Minutes of the Meeting of July 11, 2012
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noor Ismail</td>
<td>Sarah Quinn</td>
<td>John Radelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jennings</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda McClelland</td>
<td>Matt Brind'Amour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Serrao</td>
<td>Josh Ebaugh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Hogan</td>
<td>Ken Holmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Loos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Sturiale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dino Bagatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Frank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seth Ganley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Yauger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jay Vetere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drew Chelsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Indovina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David McLean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristal Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaz McAllen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Palcic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Heinzl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business - None

New Business

Approval of Minutes: No minutes were available for approval. Mr. Serrao states that they will be reviewed at next month’s meeting.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the June 2012 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Jennings makes a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness report from June 2012, Ms. McClelland Seconds, all members voted in favor.

Other:
1. Mr. Serrao asks if there are any updates regarding the St. Nicholas case.
2. Ms. Quinn indicates that she has not heard anything specific about it. She indicated that she spoke with the legal department earlier today and they had nothing to report.
3. Mr. Jennings says that there was another report to building inspection that someone was removing stained glass panels from the church again. He indicated that their project chief went out and looked at it again and the building is “buttoned up tight” and he didn’t see anything else missing, so we’re not sure where the complaint came from.

Adjourn:

Ms. McClellan motions to adjourn.
Mr. Jennings seconds.
All members voted in favor.
Motion passes.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.
**One Step Program**

Richard Meritzer, City of Pittsburgh ADA Planner,
 applicant

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Meritzer briefly thanked the commission for the opportunity to present the program and introduced his intern, Amaris Whittaker, as the one who would give the presentation for the program.

2. Ms. Whittaker described the program as a way to facilitate ADA compliance for small businesses by streamlining the City review process for “One-Step” projects.

3. Ms. Whittaker described the legal requirements related to the ADA Act and provided photos of examples of appropriate applications.

4. She discussed the uniqueness of the program and what was to be included in the packet for the applicants.

5. She explained that there was an understanding that the historical nature of the façade was important and that they weren’t asking for exemption from review.

6. She explained that they sought the Commission’s approval to allow over-the-counter approval for “One Step” projects to streamline the permitting process.

7. At this time, Mr. Serrao asked for public comment.

8. Ms. Lucy Spruill provided some background on the importance of complying with the ADA and said that she wholeheartedly supported the program.

9. Ms. Ismail indicated that when the Planning Department requested permission from City Council to waive the review fees for the “One Step” program, there was unanimous approval.

10. Mr. Serrao asked the Commission if there was a motion.

**Motion:**

11. Mr. Jennings made the motion that the Commission approves the request to allow Staff to make over-the-counter approvals for the “One-Step” projects.

12. Ms. Ismail seconded the motion

13. All members voted to approve the motion

14. Motion passes
**415 Avery Street**

**Deutschtown Historic District**

**Owner:**
Lisa Sturiale  
415 Avery Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

**Ward:** 23rd

**Lot and Block:** 8-D-180-17

**Inspector:** Bill Kelley

**Applicant:**
SureGreen Construction  
12300 Perrytown, Suite 211  
Wexford, Pa 15090

**Council District:** 1st

**Application Received:** 6/4/12

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

**Proposed Changes:** After-the-fact installation of a new door and glass block windows

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Quinn handed out to the Commissioners the written comments provided by Mr. Kyrazi regarding the project.

2. Mr. Frank of Shipley Brothers Construction introduced himself and explained what was done for the project and that their main impetus the glass block basement window infill and installing the new door was the safety of the resident. He stated that they had received a notice from BBI because their permit included interior work only. He said that repairing the door and the window that you really can’t see from the street. One of the neighbors notified BBI and BBI issued a citation. The door that was in place was both glass and paneled. The new door is very similar. He said that he had contacted the HOA and were told the project was fine and we proceeded with the project based on that. They are looking to get back on track and need to know what to do next.

3. Mr. Frank indicates that he has reviewed the guidelines and feels that his project falls within them.

4. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any questions from the Commission.

5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He enters into the record the written comments submitted by Mr. Kyriazi.

6. Mr. Hogan described the doors that are in place in the other units.

7. Mr. Hogan indicated that the other properties within the townhouse row had glass block that was below grade and that the glass block for this property was too visible, even with the current landscaping.

8. Ms. Sturiale indicated that the style of door was chosen to allow additional light into the entryway and that the previous door had a large glass pane in it.
9. Ms. Sturiale indicated that she was concerned that someone could just punch in the window and reach the locks on her door. She feels that this style of door is better for her safety.

10. Mr. Hogan explains that even though the HOA has their own rules, the property in question is within a City historic district and there are approvals required because of that. He states that if they had been indicated that they were going to be doing external work on their building, they would have been required to come before the Commission anyway. It's important to replace items with “like kind” and it's clear about basement windows and the windows on the fronts of buildings. Both items are contrary to the historic guidelines and there are specifics about safety items.

11. Mr. Frank indicates that there are other glass block windows on the street.

12. Mr. Hogan says that they are not visible.

13. Ms. Sturiale indicates that her unit is across the street from a parking lot for a funeral home.

14. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

15. The Commissioners discuss the existence of foliage in front of the windows.

16. Ms. Quinn asks the applicant if they plan to paint the door.

17. Mr. Frank says yes, the HOA has approved a color.

18. Mr. Hogan asks for consideration of the door, but denial of the glass block windows.

19. Mr. Franks ask is he could install a piece of smoked glass over the glass block, if that would be acceptable.

20. Mr. Hogan states that smoked glass is not allowable in a historic district.

Motion:

21. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the after-the-fact installation of the door with the appropriately selected paint, and deny the installation of the glass block window, and have the applicant submit a remedy to Staff.

22. Mr. Jennings seconds

23. All members voted to approve the motion.

24. Motion passes
1500 Bingham Street

Owner: 1500 Bingham Partners, LLC
1500 Bingham Partners, LLC
223 Fourth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Applicant: Permier Architecture
1273 Washington Pike, No 202
Bridgeville, Pa 15017

Ward: 17th
Lot and Block: 3-H-99
Inspector: Pat Brown
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 6/21/12

National Register Status:
Proposed Changes: Renovation and construction of an additional floor.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Justin Cipriani introduces himself and says that he is with Cipriani Studios. He provides the hard copies of the application materials to the Commissioner. He says that he was retained several months ago to work on the project. It is an existing garage and warehouse on the corner of Bingham and 15th.

2. He says that the goal of the project is to rehab the existing shell and add two units above for residential units. There are garage doors on the bottom floor and windows on the second floor. Flanking is McCool’s on East Carson Street. They did communicate with the Southside LDC as well as the LRC to get a sense of how they saw the project fitting into the neighborhood.

3. He says that the design strategy relates to the massing. They tried to keep the large portion of the massing toward the bigger building. A project similar to this done by another firm was approved last year.

4. He says it will be hard to match the existing brick so we want to use a similar toned panel product on the upper stories. The windows will have a dark bronze finish and the panels will match the existing brick.

5. Mr. Hogan asks if they are using cement board with rain wall.

6. Mr. Cipriani says that they are going to use some kind of a paneled product.

7. Mr. Hogan asks what the plan is with the brick.

8. Mr. Cipriani says that they will probably take off the top two feet of the parapet but it’s mostly in good condition.

9. Mr. Serrao indicated that sand blasting is unacceptable.
10. Mr. Hogan asks for an explanation of the corner window.

11. They took out the middle of the building – the patio space – it was just a way to keep it private.

12. Mr. Hogan says that the window is tough for the district. He asks what the reason is for using the proposed windows rather than something more appropriate.

13. Mr. Cipriani says it is to match a true pane.

14. Mr. Hogan says that there may have been a warehouse window there.

15. Mr. Cipriani says that McCool’s was a good example.

16. Mr. Hogan asks, so you’re not proposing to keep these industrial windows?

17. Mr. Cipriani says that they will need to replace them for energy efficiency and tried to match them with a more conventional design.

18. Mr. Hogan says you’re changing the building though.

19. Mr. Cipriani states that they considered that but as they got into the design of the upper story, they wanted it to look like one entire building rather than an old building with a new addition.

20. Mr. Hogan asks about the proposal to try to tie the colors together.

21. Mr. Cipriani says that they just want to match the tone of the brick.

22. Mr. Hogan states that they are trying to make the building too homogeneous and it starts to compete with the original building

23. Mr. Cipriani states that they were trying to weave the historic and modern together.

24. Mr. Serrao says that from the third floor up, he agrees with the chairman – in particular about that one window that it out of context.

25. Mr. Cipriani says it is too stark?

26. Mr. Serrao says that you are adding element upon element upon element. He says that he disagrees with the loft. The idea that there is an old building and it is perfectly satisfactory to see a nice modern addition on the top of the building – that it makes it even better.

27. Mr. Cipriani asks if changing the corner window to match some of the other windows would be acceptable.

28. Mr. Serrao says that he is not dead set against the window he selected, but that this is not a restoration but a renovation and they should recognize what was there and what is new and that the guidelines indicate such. He says he likes what they’re doing from the roof-line up, but the one window seems like it’s out of character.

29. Mr. Cipriani says that they can make that fit in a bit better.

30. Mr. Serrao asks if they have looked at just replacing the warehouse windows with a modern window but a more true to style design.

31. Mr. Cipriani says that they can do a rendering and that he doesn’t think it has a negative impact on the design.
32. Mr. Serrao says he is curious to see that and that it may look awful, and then we'll agree with you.
33. Mr. Hogan states that there are more of them.
34. Mr. Cipriani states that that is 15th street on the side.
35. Mr. Serrao indicates that is actually Bingham.
36. Mr. Hogan states that he thinks that they were sensitive with the glass walls and pulling back from the edge, they need to deal with the two windows and blocking. He says he understands the principle of the lower windows tying to the upper windows. He also questions the coloring and that he thinks they can make it look unified, but set aside. Because they are different materials, it looks odd.
37. Mr. Jennings says that he disagrees with Mr. Hogan and that if you make them different colors your eye will go right to the addition and that making it the same color will make it blend in with the whole block.
38. Mr. Cipriani says that it almost looks like McCool’s with the old with the thing popping up on the corner.
39. Mr. Hogan says that they played with it well.
40. Mr. Cipriani says that they are trying to finalize the palette and pull it from some of the materials on the street.
41. Mr. Jennings says that he thinks that the windows on the second floor should be more in keeping with the original.
42. Mr. Serrao says that they have created a good language but there are some missing notes. He says that the extra design element is disconcerting.
43. Mr. Hogan states that the color is close to blond brick.
44. Mr. Serrao says that they will need to see the final colors.
45. Ms. McClelland says they will need to see the final materials too.
46. Mr. Cipriani says they will clean some brick to see what the color will be.
47. Mr. Serrao says that they will also need to see what the rain screen is.
48. Mr. Cipriani says he expects them to not want to go with a masonry base to keep the dead load lighter.
49. Mr. Serrao says that there are a lot of systems and that they need to know which one they choose to use.
50. ‘Mr. Cipriani says that they were replacing the garage doors to match the other ones.
51. Mr. Hogan asks what the color of the existing door is.
52. Mr. Cipriani states that other than adding some lighting around the ground floor to make things safer, they were thinking that they may put some glazing in the garages so it’s a little more pedestrian friendly, but it might be the owner’s call on that one.
53. Mr. Hogan states that again, they would need to see it. That it’s not impossible to have glazing in the doors because there are standards that were there before.

54. Ms. Quinn states that they would need to have all of those details.

55. Mr. Serrao says that the issue is that they need to fine tune their design. He says that the project is a great project. But that they need to be more decisive about what the project is and what they will be using.

56. Ms. Quinn says that when the applicant came in, she let them know that there had been an issue matching the color of the brick in the past.

57. Mr. Serrao says that there were some minor issues the popped up in the past during the previous review.

58. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

59. Mr. Josh Ebaugh says that he remodeled Finn McCool’s and that they were looking at that building and it is an incredible eyesore and that the new design is beautiful.

60. Mr. Serrao asks the Commission if they should have the applicant come back.

61. Mr. Jennings says that he would be interested to see how they change things.

62. Mr. Hogan says that there are a lot of changes and asks if they would be doing any harm to ask them to come back in a month or two months when they know their materials and they are looking for final approval, is that a problem?

63. Mr. Cipriani says it is not a problem for them but that their client is trying to get financing and maybe Planning Commission can approve it.

64. Mr. Hogan says that they are separate bodies and that they would have to come back.

65. Mr. Serrao says that they need more details.

66. Mr. Cipriani states that the way the project is drawn is the way they plan to execute it.

67. Mr. Serrao says that they have to change the elevation on Bingham.

68. Ms. Quinn states that if the Commission wants her to do over the counter approvals on some things and that they need to be very detailed as to what they’re approving and not approving.

69. Mr. Serrao indicates that it is way too much.

70. Mr. Hogan says that they need to know the finish of the upper level windows, the paint, and the panel color.

71. Mr. Cipriani says that they can get on the calendar for next month and work on things.

72. Mr. Serrao says that they were definitive in their selections, they probably would have given approval.

73. Mr. Hogan says that they are going to have to get the cut sheets on the windows.

74. Mr. Serrao says that they will need that level of detail.
Motion:

75. Mr. Serrao motions to table 1500 Bingham Street so that the applicant may provide more detail to the Commission.

76. Mr. Jennings seconds

77. All members voted in favor of the motion

78. Motion passes.
# 97 South 19th Street

**East Carson Street Historic District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Owner:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ward:</strong> 17th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas W. Jackson</td>
<td>Lot and Block: 12-J-390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2250 Mary Street #308</td>
<td>Inspector: John Stahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa 15203</td>
<td>Council District: 3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Application Received:</strong> 5/22/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Painting and Remodeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3117 Josephine Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa 15203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of a large, upper-story addition.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Hogan introduces the project and asks the applicant to discuss it.

2. Mr. Matt Brind’Amour indicates that the smaller packet is the updated design and that the 11x17s are an older design. He says that he is the designer for this project and that the project is essentially the addition of a dormer. They are taking the attic space and adding a dormer just like the neighbor to make some usable living space. So, there will be a dormer in the front at approximately the same line as the neighboring dormer. It will extend out of the rear portion of the attic out over the gabled roof portion of the townhome and out over the flat roofed portion. Where there will also be an in-board balcony. He says that this is the view on 19th Street from Carson to the subject property and that Mr. Ebaugh is the builder for the project.

3. Mr. Ebaugh introduces himself and states that the plan for the addition is to do a hardi-siding and their trim with a wood grained finish as well as well. He says that they wanted to do a gabled roof on the front dormer to try to match the neighbor’s dormer. He says that all of the doors will be solid Spanish cedar by a contractor that does historic replications. The plan is to have all of the windows be made of Spanish cedar and he wants to replace all of the windows on the front and the front door as well – just to tie the look together.

4. Mr. Hogan asks if the siding will be dutch-lap.

5. Mr. Ebaugh says that it will just be lap.
6. Mr. Brind’Amour says that it is more like a ship-lap.

7. Ms. Quinn asks them to clarify that they are planning to replace the front windows and door.

8. Mr. Ebaugh says they are and that they want to leave the side windows in place.

9. Mr. Hogan asks if they are proposing to use the muntin sashes.

10. Mr. Ebaugh says no.

11. Mr. Brind’Amour states that the drawing may have a muntin pattern because he didn’t realize they were proposing to replace the windows when the drawings were done.

12. Mr. Hogan confirms that the drawings have the muntins.

13. Mr. Ebaugh says that the homeowner just recently made some decisions that just came to him this morning.

14. Mr. Hogan says that the dormer next door is not original but an addition. He asks if there is a reason that they did two windows versus one.

15. Mr. Ebaugh says to match the dormer next door.

16. Mr. Brind’Amour says he put two windows there to get more light in.

17. Mr. Hogan asks what they are doing with the brick. He says that it looks like it is painted grey right now.

18. Mr. Ebaugh provides paint chips and says that the owner has some ideas on the paint details.

19. Mr. Hogan says that he is more inclined for the brick color to be green rather than tan, but that he would prefer that they would clean it.

20. Mr. Ebaugh says that they looked at that and he thinks that it was painted because a lot of the bricks didn’t match each other.

21. Mr. Hogan states, green, no mullions, wood sash windows.

22. Mr. Ebaugh states that the front door would be left wood as well and that he would like to paint it antique gold.

23. Mr. Hogan says the lower windows will be replaced so that all of the window openings will be restored and replacing them with wood sash windows.

24. Mr. Ebaugh asks if a small roof and surround could be approved over the door.

25. Mr. Hogan says that they would need to see the detail but that their example doesn’t belong on the building.

26. Mr. Hogan asks if they are assuming that the ship-lap siding on the dormer will also be painted green.
27. Mr. Ebaugh says yes and that they will be using dimensional shingles.

28. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

29. Mr. Hogan says he would like to entertain a motion to approve

**Motion:**

30. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve 97 South 19th Street – the general design as submitted with the masonry and new wood siding to be painted green as submitted by the applicant and to place a new door and trim and lintel detail to match what’s at 99 South 19th Street with an antique gold door. As well as to approve a new grey, dimensional shingle roof, to restore all of the window openings and replace with wood sash windows with no mullions on the front.

31. Mr. Jennings seconds the motion.

32. All members voted to in favor of the motion.

33. Motion passes.
1401 East Carson Street  East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:  
John Vetere  
1401 East Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203  
Ward:  17th  
Lot and Block:  3-H-123  
Inspector: Pat Brown

Applicant:  
John Vetere  
1401 East Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203  
Council District:  3rd  
Application Received: 10/16/2011

National Register Status:  Listed:  X  Eligible:

Proposed Changes:  Review of fire escape and canopy

Discussion:

1. Mr. Hogan introduces the project.

2. Mr. David McLean with McLean architects introduces himself and says that he has the owner with him – Jay and Frank and Brian Vetere. He says that they have gotten approval on the main project but needed to come back for review of the fire escape and awning on the roof top. What they had previously presented is still the same except that they were able to improve the height below the existing parapet. He refers to the dimensions found on the drawings.

3. Mr. McLean says that the distance from the walking surface to the top of the awning is 8’10” at its highest point and that they’re looking at the awning at the front of the building and its specific dimensions and that the awning will be 5 feet back from the edge on the street sides. And the awning at the edge is only one foot above the parapet.

4. Mr. McLean states, that they modeled the building with the roof-tops on it and turned it to match the view that we have in the photograph just to demonstrate that you will not see the awning from the street. The existing hood cap in the back will remain as the highest point.

5. Mr. Hogan asks what the height is of the awning to the parapet wall.

6. Mr. McLean says that at the edge it is about ten inches at the peak it is 8’8” and that is five feet back from the edge. The front edge is where the balustrade is and there is additional height there too. If you look at the most recent drawing, that’s the profile of the elevation and again it is five feet back and it’s actually in four retractable panels that recoil into the center and then out.

7. Mr. Hogan asks if they are five feet from the front or eight feet from the front.
8. Mr. McLean says that they are five.

9. Mr. Hogan says otherwise nothing has changed.

10. Mr. McLean says that that’s correct except for the additional detail that they’ve added for the fire escape. He says that it didn’t change significantly from what they had before, but now they have the final dimensions.

11. Mr. Hogan says that he thinks parts of it may be able to be seen from the street.

12. Mr. McLean thinks it would be visible only from farther down the street.

13. Mr. Serrao asks about colors and materials.

14. Mr. McLean says it is dark blue canvas.

15. Mr. Hogan prompts Mr. McLean to talk about the fire escape.

16. Mr. McLean says there is an existing fire escape which they will be replacing. The existing fire escape was black iron and the new one will be black steel. It is a means of egress from the roof down to the alley, and the last section is retractable.

17. Mr. Hogan comments that the new fire escape is almost in the exact same position as the old.

18. Mr. McLean says the existing one was just a little more over to the left.

19. Mr. Hogan asks if they are running into any issues with the existing glazing.

20. Mr. McLean says it is far enough away that it has not been an issue.

21. Mr. Hogan advises they should take a closer look at that as it looks like the window or windows will be right under the platform, and they may need to have fire glass.

22. Mr. McLean asks for clarification of which windows are the concern.

23. Mr. Jennings says it would be both windows under the landing. As far as the other windows, they would have to be within ten feet of the fire escape itself.

24. Mr. Hogan asks if the applicant has anything else, since no, he asks for public comment. There is no public comment.

**Motion:**

25. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the fire escape and retractable canopy as submitted, with the fire escape to meet all BBI standards.

26. Mr. Jennings seconds.

27. Mr. Hogan asks if the Commission has to deal with how the applicant will fire rate the windows.

28. Mr. Jennings says they may have to go to the Board of Appeals about different solutions for that issue, and they may have to come back to the Commission if anything has to change.

29. Mr. Serrao amends the motion.

30. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
1408 N. Franklin Street  Manchester Historic District

Owner:  Seth Ganley
Seth Ganley
1408 N. Franklin Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

Ward: 21st
Lot and Block: 22-K-275
Inspector: Mark Sanders
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 6/22/12

Applicant:
Seth Ganley
1408 N. Franklin Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

National Register Status:  Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes:  Installation of large privacy fence.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Seth Ganley steps to the podium and introduces himself. He is proposing to install a residential wooden fence.
2. Mr. Hogan prompts him to speak about the project.
3. Mr. Ganley says that it will be a red cedar fence, natural finish, with the top clipped in a dog-eared style which is common in the neighborhood.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a site plan. The Commission members review it.
5. Mr. Hogan asks if the fence will be seen from the street.
6. Mr. Ganley says no, just from Rush St. which was formerly an alley.
7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
8. Ms. Evelyn Jones from the Manchester LRC introduces herself. She says she doesn’t see any problems with the project.
9. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment. There is none.

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve as submitted.
11. Mr. Jennings seconds.
12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
1416 N. Franklin Street  Manchester Historic District

Owner:  
Michelle Murphy  
1416 N. Franklin Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

Applicant:  
Bill Miller  
121 Fireside Drive  
New Castle, PA 16105

Ward: 21st  
Lot and Block: 22-K-279  
Inspector: Jim King  
Council District: 6th  
Application Received: 5/15/12

National Register Status:  Listed:  Eligible:

Proposed Changes:  Non-compliant window replacement

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn lets the Commission know that the owner is unable to attend due to a car accident.

2. Mr. John Thomas, the consultant for Sears, steps to the podium and introduces himself. He explains the proposal is for the windows in the front of the house. He says the windows are currently wood but several neighboring houses do have vinyl windows. The woodwork around the windows will remain, but the inserts will be vinyl in a tan color. They will try to match the look of the old window. They are also upgrading to double pane glass.

3. Mr. Jennings asks if he is saying it will have a wood frame.

4. Mr. Thomas says yes, but it will be a vinyl sash set up against it.

5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

6. Ms. Evelyn Jones of the Manchester LRC steps to the podium. She says they would like the project to be in compliance with Manchester guidelines.

7. Mr. Hogan says that according to the guidelines, vinyl windows are acceptable on the rear or side of buildings where they are not visible, so what they are proposing would work there. However, the front windows need to be painted, stained, or vinyl-clad wood. Since the windows are already wood, replacement could be approved over the counter.

8. Mr. Serrao points out that a vinyl clad wood window would be indistinguishable from a vinyl window aesthetically.

9. Mr. Hogan says he understands, but is inclined to deny the application because if the applicant comes back with acceptable materials, she would not have to come
before the HRC again.

10. Mr. Serrao disagrees because what is in the proposal and what would be acceptable look exactly the same.

11. Mr. Jennings says what is before them is just to determine if what is in the proposal matches the guidelines.

12. Mr. Serrao feels that the language of the guidelines is confusing and self defeating on this issue.

13. Mr. Hogan asks if he is saying the Manchester guidelines are in conflict.
14. Mr. Serrao says yes, that aesthetically these two products are identical.
15. Mr. Hogan states that there would be some difference in the profile and detailing.
16. Mr. Jennings says even though it may look the same it still is not meeting the guidelines.
17. Mr. Serrao doesn’t think the Commission should be getting into details of construction.
18. Mr. Hogan disagrees and says they should just follow what the guidelines say. He also says they can only look at what is before them; they have no vinyl clad wood window for comparison and he isn’t even sure that product exists.
19. Mr. Thomas from Sears confirms it does.
20. Mr. Hogan says that the vinyl would probably be a shrink coat vinyl to cover and protect the wood, so the profile would be extremely different than a regular vinyl window.
21. Mr. Serrao says if they are talking about matching the profile of the old windows, that is something he feels the Commission can address.

Motion:

22. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the side and rear windows, and that documentation is needed that the new windows on the front would match the profiles of the existing windows.
23. Mr. Jennings seconds.
24. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
1246 Resaca Place  Mexican War Streets Historic District

**Owner:**
John and Marirose Radelet  
1246 Resaca Place  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Ward: 22nd  
Lot and Block: 23-K-71

**Applicant:**
John and Marirose Radelet  
1246 Resaca Place  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Inspector: Jim King  
Council District: 6th  
Application Received: 6/16/12

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

**Proposed Changes:**  Construction of a shed to the rear of the building.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Radelet steps to the podium and introduces himself as the owner, applicant, and architect. He explains that the proposal is for a small garden shed in the back corner of the property. The building would be seven feet square including the roof. Since the fence is six feet high really the only thing that will be visible is the roof structure. He says the precedent for the project is the porch roof that was approved in 1998; the shed will match the design and colors of the porch roof as much as possible.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about materials.

3. Mr. Radelet says that it will all be wood except for the asphalt shingles and aluminum gutters.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve project as submitted.

6. Mr. Jennings seconds.

7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
**315 Bellefield Avenue**

**Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

**Owner:**
University of Pittsburgh  
3400 Forbes Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15260

**Ward:** 4th  
**Lot and Block:** 27-S-74

**Applicant:**
Dino Bagatti  
555 N. Bell Avenue  
Carnegie, Pa 15106

**Inspector:** Mark Sanders  
**Council District:** 8th  
**Application Received:** 5/29/12

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of metal window louvers.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bagatti steps to the podium and introduces himself. He is with Loftus Engineers, who were hired by the University of Pittsburgh to update the HVAC systems in Bellefield Hall. Because of the nature of the new equipment they will need to replace four windows with metal louvers.

2. Mr. Hogan clarifies which windows.

3. Mr. Bagatti clarifies and states there are already some existing louvers.

4. Mr. Hogan asks if any of the existing ones can be eliminated.

5. Mr. Bagatti says no, that they are all serving other systems.

6. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any other ways to get air in to the system.

7. Mr. Bagatti says the only other way would be to punch new holes in the walls. He says there is no window in the mechanical room which would have made it easier.

8. Mr. Hogan asks how big the one opening would have to be to accomplish the same thing as the louvers.

9. Mr. Bagatti says it would be the sum of the individual windows. However, they don’t have the space needed in that area for ductwork, etc., and it would be rather difficult.

10. Mr. Serrao says that they have a conundrum, as this is definitely a contributing building to the district. He asks if there is any way they could go through the roof.

11. Mr. Bagatti says no, they would be going through other spaces like classrooms and offices. He says they could try to make it work in the mechanical room, but they
would need to make a very large opening.

12. Mr. Hogan asks about the dimensions of the individual openings.

13. Mr. Bagatti says they are two by two.

14. Mr. Jennings says that if they punch the hole, and in the future they get rid of this HVAC system, they would need to then patch that hole, which would be more of an issue than getting rid of louvers and putting windows back.

15. Mr. Hogan says that they would have to give up floor space to replace the window, they would need to expand the mechanical room into the corner to get to that window.

16. Mr. Bagatti says they would probably not go through with it if that was the case.

17. Mr. Jenning says again he would rather see the windows replaced with louvers, to preserve the building better for future restoration.

18. Mr. Hogan says he doesn’t think any money will be spent on the building for restoration for a long time.

19. Mr. Serrao says the issue is how to make these changes to the building consistent.

20. Mr. Hogan asks about the lower windows that are glass block.

21. Mr. Bagatti says they are for another space, the ground floor.

22. Mr. Serrao comments that the side of the building they are talking about is facing a narrow one way street and may not be highly visible.

23. Mr. Hogan disagrees. He asks for public comment, there is none.

**Motion:**

24. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve application for metal louvers as submitted.

25. Mr. Jennings seconds.

26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all members are in favor and motion carries.
907-909 Penn Avenue

Penn Avenue Renaissance III
941 Penn Avenue, #201
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd
Lot and Block: 9-N-158-01

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 5/18/12

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of balconies and a two story penthouse addition.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Indovina steps to the podium and introduces himself. He is from Indovina Associates, the architects for the project. He says they presented the project to the Commission the previous month and were asked to come back with more details on the storefront and also samples of materials and colors, which he has. He says the building is an existing unoccupied building that they are looking to renovate into residential units. They are keeping and refurbishing the existing façades and windows. They are proposing to add balconies for the residential units on the side and add an additional two stories for residential units on the roof. The idea would be to keep the existing building and create a modern contrasting addition on top. He presents the materials and details of the elevations to the Commission. He says that the request for the storefront was a “Paris-to-Pittsburgh” treatment, so a possible restaurant tenant could open up the façade. They are trying to maintain the look and massing by just making the glass portions of the façade operable. He says they reviewed their proposal with the Cultural Trust and History & Landmarks, and both organizations are in support of the project and design.

2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment, there is none.

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to approve the project application including materials and colors as submitted.

4. Mr. Jennings seconds.

5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
920 Ft. Duquesne Boulevard

Owner: 920 Fort Duquesne Associates
920 Fort Duquesne Boulevard
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd
Lot and Block: 9-N-245

Applicant: Designstream, LLC
100 Seventh Street, Suite 100
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 6/15/2012

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovation on first floor

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jason Yauger steps to the podium and introduces himself. He is with Designstream LLC, the architects for the project. He also introduces Karen and Pam, representing the owners the Henderson brothers. They are seeking approval for a ground floor façade renovation. He says the façade was covered in granite panel, which was failing and causing safety concerns. The panels were removed and the façade was looked at by a structural engineer. There was water damage to the brick, so it was painted as a temporary solution. They are proposing a permanent solution, which would be a brick façade to match the side elevation of the building. The existing doors and windows would remain.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about brick type and Mr. Serrao asks about color.

3. Mr. Yauger says they both will be the same as on the addition in back, including pre-cast accents.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none. He mentions he has some concerns with the design, the first being that it is very “busy”. The new elevations don’t seem to translate to the existing upper portion of the building. He would like to see the center common arch carry down to the lower façade, and thinks they could lose the rest of the detail.

5. Mr. Yauger says that the arch soldier course is under the black canopy.

6. Mr. Hogan mentions he is not a fan of the canopy either, it is not in keeping with the district. He asks if the arch soldier course is existing.

7. Mr. Yauger says no, it will be added to match the rear of the building.

8. Mr. Serrao mentions that the problem is that those details have no relationship to
the front of the building.

9. Mr. Yauger says that their thinking was to tie the façade and the back together.

10. Mr. Hogan says the façade should be treated as a separate element.

11. Mr. Serrao agrees, it could be simplified and treated as a three part façade to match what is going on in the top portion of the elevation. He also says the framing system around the windows is a distraction.

12. Mr. Hogan says the windows on the ground floor mimic the third floor windows, and that those planes could be played up to create a much simpler and more appropriate façade.

13. Mr. Serrao says that the front elevation is the most important, and the key is getting the design to work with what is already there above it and not with the post-modern design at the rear.

14. Mr. Hogan also mentions again that the awnings are non-compliant, and that they might consider emphasizing the windows and losing the awnings altogether.

15. Mr. Serrao asks if it is possible to do a full glass window instead.

16. Mr. Yauger says the windows are full glass but the awnings are covering them up.

17. Mr. Jennings says that with a new design awnings may still work and not seem so busy.

18. Mr. Hogan asks again for public comment.

19. Ms. Pam Demitrizak steps to the podium. She introduces herself as a representative of the owner. She says they are open to changing or getting rid of the awnings. She needs some clarification, she understands the difference from the top floors and that it looks busy, but wonders exactly what would need to be done with the brickwork.

20. Mr. Hogan points out that in the design the brick is being accentuated by two vertical columns on either side of the windows which don’t align with anything going on above. The recommendation is to lose the two sides and pull down the center elements from up above.

21. Ms. Demitrizak asks if the sides could remain brick, but just plain.

22. Mr. Serrao says the idea is for the elements to align and relate, and that the architect should be able to work that out.

23. Mr. Hogan and Mr. Jennings make comments on the design, but indicate that these are recommendations and that the Commission can’t redesign the building; again, the architect should be able to make it work.

Motion:

24. Mr. Serrao makes a motion to table the project until the applicant is ready to submit a new design.

25. Mr. Jennings seconds.

26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
**Proposed Changes:** Installation of non-compliant windows

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Chaz McAnallan steps the podium and introduces himself. He is representing Home Depot and the owner Mr. Enrico Novelli. He explains that they are looking to install replacement windows in the dormers. The windows will be bronze color windows, which are almost black, and they do match the existing windows in color and grid pattern. They will be keeping all the wood on the outside, the only change there would be a small wrap in the same color to cover where the existing storm windows were.

2. Mr. Hogan asks if they are proposing Andersen windows.

3. Mr. McAnallan says they will be Simonton windows.

4. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be wood windows.

5. Mr. McAnallan says no, they are vinyl.

6. Mr. Hogan asks what is in the lower windows on the house.

7. Mr. McAnallan says they did vinyl windows on this house in the back, but the windows on the front of the house are the original wood with storm windows on the outside.

8. Mr. Hogan asks how many dormers there are.

9. Mr. McAnallan says there are seven.

10. Mr. Hogan wants to consult the guidelines for the district. He says some of the dormers are very visible from Centre Avenue.

11. Ms. Quinn mentions that there are no specific guidelines for Schenley Farms so they have to look at the Secretary of the Interior standards.
12. Mr. Hogan says those standards don’t accept vinyl windows. He says the only other thing they could approve would be aluminum with the appropriate divisions.

13. Mr. McAnnalan mentions they are doing another window which is wood with aluminum cladding on the outside.

14. Mr. Hogan says that would work.

15. Mr. McAnnalan clarifies that this window is on the second floor and is not a dormer. They could use that window system as an alternative.

16. Mr. Hogan says they could either deny the application or approve the alternate type of window.

17. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.

Motion:

18. Mr. Hogan proposes a motion for approval of the alternate window, which is aluminum clad wood with a black finish.

19. Mr. Jennings makes the motion to deny the application for vinyl windows but to approve the alternate windows, with final color to be approved by staff.

20. Ms. Ismail seconds.

21. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote, all are in favor and motion carries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Approval</th>
<th>C of A Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Application Address</th>
<th>Historic District</th>
<th>Work Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-061</td>
<td>4-Jun-12</td>
<td>3438 Parkview Avenue</td>
<td>Oakland Square</td>
<td>In-kind replacement of driveway and garage door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-062</td>
<td>6-Jun-12</td>
<td>709 Brighton Road</td>
<td>Allegheny West</td>
<td>Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-063</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>1010 Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>Deutschtown</td>
<td>Restoration of the front porch and repair of the windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-064</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>279 Fisk Street</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Window replacement, chimney alteration, and HVAC upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-065</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>25 Market Square</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Non-compliant signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-066</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>21 Market Place</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Non-Compliant signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-067</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>3941 O Hara</td>
<td>Oakland Civic Center</td>
<td>Non-compliant window replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-068</td>
<td>7-Jun-12</td>
<td>1401 E Carson Street</td>
<td>East Carson Street</td>
<td>Proposed rooftop deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-069</td>
<td>11-Jun-12</td>
<td>218 Forbes Avenue</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Demolition to grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-070</td>
<td>11-Jun-12</td>
<td>228 Forbes Avenue</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Demolition to grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12-071</td>
<td>11-Jun-12</td>
<td>TBD Forbes Avenue</td>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>Construction of a mixed use high rise development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-072</td>
<td>11-Jun-12</td>
<td>1114 Liverpool Street</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Fence extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-073</td>
<td>20-Jun-12</td>
<td>1425 Pennsylvania Avenue</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>In-kind garage repair/replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-074</td>
<td>20-Jun-12</td>
<td>1102 W North Avenue</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-075</td>
<td>21-Jun-12</td>
<td>1401 Columbus Avenue</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>In-kind repair and cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-076</td>
<td>21-Jun-12</td>
<td>1109 Liverpool Street</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>In-kind repair and cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-077</td>
<td>21-Jun-12</td>
<td>1301 Columbus Avenue</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>In-kind repair and cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12-078</td>
<td>25-Jun-12</td>
<td>1416 N Franklin Street</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Painting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>