of the openings is unacceptable under the guidelines. He recommends that they table this so they can go back to the drawing board. He states that they can work with staff with regards to the guidelines. He states that they will need the materials selections and full photographs of all sides of the building and its context to the street.

12. Mr. Secosky states that he didn't know that it was a historic district when the plans were done. He states that from what he heard, the doors, windows, and materials are the concerns.
13. Mr. Serrao states that everything that is there is protected under the law.
14. Mr. Hogan states that with respect to how the addition, he understands that they are trying to breathe new life into the building, but they need to know how the materials will complement the existing structure. He states that they can table the application to give them more time. He states that they will have to look at window restoration or new wood windows and alternate wood or new material siding with an appropriate profile. He states that vinyl siding and windows are not acceptable as they will be visible. He asks how much time they will need.
15. Mr. Secosky states that they can come back for the next meeting.

Motion:

16. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
 17. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 19. The owner asks if it would be acceptable if they left the windows, etc. the same. He also asks if the windows on the addition have to match the windows in front in size and material.
 20. Mr. Hogan states that they have to be in proportion, and they have to be wood if they can be seen from the street.
 21. The owner asks if Hardie board would be acceptable for siding.
 22. Mr. Hogan says yes, as long as the profile matches wood siding of that period. He recommends that they work with staff to develop an appropriate plan.
-
-

1719 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Gregg Carson LLC
PO Box 143
Allison Park, Pa 15101

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-313

Inspector:

Applicant:

Chad Melberg
Sign Innovation
50 Halstead Blvd, Suite 17
Zelienople, Pa 16063

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 3/16/16

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

Proposed Changes: Installation of metal awnings.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Chad Melberg steps to the podium; he is with Sign Innovation and is representing the owners of the business. He states that the signage for the business was already approved. He states that the owner of the business already purchased structural steel awnings with a rustic patina to match the interior of the restaurant. He talks about the material and proposed installation.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He states that the Commission has not approved metal awnings in any other historic district.
 3. Mr. Serrao states that the guidelines are specific that awnings should be canvas or canvas-like material.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application.
 5. Mr. Harless seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

***Perry Traditional Academy
3875 Perrysville Avenue***

Individual Landmark

Owner:

Vidyadhar Patil
1305 Muriel Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 26th

Lot and Block: 115-H-110

Inspector:

Applicant:

Steven Watson, AIA
IKM Inc.
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District:

Application Received: 3/15/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Relocation of louvers.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Steve Watson with IKM Architects steps to the podium; he is presenting on behalf of Pittsburgh Public Schools. He explains that the project is mostly the interior renovation of chemistry labs, which has necessitated the relocation of some exterior louvers. He shows photos of the existing conditions and the proposed locations of the louvers.
2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the relocation of the louvers.
 4. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1217 Palo Alto Street Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Karin J. Mowl
120 W. Hutchinson
Pittsburgh, Pa 15218

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-K-108

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/11/16

Applicant:

Robert H. Mowl
1009 S. Braddock #1
Pittsburgh, Pa 15218

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of a railing.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Robert Mowl steps to the podium; he is representing his mother, who owns the building. He states that they were instructed by an insurance agency to install a handrail in 30 days, which they did. He states that they have adhered to historic standards in other aspects of the building. He states that the stone steps are probably original, and they were concerned about boring huge holes into them for a handrail. They looked at other railings on the street and came up with this railing, which is galvanized steel pipe painted black. He states that they are okay with changing the railing, but are looking for guidance.
2. **Mr. Hogan states that he doesn't think they were required to install the rungs.**
3. Mr. Harless agrees.
4. Mr. Hogan states that they could have approved a regular pipe railing, to be top-affixed without the verticals. He states that the material is unorthodox but he appreciates the solution. He states that he can submit a new drawing to staff for approval.
5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
6. Mr. Serrao states that the railing can be a pipe railing, without the lugs or vertical elements.

Motion:

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of a pipe rail, to be approved by staff.
 8. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-