



**Division of Development Administration and Review**

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning

200 Ross Street, Third Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2013

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>
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	Rick Avon
Linda McClellan	Sharon Spooner	Matt Bartlett
John Jennings		Brad Spencer
Joe Serrao		Federico Siegert
Ernie Hogan		Casimir Pellegrini
		Christian Heath
		Rebecca White
		Cathy Lewis Long
		Allison Welch
		Douglas McDermot
		Sean Beasley
		Russell Blaich
		Bob Baumbach
		Curt Gettman

***Old Business***—Ms. Quinn reports that Planning Commission approved the Mexican War Streets Historic District expansion. They did not follow the HRC's recommendation of the reduced boundary but instead recommended the full boundary from the nomination. The matter will now go to City Council who will make the ultimate decision on it.

***New Business***

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the January minutes, Mr. Jennings motions to approve and Mr. Serrao seconds; all members vote in favor.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the January 2013 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Jennings seconds; all members vote in favor.

**Other:**

1. Ms. Quinn mentions that two RFP's have been posted on the HRC's website. One is for the economic effects of preservation on the City and the other is for the conservation districts. The deadline for submittal on those will be a week from Friday (February 15). She has received numerous phone calls about these, including a call from the people that worked on conservation districts in Philadelphia. Hopefully they will be able to get someone under contract for these projects soon. She also states that she will be working with City Council to get the legislation for the Mexican War Streets Expansion HRC recommendations in.
2. Mr. Serrao asks for clarification that the HRC will submit recommendations and Planning Commission will submit their recommendations separately.

3. Ms. Quinn says yes, they are submitted separately. She also mentions that she has not heard anything regarding the Iron City Brewery lately.
4. Mr. Hogan says they have been working on their roofs.
5. Mr. Jennings states that they have been planning some type of outdoor event in the spring. BBI will be meeting with the architect shortly to discuss it.
6. Ms. Quinn says that she and Mr. Jennings did meet with some neighborhood groups as well as Councilman Dowd who were concerned with demolitions on the site. She states that they were able to allay some of the concerns and they clarified some of the city's policies and procedures, including the fact that the City does hold pre-application meetings with all developers. She says she advised the neighbors to call her with any concerns, and also mentions that once the Certificates of Appropriateness start to expire after the six month period she will be working with Councilman Dowd's office on any extensions. Depending on the nature of the work she may be able to offer extensions on the C of A's for the developers to be able to complete the work.
7. Mr. Serrao asks if they have a general contractor.
8. Mr. Jennings says the development company is acting as their own contractor.
9. Mr. Serrao asks if demolitions in general have been suspended for the winter.
10. Mr. Jennings says that party-wall demolitions are suspended until the spring but other demolitions are proceeding. He mentions that they had put a few demolitions from the last meeting on hold.
11. Ms. McClellan asks if anyone will be coming to the meeting today for 700 Armandale Street, which was given thirty days last month.
12. Ms. Quinn says that Lee Bruder and Bob Baumbach should be coming in for that one. She mentions that Russell Blaich from BBI has been proactive in getting HRC approval for any demolitions and getting re-approval if the approvals had been granted some time ago.
13. Ms. Quinn mentions that the National Register districts for downtown were all recommended and approved by the board and will be forwarded down to the Park Service in D. C. She also states that the City submitted for a CLG grant for money to conduct an architectural survey. The survey would be of planning areas on the North Side.
14. Ms. Ismail asks if this is part of the building condition survey.
15. Ms. Quinn says this would be step two of the process after the building condition survey. She states that the objective of all of these would be to update the City's database, since much of the data came from a PHLF survey done in 1984 and is outdated.

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn.

Mr. Jennings seconds.

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

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

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report – February 2013**

<b>Staff Approval</b>	<b>C of A Number</b>	<b>Date Issued</b>	<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Historic District</b>	<b>Work Approved</b>
Y	13-017	8-Feb-13	1300 Arch Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind façade repairs
N	13-018	11-Feb-13	1 Bedford Square	Individual	Installation of HVAC units
N	13-019	11-Feb-13	908 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Exterior renovations
N	13-020	11-Feb-13	921 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Installation of awnings, replacement of window glass
Y	13-021	11-Feb-13	226 Jacksonia Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind window replacement
N	13-022	27-Feb-13	945 Liberty Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Installation of public art work

**1 Bedford Square  
Southside Market House**

**Individual Landmark**

**Owner:**  
City of Pittsburgh  
414 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-202

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**  
Rick Avon  
100 East Swissvale Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15218

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 1/16/13

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of HVAC units.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Rick Avon steps to the podium; he is from Lami Grubb Architects and is representing the City of Pittsburgh which owns the property. He explains that the City is looking to add HVAC ventilation and air conditioning to the gymnasium on the second floor. In order to do that they need fresh air coming into the building and will need to install louvers. They are trying to have the least impact possible on the building, so what they are proposing is to install the louvers in the tops of the six arched windows at the rear of the building. They will be removing the glass and getting a custom louver to work within the existing sash and frame of the window. This will give the City an option to restore the windows in the future if necessary.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if they are only proposing louvers in the rear of the building.
  3. Mr. Avon says yes. He states that over time the building has had many holes put into it and louvers installed in various places. They are hoping to bring a little bit more uniformity to the back of the building.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks for clarification that they are just putting louvers in the top portions of the windows and not the entire window.
  5. Mr. Avon confirms this.
  6. Ms. McClellan asks if the one window that has a louver in the lower portion will remain that way.
  7. Mr. Avon says yes. He states that they are placing the new louvers on top because the HVAC units will be able to be mostly hidden and the units and ductwork will be able to cause the least disruption to the building's interior.
  8. The Commission members ask questions about the screen wall and condensers seen on the plans, but it is determined that those were approved by the Art Commission already, so the only thing that is before the HRC is the louvers.
- 
-

- 
- 
9. Mr. Serrao asks about colors.
  10. Mr. Avon says they will be matching the same color seen on the windows that have been replaced.
  11. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the application as submitted, with color to match existing window and trim color.
  13. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1111 Palo Alto Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

AK Redevelopment  
270 Meier Lane  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15223

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-P-28

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

AK Redevelopment  
270 Meier Lane  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15223

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/18/13

---

---

**National Register Status: Listed:**

**Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of portico awning and hand railing, replacement of post lights.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Matthew Bartlett steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He shows pictures of his building and states that he is looking to do work on the front façade. He is proposing to install an awning over the front entrance that is similar to the one at the YMCA on Monterey Street; it has a rounded aluminum frame and is anchored inside the framing with lag and shields. He also states that the lights on the front of the building are old and need to be replaced; he shows examples of lights from the neighborhood that would be similar to what he would be using. He also has a wooden gate that he would like to replace with a wrought iron gate that he made. He also states that there is currently no railing on the front stoop, so he would like to add a wrought iron railing on both sides.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks Ms. Quinn if these types of awnings have been approved before.
  3. Ms. Quinn says no, the Commission has denied them in other districts.
  4. Mr. Bartlett states that there are at least three awnings on Palo Alto Street.
  5. Mr. Hogan says they could have been approved prior to the historic district.
  6. Mr. Bartlett says they were recently put up. He says there are three square awnings on Palo Alto and more throughout the historic district.
  7. Mr. Hogan says the Commission has approved standard flat hanging awnings before, but the barrel or arched awnings are typically not approved.
  8. Mr. Bartlett says he could come back with pictures to show the other examples in the neighborhood. He says there was an awning on the building at one time but he does not have a picture of it.
  9. Mr. Hogan says that the rest of his treatment of the building is very appropriate. He asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the lights, railing, and gate. The awning is suspended until the applicant comes back with more evidence.
  11. Ms. McClellan seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**908 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

PMC Property Group  
915 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-94

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Sean Beasley  
Strada Architects  
925 Liberty Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/18/13

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Alteration of previously approved storefront elevation.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Sean Beasley from Strada Architecture steps to the podium. He states that the project had been previously approved on the condition that they would come back if they made any major changes based on what they found, and he is here to present those changes. After starting exploratory demolition of the front façade, they found that at some point the façade, especially the area around the front entrance, had been restructured. The masonry piers had been cut off at the top of the second floor and new steel columns were put in, and they don't feel that it would be worthwhile to take that all out, so they are trying to incorporate them into the façade. They will be providing a recessed entry on center, which will allow for one big open façade instead of four individual façades of glass. On the rear elevation, they found that they needed to have a door to provide egress, and also found they were required to bring everything down to ground level. This will result in two levels of shorter windows, with the rest of the rear façade as proposed.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if on the front elevation they are basically just not continuing the middle pier and if that element was missing anyways.
  3. Mr. Beasley states that none of these elements are existing; the whole façade from the third floor down had been removed during the renovation in the 1920's. The only difference between what was originally on the building and what they are doing is using a wood signboard instead of stone.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks what is going on behind the signboard.
  5. Mr. Beasley says that the signboard will be used to cover up where the steel beams are.
  6. Mr. Serrao asks about the columns on the façade.
  7. Mr. Beasley states that the columns are load bearing for the entire front façade excluding the side walls.
- 
-

- 
- 
8. Mr. Serrao asks about the heights of the first two floors.
  9. Mr. Beasley states that in the 1920's renovation they had taken the tall first floor and split it into two floors.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  11. Rebecca White, Director of Real Estate Development for the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, steps to the podium. She states that her organization is extremely pleased with the project and how they are approaching this historic building.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

13. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the application for the renovations and modifications as submitted, including both front and rear elevations.
  14. Ms. McClellan seconds.
  15. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**921 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

PMC Property Group  
915 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-154

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Sean Beasley  
Strada Architects  
925 Liberty Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/18/13

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Awning installation and replacement, replacement of second floor window glass with insulated glass.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Sean Beasley from Strada Architecture steps to the podium. He states that there are two things that they are asking for approval for on this project—the alteration of the large square windows on the second floor and the addition of awnings at two entrances. He says the windows in question consist of large panes of uninsulated tempered glass, and the both the owner and tenant would like to put in insulated glass. They are proposing to install a storefront system behind the original trim. The awning that they are proposing for the entrance to the residential area has the logo for the Penn Garrison apartments printed on it, which is smaller than what is allowed in the guidelines, and it will only project three feet onto the sidewalk which is smaller than the current awning. The retail entrance awning will have the same configuration except that it will fill the entire opening.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if they are fabric awnings.
  3. Mr. Beasley says yes.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks if they are just trying to go from plate glass to insulated glass.
  5. Mr. Beasley says yes. He states that on the residential entrance the same thing was done as part of the original renovation; a piece of insulated glass and a storefront frame was installed behind the existing frame.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks about the transoms.
  7. Mr. Beasley states that the transoms have insulated glass storm panels behind them already.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks if they can do a storm window on the windows in question also.
  9. Mr. Beasley says they are limited by the size of the panes which is why they are going with the storefront system.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

11. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the application as submitted.
  12. Mr. Jennings seconds.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**945 Liberty Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Bruno Bldg Limited Partnership  
945 Liberty Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-42

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

The Sprout Fund  
5423 Penn Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/13

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of illuminated public artwork.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Cathy Lewis Long steps to the podium; she is the executive director of the Sprout Fund. She introduces the project, stating that it is to be an illuminated public art installation on the upper west facing wall of the Bruno Building. She states that this project will be the largest for the Sprout Fund to date, and will serve as a capstone project after a decade of creating and promoting public art in the city. They held a national call for public artists with ties to the region, and chose these artists from a pool of 97 applicants. She states that the project is supported by many local foundations, and was guided by an advisory committee comprised of downtown stakeholders and art professionals. They also included community input as part of their process. Once the artwork was developed they sought and received an endorsement form the Cultural Trust and displayed a video of it to the public.
  2. Mr. Curt Gettman steps to the podium to speak about the project; he is the public art manager of the Sprout Fund. He states that the Bruno Building was selected as the site for this work for several reasons: it is in the Cultural District which is a natural space for public art, the owner is supportive of the project and supports historic preservation and the arts, it is structurally able to support the work as verified by structural engineers, and the height and visibility of this west facing wall lends itself to public art and is “above the fray” of signage and storefront. He shows photos of the district including other buildings and artwork. He shows a historic photo of the district, noting that historic photos and “ghost” signs on the building itself show that this wall has long been used for painted signage. He talks about the artwork, stating that it is part of the Cultural Trust’s public art plan which encourages light based works of art. It also continues a tradition of light based communication in the district, which used to be dominated by flashing incandescent and neon signs. The material for the work will be iLight, which is the LED successor to neon. The dimensions of the piece are 21 feet across and 23 feet high, which are slightly smaller than what was submitted in the application to take
- 
-

---

---

advantage of factory lengths of iLight. The work will illuminate in a sequence of abstract geometric patterns changing throughout the day and night. There will be four unique 15 minute compositions per hour. The artwork is in compliance with brightness regulations and can be dimmed if needed. It will be attached to the building by a surface mounted metal armature; it requires fewer points of attachment and is less damaging and more easily reversible than mounting the lighting directly onto the building would be. The holes will be drilled into the mortar to preserve the historic brick. The artwork is designed to be low maintenance and the components are replaceable; its life span will be 15 to 20 years by design, although it could remain longer if desired.

3. Ms. Lewis Long returns to the podium to speak about how they believe the project meets HRC guidelines. They believe the project should be considered a unique case, as the Penn-Liberty historic district guidelines do not explicitly address public art. She says that the section on signage is notable as it states that signs that move and flash will be favorably reviewed, likely due to the legacy of signage in the district as noted earlier. Although the artwork fits the spirit of that legacy, it is important to note the differences between the artwork and a sign. A sign contains commercial information, whereas this project does not have any commercial content and is purely a work of artistic expression. In the absence of any explicit guidelines, she states that they believe there are two questions which should guide review of the project: what is the direct physical impact of the installation on the building, and what is the overall effect of the artwork on the historic district as a whole? In response to the first question, she states that the artwork is designed to be minimally invasive as noted previously. As for the second question, she states that they are aware that it is not the HRC's role to judge the content of the artwork, but to protect the historic character of the district. Unlike brick and mortar alterations or additions, light is not permanent or substantial and it has no weight or dimension. The source of the light does, however, and they have already outlined how they will keep it minimally invasive. They believe that this wall is the perfect location for this artwork due to its height, sight lines, and long history of display.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks if the video of the artwork that the Commission viewed was in real time.
  5. Mr. Gettman says yes, what the artists are illustrating with the video is what the piece would be doing in real time at different times of the day. It would be slower during the daytime and more active in the evening.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks what the durations of the compositions will be.
  7. Mr. Gettman says there are four 15 minute compositions per hour.
  8. Ms. Quinn states that at the pre-application meeting, one of the concerns was that there were some elements of the design that could be interpreted as signage—for example, the Steelers logo. She asks if that has been changed.
  9. Ms. Lewis Long says yes, that has been changed. She states that what they were trying to show is that there are infinite possibilities with the technology, but with this piece the artists will design closed circuit sequences.
  10. Ms. Eve Picker steps to the podium; she is the owner of the Bruno Building. She wants to state for the record that it was a requirement for her that the artwork be a closed loop, and that they wouldn't be getting requests for logos or holiday
- 
-

---

---

symbols or anything like that.

11. Mr. Hogan states then, that if the Commission builds that closed loop requirement into the approval, it would not be a problem.
  12. Ms. Lewis Long says yes.
  13. Ms. Ismail states that she is also concerned about that, that the artwork should not be able to be interpreted as a sign, and that should be addressed in the approval. She is also concerned about the attachment to the building and that it should cause minimal damage.
  14. Mr. Hogan asks at how many points does the installation attach to the building.
  15. Mr. Gettman states that they are trying to make it as minimally invasive as possible, but it would require 15 to 20 holes.
  16. Mr. Douglas McDermott of Clearstory steps to the podium. He explains that the engineers are reviewing different attachment techniques. They have a few options that they are considering, but right now the drawings show a horizontal aluminum rail system that the piece could sit on, and if it was ever to be removed the rails could come down and the mortar holes could be filled and the joints repointed.
  17. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  18. Mr. Murray Horne steps to the podium; he is the arts curator for the Cultural Trust. He states that the Sprout Fund presented this project to their design review committee in January, and it was approved unanimously. They are very excited to have this project in the Cultural District to join the other light-based works. He speaks briefly about the nature of LEDs; he states that they have a constant glow and will “flow” rather than “flash”, and will be a little quieter and more muted than the digital rendering shows.
  19. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
  20. Ms. Ismail asks if it will be a problem to limit the brightness of the piece.
  21. Mr. Gettman states that the artists and engineers have been informed of the city guidelines on brightness and signage and will be complying with those, even though the artwork is not signage. He states that the piece is also fully controllable and can be dimmed if the need arises.
  22. Mr. Hogan states that the factors that distinguish the piece are the compositions; the Commission should move to approve with the understanding that there are four compositions per hour. He also states that it is larger at 483 square feet than the guidelines allow for signage, and that they need to require that the compositions are chosen and then frozen, so that it would not in any way be a public display for signage.
  23. Mr. Jennings is concerned about the animation and having too much flashing.
  24. Mr. Hogan doesn’t think that will be an issue based on what they have seen. He states that what the Commission has to be careful with in the code is to not approve any type of display sign; the piece is a work of art that will have a set composition.
  25. Ms. Lewis Long states that they would be very comfortable with an approval including a stipulation for the piece to be a closed system to be only designed by
- 
-

---

---

the artist. She wants to also point out that the four compositions per hour will not always be the same; at this point they are looking at 12 total compositions to be played throughout the day at four per hour.

26. Ms. McClellan asks if it will be a 24 hour display.

27. Ms. Lewis Long states that they will be looking for community input on that; they anticipate that some community stakeholders may request that the piece go to sleep or become very dim overnight.

28. Mr. Hogan agrees and states that the Commission shouldn't be too concerned about that; the main things they are looking at again are the attachments to the building and the differentiation from signage.

---

---

**Motion:**

29. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve the project based on the fact that the piece is not signage or advertising. It is an artistic composition and from time to time it may change; however at no time may it represent any identifiable cause, issue, or logo, and it shall never exceed more than four compositions in one hour. It also must conform to all other applicable city codes and ordinances including those regarding brightness.

30. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the application.

31. Mr. Jennings seconds.

32. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.

---

---

**700 Armandale Street**      *Mexican War Streets Historic District*

---

---

**Owner:**

Jessie Johnson  
7205 Mount Carmel Road  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15235

Ward: 25th

Lot and Block: 23-E-325

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Bureau of Building Inspection  
200 Ross Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 10/18/12

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Razing of structure to the ground.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Russell Blaich of BBI introduces the application. He states that the property owner is deceased, and family members have wanted nothing to do with the house. BBI has received complaints about it from several neighbors so now it is before the HRC.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if it is part of a row.
  3. Mr. Blaich says no, it is freestanding.
  4. Ms. Quinn mentions at one time the property was a senior care home.
  5. Mr. Blaich mentions that he has heard there are parties interested in purchasing the property.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks if it is sealed up.
  7. Mr. Blaich says that he can have Public Works seal it up, and also some neighbors were willing to seal it up.
  8. Mr. Hogan and Mr. Serrao state that, from the pictures, the property doesn't look too bad.
  9. Mr. Blaich says that the interior has some water damage, but overall the building is structurally sound.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  11. Mr. Brad Spencer steps to the podium; he lives across the street from the house. He has spoken to his neighbors and knows of only one that is for the demolition of this house; the rest are in favor of saving it and they request that the city board up the house and secure it. The neighbors are even willing to step in and board it up. He also mentions that this house predates the row house neighborhood of the Mexican War Streets; it is the largest and only remaining estate house of the four or five that existed at the far end of the War Streets.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks how many neighbors he has spoken to that are in favor of saving
- 
-

---

---

the house.

13. Mr. Spencer states that he has talked to six neighbors and they are all in favor.
14. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment.
15. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is a local architect in favor of saving the house. He was able to go through the house and feels that it is solid, from foundation to roof. He states that the outriggers and box gutters are damaged and make the building look bad, but they could be easily repaired. He also says that architectural details of the period are still present on the inside. He presents a copy of an 1872 map that shows the house before all the row houses on the upper part of Buena Vista were built. He also shows some pictures of the inside of the front structure; the rear wing is a later addition and in worse condition. He mentions that the neighbors have located an address for family members of the deceased owners and have sent a letter to them expressing interest in buying the property.
16. Mr. Serrao asks if he thinks it is a safety hazard at all.
17. Mr. Baumbach states that he does not think there is a safety hazard except for perhaps the box gutters.
18. Mr. Blaiich states that the sidewalk is right underneath the box gutters.

---

---

**Motion:**

1. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the proposed demolition.
  2. Ms. McClellan seconds.
  3. Mr. Jennings adds that if any other structural problems are found, it may have to come back to Commission.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-