



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 March 6, 2013
 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>	
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	Jonathan Daniel	Erin Candee
Linda McClellan	Sharon Spooner	Lee Spangler	Jenna Briasco
John Jennings		Carol Kowall	Joseph Poor
Ernie Hogan		Dan Wintermantel	Amy Tiernan
		Renee Dupree	Danielle Doubet
		Susan Warner	Robert Iland
		Drew Sheldon	John Grant
		Bob Baumbach	Todd Kilgore
		Barrett Reiter	Robert Loos
		Sarah Medeeley	Russell Blaich
		Angelique Bamberg	Rebecca White
		Jim Smith	Quentin Brown
		Mary Liu	Rachel Kauffman
		Kaley Kilpatrick	Jeff Saul
		Kieran Moyle	

Old Business—None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the February minutes, Mr. Jennings motions to approve and Ms. McClellan seconds; all members vote in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the February 2013 Certificates of Appropriateness, Ms. Ismail motions to approve and Mr. Jennings seconds; all members vote in favor.

Other:

1. Ms. Quinn states that the legislation for the Mexican War Streets expansion has been forwarded to City Council. She also mentions that the CLG grant and the Keystone grant have been submitted for money to conduct an architectural inventory and update the database for PreservePGH. She talks about the window issue at 1102 W. North Avenue. The owner was taken to court and the judge ordered him to go back to the HRC; he was given six months to do so. She also states that she hasn't heard anything from the Iron City Brewery lately.
2. Mr. Jennings states that they are planning on having an event over the summer, and BBI will need an engineer's report from them on the safety of the site and the buildings.

3. Mr. Hogan asks if BBI has any contact information for the owners of 700 Armandale Street; Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation is interested in helping the neighborhood buy it.
4. Mr. Jennings says he will check.
5. Ms. Quinn states that Lee Bruder had contacted the owners and said they were not interested in selling it, but she doesn't know anything for sure.
6. Mr. Hogan asks what the next step is for PreservePGH.
7. Ms. Ismail says that it was approved by Planning Commission. At this point there is a lot going on such as work on the guidelines and the economic study, and organizations like PHLF continue to do their work, but there is still the issue of a lack of funding. At one point the URA was planning to have a fund for rehab and preservation that communities could tap into, but that is no longer the case.

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.

1304 E. Carson Street East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Renee Dupree
1304 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-33

Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:

Renee Dupree
1304 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 2/7/13

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Restoration of first floor storefront.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Renee Dupree steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She is looking to restore the façade of her building, in particular the first floor storefront. She did some restoration work on the upper floors when she purchased the building years ago, but kept the first floor as it was. Recently when she was doing some work on the inside of her building she came across evidence that the storefront is not in its original configuration, but had been remodeled possibly in the 1960's or earlier. She shows a picture of the entrance of the building where she had removed a dropped ceiling and exposed the original woodwork. She shows the track for the original windows; the current windows were attached in a different configuration to the dropped ceiling, leaving a six inch gap between the top of the windows and the woodwork. She would like to install new windows and a door in the original historic location. She also explains that when she removed a dropped ceiling from the inside of the first floor, she found more original woodwork that had been damaged to install lighting. She plans to repair and stain it to match. She also uncovered the original leaded glass transom, which is still covered on the outside. She would like to reveal and restore the transom. She shows pictures of the cement footer on the storefront that will need to be reset to its proper location. She explains that the only thing she is unsure what to do with is the hallway door—it is on her property but the bar next door also uses it as a fire exit, and she is not sure what kind of door the fire code requires.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification if the business next door has access to the door that is on her property.
 3. Ms. Dupree says yes, the owner asked her permission to make an opening into her hallway to be able to access that door, since he wanted to use his second floor and needed an exit.
 4. Mr. Jennings says that is illegal and they may have to have a conversation about that with the business.
-
-

-
-
5. Ms. Dupree states that in other buildings on the Southside with similar setups, the door would be considered a common fire hallway and means of egress.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that it is not technically a fire exit as it was originally an entrance to her second floor.
 7. Ms. Dupree states that it currently meets all fire codes for both buildings.
 8. Mr. Jennings says that it will be looked into but not as part of today's discussion. It is not in the HRC's privy.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks if she is looking to reconstruct the storefront with a wood frame and Thermopane glass.
 10. Ms. Dupree says yes. She does need advice about the doors though.
 11. Mr. Hogan states that she is fortunate that there is still so much of the original material to work with. He notes on her drawing that her building probably originally mirrored the building next door with the corbelling and plank going all the way up.
 12. Ms. Dupree states that her building matches the one on the other side more closely. She shows where the historic large marquee was attached to the building. She states that she doesn't know what is under some of the materials covering the storefront but once she removes them she will be able to proceed better.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks if the tile on her drawing is existing or no.
 14. Ms. Dupree says it does exist but it is in a state of disrepair. She shows a sample of the tile she plans to replace it with, as well as samples of her other materials.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

16. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve replacement of the existing storefront with a wooden storefront to replicate the historic configuration. Mr. Hogan asks for Mr. Jennings' opinion on the side fire door, stating that in most cases it probably would have been a glass door.
 17. Mr. Jennings says that they have to look at a few things with that door. If her building is not to have occupancy on the upper floors, then it will not be a means of egress for her, but they will still have to look at the shared issue. He suggests that she work with staff on the door.
 18. Mr. Hogan outlines the restoration to be approved: restoration of the coffered ceiling, replacement of the original bowed front storefront in wood, with wood doors and glazing, exposure of the leaded glass transom, and installation of the porcelain non glazed hexagonal tile for the apron.
 19. Mr. Jennings motions to approve as submitted, with modifications to the side pilasters to match adjacent properties, and all colors and changes to side door to be approved by staff.
 20. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 21. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1221 Monterey Street *Mexican War Streets Historic District*

Owner:

Guy & Michele VanDoren
88 Riberia Street, Ste. 400
St. Augustine, Fl 32084

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-280

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/15/13

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

Proposed Changes: Conversion of rear property into garage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains that the owners' lot has two houses on it—one facing Monterey Street and one that faces Mimosa Way. The main house in the front is an 1870's Italianate Victorian, but the alley-facing house is a more modest, two and a half story wood-frame house that is currently vacant. The owners would like to have parking in the back yard while retaining this structure; on the alley there is a lot of parking and only a few houses remaining. The solution they came up with is to keep the house but take out the front door and windows and install a garage. The living quarters would be on the story and a half above the garage. They are proposing a paneled garage door to be twelve feet wide and nine feet high. The project would involve filling in the basement and taking out the floor in one section, but they would keep everything on the upper floors in place. They are also proposing to re-side the building with Hardie siding, and they will be using a dark gray shingle on the roof. They will restore the dormer and replace the windows with wooden double-hung one-over-one windows. He states that, according to the district guidelines, the location and materials are appropriate for a garage. The form and size may not exactly follow the guidelines for a garage, just because they are working with a house.
 2. Mr. Jennings asks what the area above the garage will be used for.
 3. Mr. Baumbach says they are keeping it as residential.
 4. Mr. Hogan mentions that the house next door has a similar setup, although the treatment is less appropriate than the one they are proposing.
 5. Mr. Baumbach says that yes, it is a precedent for what they are proposing, although it is a brick structure and they have used a more suburban style garage door.
 6. Mr. Hogan notes that they are calling for a much higher door.
 7. Mr. Baumbach says yes, they are looking for a taller proportion for the door to
-
-

better fit the historic guidelines.

8. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any questions from the Commission.
9. Mr. Jennings asks about the light fixtures, and if it might be more appropriate to use coach lamps rather than the globes.
10. Mr. Hogan says that coach lamps wouldn't have been used historically either.
11. Mr. Baumbach states that they will look for something appropriate to the period of the 1910's or 20's.
12. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

13. Mr. Hogan states that they may want to use the alley address in the approval.
 14. Mr. Baumbach says when the property is looked up in Zoning, the alley address does not exist, only the main house address does.
 15. Mr. Jennings advises that for permitting reasons, they may want to keep everything under the main house address—1221 Monterey Street—and add AKA 1222 Mimosa Way. The Commission decides to go with this.
 16. Mr. Jennings motions to approve as submitted, with all finishes to be approved by staff.
 17. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1521 Monterey Street *Mexican War Streets Historic District*

Owner:

Robert Sendall
1517 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 25th

Lot and Block: 23-E-268

Inspector: Jim King

Applicant:

Daniel Wintermantel & Leslie Vincen
1523 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/4/13

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

Proposed Changes: Building rehab and garage construction.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Daniel Wintermantel steps to the podium; he has lived next door to the property for 13 years and it has been vacant the whole time. They finally figured out a way to save it, right before it was before the Commission to be demolished; what they intend to do is remove everything they can't afford. He states that the façade is in fairly good shape except for some of the wooden parts, which they intend to replace in-kind. They also plan to replace the door on the right hand side with a panel and stationary glass. The windows will be replaced in-kind with Marvin windows; they are requesting to use metal clad on the outside and wood on the inside just for maintenance. He states that the brick is in good shape and doesn't need to be repointed, they just plan to clean it.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if they are eliminating the second door on the front because the building will be converted to a single dwelling.
 3. Mr. Wintermantel says that is correct. He shows the drawings of what they plan to do with the rest of the building. They plan to partially demolish the parts of the third and second floors that they can't afford to rehab. They will leave twelve feet of wall to form a courtyard. They plan to move the back about five feet in from the alley to put a garage in. The back of the building will be largely glass.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that it looks like they will be keeping the existing exterior walls at least on the first level.
 5. Mr. Wintermantel says yes, they will actually be keeping the existing exterior walls throughout the building.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if the building is three stories all the way back.
 7. Mr. Wintermantel says yes.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks about the roof deck. He states that it looks like they are trying to place it off the parapet.
 9. Mr. Wintermantel notes that they have changed the stairway to the roof deck and
-
-

will be keeping a wall as protection for it. He states that the parapet is existing and is one and a half or two feet, and they will install a rail around the impacted areas.

10. Mr. Hogan states that they are asking for approval for partial demolition to bring the building down to an economically feasible footprint for restoration, and that otherwise the building may be lost.
11. Mr. Wintermantel says yes, this is the only feasible solution so far. He says that the renovated building will be 2400 square feet.
12. Mr. Hogan says that his concern is with the roof deck and that they are installing a railing that looks like it would be visible from the street.
13. Mr. Wintermantel says that the drawing is preliminary and that they will be shrinking the roof deck and pulling it back. They will probably use an iron rail and install it inside the parapet rather than on top, as the building has ceramic tiles on top which they are going to save.
14. Mr. Hogan asks about the door. They have a four paneled vertical door in the drawing which he is not sure is appropriate.
15. Mr. Wintermantel asks if there should be a glass component in the door.
16. Mr. Hogan says that would probably work better.
17. Mr. Wintermantel says the current doors are not set back into the woodwork, they are flush with the storefront and he is not sure how old they are.
18. Mr. Hogan states they seem to be fairly old, maybe from the 20's.
19. Mr. Wintermantel asks if the metal clad wooden windows will be appropriate.
20. Mr. Hogan says they are fine for the rear, but for the front the guidelines require wood.
21. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
22. Mr. Hogan talks about the garage door and that he does understand the contemporary look, as the back of the house will have a contemporary feel versus the historic front façade.
23. Mr. Wintermantel states that he chose that garage door as it was the only one that didn't seem too "country house" or "suburban" style.

Motion:

24. Mr. Jennings motions to approve as submitted, with all colors, finishes, and changes to the door to be approved by staff, and with the modification that the deck be set back at least eight feet from the front of the building with the railing to be mounted directly to the deck.
 25. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1513 Wolpert Way

Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Robert Sendall
1520 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 25th

Lot and Block: 23-J-33

Inspector: Jim King

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/15/13

Applicant:

Robert Sendall
1520 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

National Register Status: Listed:

Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Garage construction.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Susan Warner steps to the podium; she is representing the owner who could not attend. She states that the owner has an alley house on his property that is condemned and is due to be taken down by the city in April. Since the property is in the proposed expansion district they are now before the Commission to make sure it is permissible to demolish the house and construct a garage in its place. The adjoining property is in the process of closing, and the new owners want to do something similar there as well. She states that the proposed garage would be a one story, one car garage with a flat roof and a small work area in back.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that from the materials it looks like the existing alley house has a joint marriage wall.
 3. Ms. Warner says it does. She shows pictures of the alley, including several existing one story garages.
 4. Mr. Jennings asks if they have applied for a demolition permit.
 5. Ms. Warner states that the building is already condemned, and when they tried to apply for permits they were directed to go through historic review first.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if she knows at all what the new neighbors are planning on doing.
 7. Ms. Warner states that they are looking to consolidate this alley house with several other lots that they already own. They assumed that the alley house would be torn down as it is also condemned.
 8. Mr. Hogan says that it looks like the alley houses are brick.
 9. Ms. Warner says yes, and they are both condemned.
 10. Ms. Quinn asks Mr. Russell Blaich from BBI to take a look at the pictures.
 11. Mr. Blaich says that he has not been inside these houses, but confirms that they are condemned.
-
-

-
-
12. Mr. Hogan says they also seem to be bowing out on the alley side. He asks to see Ms. Warner's sketch of the proposed garage.
 13. Ms. Warner says it is just a preliminary drawing. She also states that they will have to go through Zoning for an exception as they are limited in the size of what they can build on the site.
 14. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks if it will be a wood frame garage.
 16. Ms. Warner says they were hoping to do a masonry party wall with the new neighbors' proposed structure, with the rest of the garage being wood frame with Hardie siding. They will conform to the height requirements for garages to keep everything level while still letting light into the yards.
 17. Mr. Hogan says they might want to build on the higher side to keep the proportions since the lots are so narrow. He states that his feeling on this is that the alley houses were a function of the neighborhood at one point, but now with the city's population decrease the houses don't add much to the district from a form or function standpoint.
 18. Mr. Jennings says he doesn't have a problem with it either as the buildings are already condemned.
 19. Ms. Warner states that both the owners are design sensitive and want to complement each other's designs.
 20. Mr. Hogan states that they will need to have their final design vetted.
 21. Ms. Warner says they will, they just weren't sure if they would be able to tear down the houses or if they would have to keep them and work from there.
 22. Ms. Quinn mentions that they may want to consider recycling some of the materials from the houses.
 23. Ms. Warner says they will consider it.

Motion:

24. Mr. Jennings motions to approve the demolition of the condemned masonry structure to make way for the garage construction, with all finishes, final design, and color selections to be approved by staff.
 25. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

960 Penn Avenue

Penn-Liberty Historic District

Owner:

Golden Triangle Mgmt Acceptance Co.
960 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-122

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Adam DeSimone
960 Penn LLC
1511 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 2/14/13

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jim Smith steps to the podium; he is with Design 4 Studio, the designers for the project. He also introduces Adam DeSimone, the owner of the restaurant that will occupy the space. He explains the project, stating that the building is an office building, with the ground floor having been occupied by a day care center until recently. They plan to put a restaurant in this space on the ground floor. They will not be changing any of the brickwork on the building, they will just be replacing window systems, including installation of an operable window system in the front bar area. The operable systems will be NanaWall systems and the fixed windows will be standard storefront Conair windows. The doors will also be Conair; the main entrance doors will stay in their existing position with just the doors being replaced. Along Penn Avenue there are three existing bays for the windows, and they are planning on putting operable systems in each bay. Along 10th Street, they have two bays where they would like to place operable systems. The other windows will open, but they will have a sill on them. He says that from the outside, all the windows will have a uniform appearance despite the different functions. He also explains that between the windows and the transoms there is a structural piece on which they would like to place fixed, low profile awnings. He mentions that they took the project to the Paris-to-Pittsburgh group, and they approve the look and design.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the transoms. He notes that the drawings show that they are going from two to three transoms, and the renderings show going from two to six transoms.
 3. Mr. Smith explains that they are limited by the dimensions of the window systems. He mentions that the windows are a maximum of eight feet tall, and above that they added the mullions. He also mentions that they want to keep the symmetry in the window systems, but are limited by the available widths.
 4. Mr. Hogan mentions that there are still some differences between the drawings and the renderings as far as how many windows, doors, and transoms there will be
-
-

going across.

5. Mr. Smith states that because of the width limitation of 36 inches, if they broke each bay into four divisions instead of five the divisions would be too large. They had discussed adding a mullion to cut down on the width.
6. Mr. Hogan says they would be then carrying the mullion from the upper windows down through the center to maintain the symmetry. He doesn't think, though, that the upper windows were original.
7. Mr. Smith says no, they were changed in 1990.
8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
9. Ms. Rebecca White with the Cultural Trust steps to the podium. She states that they are in support of the project and hopes that a solution can be found on the design.
10. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none. He asks the applicants if they would have a problem getting to a four door system and having a six foot opening on either side of the mullion instead of a full open.
11. Mr. DeSimone says they wouldn't prefer it, but they will do what they need to do. He can also try to work with the manufacturer to get a product that will allow four divisions.
12. Mr. Hogan states there may be a problem in matching the first floor to the upper floors in case they ever go to change those. He feels that the applicants have done a good job, but he is concerned about the rhythm of the storefront.
13. Mr. Smith mentions that they could add to each side instead.
14. Mr. Hogan says that would be altering the openings which would be more problematic. He asks the applicants about the awnings.
15. Ms. Quinn mentions that they just can't be attached to historic materials or have signage on the front of them.
16. They applicants state they will be cloth with no signage, and they will be attached to new materials.

Motion:

17. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve, for the 10th Street façade, construction within existing openings of a standard storefront system. First two bays to consist of NanaWalls to grade, with four transoms above. Remaining four bays to consist of four windows each, with four transoms above and spandrel glass below to grade, with colors to match existing upper floors. For the Penn Avenue façade, he entertains a motion to approve construction within existing openings of a standard storefront system with two transoms and three doors per bay and color to match existing upper floors.
 18. Mr. Jennings motions to approve.
 19. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

3990 Fifth Avenue *Oakland Civic Center Historic District*

Owner:

University of Pittsburgh/Park Rankin
3400 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15260

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-C-23

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Jason Franklin
Strada Architecture LLC
925 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/15/13

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jason Franklin with Strada Architecture steps to the podium. He explains that they are looking to swap out the existing storefront with a new bronze storefront to match the building next door that was recently approved by the HRC. They are also looking to replace the granite base, which is in disrepair. He says that the building currently houses a bank and will also house a bakery in the near future. They will also be applying for signage.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

3. Mr. Jennings motions to approve the application as submitted, with staff approval of finishes and colors.
 4. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

4360 Centre Avenue

Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:

Marion Lee Spangler
4360 Centre Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-89

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Jonathan Daniel
4360 Centre Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/15/13

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After the fact refenestration.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jonathan Daniel and Mr. Lee Spangler step to the podium; they are the owners of the property. Mr. Daniel shows pictures and gives some background on their prior application from May 2012. He states that the garden wall had been deteriorating and they were looking to fix it as well as widen the driveway, change some windows, and close up a door. During construction, they discovered that the wall in which they wanted to change the windows was load bearing, and the span of four windows that they had proposed was not going to be possible. He shows pictures of what they ended up doing, which was installing a span of three windows and then a separate fourth window in place of the door that was closed up. This new double paned window is meant to match an existing single pane window with a projecting storm window on the opposite side of the span of windows. They have not had a chance to trim out the windows or paint the brick. He states that a neighbor had a concern that the glass in one window is slightly larger than in the other, so when they do trim the window they will do it in a way that will make the windows match.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if the previously existing window is a single window.
 3. Mr. Daniel says yes, it is a single, wooden, in-swing window, and has a single piece of glass. He states that the new window does not have a sill yet and they can build it in to match. He states the differences between the two windows are quite minor.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if they can try and replicate the other window as best they can.
 5. Mr. Daniel says yes. He states that they were also looking for approval today to replace some additional windows in-kind. He shows pictures of the windows.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 7. Mr. Bob Island steps to the podium; he is a neighbor. He shows pictures of the after-the-fact window and the one that they are matching it to. He states that the existing window is somewhat recessed but much smaller than the new one. He also
-
-

says that the glass is much higher in the new window, and because the existing window has a storm window it is much farther forward than the new window.

8. Mr. Hogan states that the new window is a brick higher than the existing window and asks the applicants why they did it that way.
 9. Mr. Daniel states that they had not noticed it. He says they just didn't want to have the area completely bricked up which is why they went with the window. He also presents a letter of support for their project from architect Keith Cochran as well as a passage from the 1982 historic designation for the district. The passage talks about the fact that Fairfield Lane is the architectural front for these houses, and the Centre Avenue façades were technically the service areas and thus include a lot of asymmetry already in their designs.
 10. Mr. Island states that there are a few other issues that came out of the hearing from last year. He says that the part of the wall that was reconstructed on Centre Avenue was not done as approved and part of the wall did not get put back. He shows pictures to the Commission. He says that the wall that runs along the driveway was built too low and enables service doors and meters to be seen that were hidden before. He says they also installed an unapproved address plaque.
 11. Mr. Daniel says that they own a corner lot next door and were trying to establish a visual link with it. He states that from his research on the district, he found that when each home was built, the brick wall was built with it. When they widened the driveway, there was a small section of wall to the left of the driveway that visually didn't fit in. It was intended to be attached to a longer wall for a next-door house that was never built. They wanted to create a visually pleasing link with the lot at grade instead of having a massive single post that which would look out of place and could be knocked over.
 12. Mr. Hogan says that the wall was originally a higher wall that encased the entire parking area.
 13. Mr. Daniel says yes, but to the left it stops.
 14. Mr. Hogan says that originally there was a wall there.
 15. Mr. Daniel says there was never a wall next door.
 16. Ms. McClellan clarifies that Mr. Hogan is saying there was a wall surrounding the driveway; they are not concerned about the adjoining property.
 17. Mr. Hogan points out the wall in question. He says that the HRC had granted approval for the walls on either side of the driveway to be taken out and moved and for one wall to be shortened. He asks if what Mr. Island is objecting to is the height of the retaining wall.
 18. Mr. Island says the problem is really the height of the pier.
 19. Mr. Hogan says the pier height should mimic the other side of the wall that is across the driveway.
 20. Mr. Island says they indicated they would raise the height of the pier but never did.
 21. Mr. Daniel says they gave no indication of the height in their plans. He states that they do have the best interests of the property in mind.
 22. Mr. Island states that he has one other issue. They have installed a salt mercury
-
-

vapor lamp on the side of the house that was not approved.

23. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment.
24. Ms. Carol Cowall steps to the podium; she is a neighbor. She was part of the neighborhood group that worked on changes to the Islamic Center. There were major changes made in that case but they worked hard to reach a compromise. She states that the neighborhood is very concerned about keeping what they have, but that compromise and practicality should be considered. She says that the window change that was made on the project does not represent a significant change to the building's identity, and once they frame it out it will not be noticeable. The wall height may have to be adjusted, but she states that her overall feeling is that the improvements on the property have been wonderful, and she feels that the neighborhood as a whole also shares this view. She is confident that a successful solution can be found that the neighborhood can support.
25. Ms. Stephanie Spaulding steps to the podium; she is also a neighbor. She states that she has had a good relationship with the applicants and believes their improvements have been fantastic. She is concerned about the short pillar on the wall, which she can see when looking down from her property. She says that the walls on the street are all the same height until you get to this pillar. She also states that the plaque that they installed on the wall is the only one on the street. Other than that she says all the other work they have done is splendid.
26. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none. He states that he thinks once they frame out and paint the window it will blend in and be appropriate. He asks if there is a willingness on the part of the applicants to look at the pier.
27. Mr. Daniel says yes, but they were worried that it standing alone, even though it matches the height of the other wall, would not look right.
28. Mr. Jennings states that the Commission needs to look at what is on the application today, and the other matters will go to BBI if they were done differently than what was approved and are not corrected. This would include the pier, the plaque, and the lighting for the side yard.
29. Mr. Daniel asks if they can start work on correcting those issues.
30. Mr. Hogan says yes, as long as they correct everything according to what was originally approved.

Motion:

31. Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the window that was installed after-the-fact, with trim work to be done to match the existing window. Also approved are in-kind replacement of additional windows as submitted.
 32. Ms. Ismail seconds.
 33. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Certificates of Appropriateness Report – March 2013

Staff Approval	C of A Number	Date Issued	Application Address	Historic District	Work Approved
Y	13-023	1-Mar-13	941 Liberty Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Façade renovations
N	13-024	8-Mar-13	4360 Centre Avenue	Schenley Farms	After the fact refenestration
N	13-025	12-Mar-13	1304 E. Carson Street	East Carson Street	Storefront restoration
N	13-026	12-Mar-13	1221 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	Conversion of rear property into garage
N	13-027	12-Mar-13	1521 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	3 Story rehab and garage construction
N	13-028	12-Mar-13	1513 Wolpert Way	Mexican War Streets	Garage construction
N	13-029	12-Mar-13	3990 Fifth Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	Façade renovations, window alterations
N	13-030	12-Mar-13	108 Leduc Way	Mexican War Streets	Demolition to grade
N	13-031	12-Mar-13	960 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Façade renovations
Y	13-032	18-Mar-13	1100 E. Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage

Y	13-033	20-Mar-13	939 Western Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind window replacement
Y	13-034	27-Mar-13	2017 E. Carson Street	East Carson Street	In-kind window replacement