



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 May 7, 2014

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>	
Linda McClellan	Sarah Quinn	Carole Malakoff	David Dean
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Nick Kyriazi	Peg Eichner
Ray Gastil		Paul Schmitt	Gerald Morosco
Ernie Hogan		Stephen Mrdjenovich	Alex Apostolou
Erik Harless		Stephen Pascal	Chris Gates
		Abby Goldstein	Bill Benter
		Greg Joseph	Marco Cardamone
		DeAnne Hamilton	Mike Abel
		Joe Seabrooke	Andrea Boykowycz
		Walter Boykowycz	Rebecca White
		Doug Sipp	Gary Carlough
		Tom Price	Richard McClure
		Peter Landis	Jordan Nicholas

Old Business—None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the April 2014 minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. McClellan seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Gastil and Mr. Harless abstain and Mr. Serrao, Mr. Hogan, and Ms. McClellan are in favor. Motion carries.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the April Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. McClellan seconds; all are in favor and motion carries.

Other:

1. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a report from staff.
2. Ms. Quinn states that she can give an update on the ongoing projects that are being funded by the grants received from PHMC. She states that tomorrow is the kick-off meeting for the architectural inventory survey; this is the first phase of the survey, in which they will be looking to develop a methodology that will work for them, the city, and PHMC. The city is looking to complete the survey within five years. She also states that the consultant for the economic study was in town and will be coming back in July; they already have a lot of contact information and data from PGHSNAP and are moving forward with the study. She mentions that she just received an email from Preservation PA regarding the 2014 Preservation Awards, and in speaking with the law department they determined that it is appropriate for the city to nominate the Dollar Bank historic tax credit renovation of their building on Fourth Avenue downtown. She has contacted the bank and will be proceeding with the nomination. She also mentions that work on the city steps nomination for city

historic designation is proceeding, and since Planning itself is unable to submit a nomination she is looking to get community groups involved to help write the nomination with Planning's assistance.

3. Mr. Hogan suggests that PHLF or Preservation Pittsburgh submit the nomination or offer technical assistance.
4. Ms. Quinn states that it is important to involve the community groups, and it is also part of her job to offer technical assistance with nominations. She states that she has spoken with Public Works informally about the nomination, and has also spoken with Bill Callahan of PHMC, who thinks the steps would qualify for a Keystone Grant for upkeep. She would ideally like to handle repair and replacement of steps as over the counter staff approvals, and possibly get community groups involved with painting. She states that a benefit of the nomination would be a public notification process in case of any demolitions. She also mentions that a nomination is expected for a church in East Allegheny that is owned by the community group there. She talks about the nomination for Nasser's Tavern and states that City Council just held a public hearing on it and is expected to vote on it in the next few weeks. She mentions that there will be some demolitions in Manchester at next month's meeting.
5. Mr. Hogan states that he believes that there is a temporary hold on demolitions for some neighborhoods including Manchester.
6. Ms. Quinn states that the hold was only for the Mexican War Streets/Central North Side potential conservation district, but she will check into it. Mr. Harless states that he will check into it also.
7. The Commission discusses issues with demolition.
8. Mr. Hogan points out a violation on Winghart's in Market Square, where they have put a stockade fence on the roof to hide equipment.
9. Ms. Quinn states she is aware of it and it is being looked into.
10. Mr. Hogan asks about 1001 E. Carson, where they installed one-over-one windows instead of three-over-one, and placed an applied screen on top which is not in compliance.
11. Ms. Quinn says she spoke with the owner and the architect and they will be correcting the windows, but she will have to look into the applied screen.
12. Mr. Hogan asks if the building on N. Lincoln that has been an outstanding issue has ever been addressed.
13. Ms. Quinn says it has been enforced by BBI and that it is going through the court process.
14. Mr. Hogan asks Ms. Carole Malakoff about the property. She states that the address is either 856 or 858. She states that it is an issue not only with this building, there are others that are not in compliance, and the neighborhood group feels that they are not getting any resolution with BBI.
15. Mr. Hogan states that the last issue is that the Commission is going to need to do a full review of roof decks, as they are getting out of control and there are many things going up that were not approved. He says a review of all the guidelines is in order.
16. Ms. Quinn says that Planning has a solid draft of improved historic guidelines that were done as part of the design guidelines under the DesignPGH portion of the master plan.

Adjourn:

Mr. Hogan motions to adjourn.

Ms. McClellan seconds.

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

The discussion of the agenda items follows.

825 Western Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Park West
825 Western Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-53

Inspector: Jim Seskey

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/14

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations and installation of ADA ramp.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that the building was originally a Victorian rowouse on Western Ave. that became a VFW starting around the 1950's, and they are looking to do renovations to it. He says that the existing windows are not appropriate for the openings, and they plan to install new wood double-hung windows as well as restore all trim. The existing dormer has no detail, and he was unable to find a precedent for that exact shape and style of dormer, so he is proposing to add a cornice with a small hipped roof that would return back into the gabled roof. The front of the structure would have originally had an open porch, which was enclosed in the '20s. The windows are existing behind the boards that are there now, and they plan to keep the jambs and mulls and replace them in kind. He mentions that the LRC wanted to see the addition removed and changed back to a period-appropriate porch, which he approached the owner about, but the owner is looking to have a retail space in the building and the extra space will be needed. The VFW saved the original doors so they will be reinstalling those and restoring the transom window above. He shows the side elevation and states that they are looking to replace the windows in kind with double-hung windows that match the profiles and mulls of the existing. There is a non-original window that they plan to replace with a wooden casement window. They are also looking at the possibility of installing an ADA ramp. He talks about some other small changes on the side elevation including fenestration and gutters. The side also has CMU and brick additions which they are looking to paint it to approve the appearance. At the rear he has made a revision to include the recommendation of the LRC to use a carriage-style door. On the west side elevation they will be restoring the historic windows, painting, and reconstructing the historic cornice.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She talks about the importance of the building, being right at one of the entrances to the
-
-

neighborhood, and she says that Mr. Baumbach took great care in presenting his plans. She states that they are happy with many aspects of the proposal, and although they are disappointed that the historic porch will not be restored, they understand that the owner will need the space for the future business. She states that they appreciate that he took their recommendation on using carriage door in the rear. She mentions the chimney removal that is part of the proposal but was not addressed by Mr. Baumbach. He informed the LRC that there are structural problems and that two chimneys will need to be removed, but the LRC feels that chimneys are important architectural elements and should be kept. They also recommend that they think about where the future signage for the business will go.

4. Mr. Serrao asks about the existing sign.
5. Mr. Baumbach says that the VFW has an existing sign, but that the LRC's recommendation was to remove that and do something more tasteful. He states that they will be leaving it as is for the time being. He also addresses the chimneys, stating that the owner wanted them to be removed based on a recommendation of a structural engineer. He does agree that the chimneys are an important feature of the building, but states that the east wall is buckling out at both floors and the chimneys are aggravating the problem. He would be glad to table the subject in order to do more research with the engineer.
6. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment.
7. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He states that in old houses, the chimneys work as a key support system and removing them often causes more problems. He also states that the dormer with the hipped roof is not period appropriate; a pediment would be more appropriate.
8. Mr. Hogan asks if the hipped roof is existing from a prior renovation.
9. Mr. Baumbach says yes.
10. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none. He acknowledges for the record the email received from the LRC. He recommends approval of the application with conditions, such as bringing more information about the chimneys and a possible redesign on the dormer.

Motion:

11. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations and ADA ramp as submitted with the following qualifications: all final materials and finishes should be submitted to staff for final approval, the chimneys should remain, and the applicant will come back before the HRC with new information if they would like to pursue removal.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks about the dormer.
 13. Mr. Serrao amends his motion to include the HRC's recommendation of a more period appropriate dormer, which can be submitted to staff for approval.
 14. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

607 Avery Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Perry Miranda
607 Avery Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 24-N-284

Inspector: Jim Seskey

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/14

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the project, stating that the façade is the only side of the building that faces a historic street. He says that it currently has aluminum one-over-one windows and that they are proposing to replace them with wooden double hung two-over-two windows. They will be restoring all trim and replacing the door with a four-panelled wood door. They will be restoring the box gutter. A new feature that they are proposing is an iron gate to the side of the house. The dormer is a feature that is challenging to address; the attic has an especially low ceiling and the dormer has a flat ceiling that sheds out instead of being gabled or hipped. They are proposing to keep it as-is in order to keep the proportions as well as the ceiling height in the attic per the code. They will add a cornice line with a small eave overhang and trim, and they will do two double hung windows instead of the one that is there now.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if the roof is currently an asphalt roof.
 3. Mr. Baumbach says it is and they will be replacing it in kind. He also says the building is currently painted and they are proposing to remove the paint.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium; he is with the LRC. He has objections to the dormer and thinks it doesn't look right on an Italianate house.
 6. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He asks what the side treatment of the dormer will be.
 7. Mr. Baumbach says they will use Hardie board.
 8. Mr. Kyriazi steps back to the podium to ask if they could do a very flat gable on the dormer.
 9. Mr. Serrao agrees that would be better, but since the dormer is existing they have the right to keep it. They can only encourage the owner and applicant to construct
-
-

a more appropriate dormer.

10. Mr. Baumbach steps back to the podium. He agrees to go back and see if he can make changes to the dormer to accommodate the suggestions.

11. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.

Motion:

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve façade renovations with the possible modification of the existing dormer to be submitted to staff for final approval.

13. Ms. McClellan seconds.

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

604 Middle Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

Peter J. Barner
604 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 24-N-226

Inspector: Jim Seskey

Applicant:

Peter J. Barner
7337 Austin Street Apt 6K
Forest Hills, Ny 11375

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/14

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

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Dean steps to the podium; he is a realtor with Howard Hanna and is representing the owner of the property. He states that the project has been controversial in the neighborhood, but he will do his best to explain the owner's intentions. He shows a photo of the existing conditions, stating that the dormer was removed and replaced, but removed again in response to neighborhood concerns. They have covered the roof area to prevent damage to the interior. He also shows elevations of the existing conditions. He shows drawings and explains the project, stating that they are looking to add a new dormer with steel patio doors and a Juliet-style handrail. He says that there are currently two windows on the second floor and a window and door on the first floor. They are proposing to refenestrate, moving the door to the middle and adding two large wooden windows. The door would be a wooden double door with a "pediment" element above. The roof would be completely redone in-kind with asphalt shingles. He explains the refenestration, stating that the interior of the building was cut away from the façade to rearrange the interior space.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that the building is two and a half stories now, and asks if they are changing it to a one story structure with an attic.
 3. Mr. Dean says no, it is still two and a half stories, but there will be a double-height entry area, with a balcony where the second floor would be, and a set of steps going up to the third floor. He also clarifies that they will be raising the roof.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium; he is with the LRC. He provides a photo that shows the existing building in context; it is the left half of a double house. The house was unfortunately modernized in the early '40s or '50s and covered in brick, and the dormer was probably enlarged. Looking at the house on the right, the dormer looks to be the original and is quite small. He would like to see them reconstruct the original dormer in the front and possibly raise the roof in the back
-
-

if they need extra space. As far as the façade, he says it bears no resemblance to what is there now, and there is no justification or historic precedent for it.

6. Ms. Peg Eichner steps to the podium. She agrees with Mr. Kyriazi and states that the building should match with the one next door since they are joined together.
 7. Mr. Stephen Pascal steps to the podium. He appreciates that the last two speakers gave some alternatives to the design. He states that he doesn't understand where this proposal is coming from in terms of design; it has nothing to do with the period of the district or of the house and is a mix of incorrect styles and details and uses inappropriate materials. He feels they really need some guidance and need to look to the house next door.
 8. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He requests that a photo from the tax records be included with applications so people can see what the building used to look like—in this case what the dormer looked like before it was taken down. He also points to the fact that it is part of a pair of houses, and if this one is altered and the roof raised they would no longer look like a pair. He points out discrepancies in the proposal with the treatment of the area above the window, and mentions that the brackets are inappropriate and have no precedent in the neighborhood.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
 10. Mr. Hogan states that given the inappropriateness of the proposal and the neighborhood's objections, the Commission has two options: either reject the application completely and they would have to start over, or table it for 60 days and have the owner consult with an architect and the LRC and revise the design.
 11. Mr. Dean says they tried to work with a local architect but they refused to take the case.
 12. Mr. Serrao says they can work with anyone.
 13. Mr. Hogan says he understands that they have challenges because the building has been compromised and will need some serious attention and reconstruction, but he believes they do have alternatives. As presented, he is not going to support the proposal.
 14. Mr. Serrao states that they can review the historic guidelines and work with staff as well.
 15. Mr. Dean says the problem is there has been an adversarial relationship between the developer and the neighborhood group.
 16. Ms. Eichner steps back to the podium, and states that the problem she has is that the developer of the property lives in the Mexican War Streets, and would never do this type of design in that neighborhood. She states that she used to own this property and sold it to the current owner with the understanding that it would be fixed properly. She doesn't feel that the neighborhood is being adversarial to the developer.
-
-

Motion:

17. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the façade renovations as submitted.
 18. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 19. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

606 Middle Street

Deushtown Historic District

Owner:

J. Thomas Seabrooke
4124 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 24-N-225

Inspector: Jim Seskey

Applicant:

Michael Abel
4124 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Joe Seabrooke steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he doesn't understand the problem with his project; the front wall of the building had been collapsing, so they had to tear it down and re-lay it immediately. To his understanding, the problem was the foundation under the brick, which was part sandstone and part concrete block, and they replaced it entirely with concrete block. He says he has seen other building in the district use concrete block, and it looks a lot better than the sandstone/concrete block mixture with mortar over it. He states that another problem was the glass block window, but the building has had a glass block window there since 1970. He also mentions that the building has existing aluminum windows which they will be reinstalling. He has a question about the doors; the building had a flat wood door, and he is willing to replace it with one that is more historic if he can find one for a reasonable price.
 2. Ms. Quinn says that a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for in-kind repair of the brick façade only.
 3. Mr. Seabrooke says the brick was bowing out and had been painted; they reused the brick but removed the paint, and the building looks much nicer now.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if there were two windows in the basement.
 5. Mr. Seabrooke states there was only one, which they replaced in-kind.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if they replaced wooden caps and lintels with granite.
 7. Mr. Seabrooke says yes, the wooden ones were rotted.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 9. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that when the building was being worked on he asked the workers and they stated they had received historic approval and were going to replace everything exactly as it was. He says that he didn't know the glass block was existing until he looked at an old photo; it had been less visible before. He says that the project would have been okay if they had
-
-

just replaced the brick and not touched the foundation, but they took out the foundation and the belt course and actually never replaced the belt course. He says it makes it look like new construction. He doesn't know what can be done about it now but maybe something could be applied to the brick for the look of a belt course.

10. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He states that even the new construction houses in the neighborhood have belt courses, which improve the look. He also says that stuccoing over the concrete block would also help.
11. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
12. Mr. Seabrooke says a lot of the problem was that the work was done over the winter, which they had to do because it was an emergency. They didn't know the condition of the foundation would be so poor.
13. Mr. Hogan asks if they would be willing to work with the Commission and the community to come up with a solution.
14. Mr. Seabrooke says if they would like him to metal lathe and stucco the foundation he would be willing to, although he thinks it looks better as it is.
15. Mr. Hogan says he understand their challenges, but they do have to work within the guidelines. He says he would like to see an enhancement for the door, a more appropriate hopped window with a security grate for the basement, and some way to mimic what would have been a belt course above the foundation. He says they are within their right to replace the aluminum windows, but he would like to see them go to wood windows if possible. He states that they received authorization for in-kind repair and replacement, and they haven't exactly done that, which is where the problems have come in. He would like to see a reasonable compromise reached so that they can proceed with their project.
16. Mr. Serrao says that he can work with staff to come up with some product recommendations.

Motion:

17. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations with the conditions that the front door and surround be upgraded, and that the applicant work with staff on applying a belt course treatment. He also says that the glass block window should be looked at to see if it can be replaced with a hopper window.
 18. Mr. Seabrooke says he will check in to the window.
 19. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1117 Bingham Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

MAPA Real Estate Holdings
1000 Grandview Avenue #907
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-22

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Pittsburgh Community Broadcasting
67 Bedford Square
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/17/14

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Extension of C of A permitting use as a parking lot.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn presents a letter from Councilman Kraus in support of the applicant.
 2. Mr. Marco Cardamone steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He also introduces Abby Goldstein from WYEP, DeAnn Hamilton from WESA, and Greg Joseph from the board of WYEP. They are asking for an extension or an issuance of a new three year Certificate of Appropriateness to continue parking on the property while the property is being sold to WYEP and while they work on raising funds to construct a new building on the property.
 3. Ms. Goldstein adds that they are in the due diligence phase, doing inspections and an environmental study on the property, and should be closing soon. They would like to have the Certificate extended so they can do a feasibility study and conduct a capital campaign; they would then return to the Commission with a design for construction.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that there has been frustration around this property. He is inclined to work with them, but he does want clear understanding of what will be built and when, as they lost an important piece of the fabric of Bedford Square for this parking lot. He acknowledges the letter from Councilman Kraus in support of the applicants.
 5. Ms. Goldstein says it is also in their best interests to move quickly and with respect for the historic nature of the neighborhood.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 7. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium. He says the LRC did not discuss this issue. He says that the radio station is committed to the neighborhood, and he feels he can speak in general on the behalf of the neighborhood to say they are looking forward to the project.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for any other public comment; there is none.
 9. Mr. Hogan says he is inclined to authorize the three years, but he would like a
-
-

check-in. He asks the applicants if they could check in at 18 months to let the Commission know their status.

10. The applicants agree.

Motion:

11. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for use as a parking lot for three years, with a check-in by the owner on the status of the project at 18 months.
 12. Ms. McClellan feels that they should make the Certificate good for 18 months, and have them come back for another one.
 13. Mr. Hogan says it will take them three years to secure the financing.
 14. Ms. Goldstein agrees it will take some time to raise the money and get the plans done. She feels that they can give an update in 18 months, but it will take them the full three years to be ready to move forward. She states that they want to move as quickly as possible.
 15. Mr. Hagan says at least having a check-in will be essential. He states that the motion has been made, and asks if there is a second, or if they want to amend it at Ms. McClellan's suggestion.
 16. Mr. Harless seconds.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, Mr. Harless, and Mr. Gastil are in favor and Ms. McClellan abstains. Motion carries.
-
-

1500 Bingham Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Ravi Kondaveeti
222 5th Avenue, Apt. 320
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-99

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

JMAC Architects
1273 Washington Pike
Bridgeville, Pa 15017

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/17/14

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Demolition and new construction.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jim McMullen steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the project was before the Commission in the fall of 2012, and a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for renovation of the existing building. Since then there has been more analysis of the building, and the project was scaled back from being four residential units to just one. Due to the results of the structural analysis, they have also decided that demolishing the building and constructing a new one would be more feasible than working with the existing building. They discovered that the steel roof structure would be unsuitable for addition of another floor, and the existing masonry was unsuitable for what they wanted to do as well. They plan to keep the new construction along the same lines as what was previously approved for the renovation.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials; he mentions the composite siding and that the brick looks to be the same color as the existing.
 3. Mr. McMullen says they are keeping the materials the same as what was previously approved. The brick is going to keep the same look as the existing building.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 5. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium. He says the LRC did review this without the owner being present, he understands that the applicant met with the Planning Forum but not the LRC. He goes over the requirements for new construction in the ordinance, namely that it should be compatible with the historic character of the district in materials, scale, and massing. He states that although this is not a storefront building, it does contribute as far as scale, mass, and texture. He says that some aspects of the proposal are not in compliance with the guidelines, and he would like to see the application tabled so that the LRC can work with the owner and applicant.
 6. Mr. Kevin Connelly steps to the podium; he is the owner of the building next door. He has concerns about the demolition and construction job that are outside the
-
-

purview of the HRC, such as insurance of demolition contractors. Mr. Harless and Mr. McMullen address his concerns.

7. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He doesn't believe that the arguments made today prove the non-viability of the structure, and that the demolition would be done for financial reasons. He believes that the owner and applicant should look more into reusing the existing building, and possibly at using it for something else other than residential.
8. Mr. McMullen says that they have checked all their options and have determined that the structure is structurally unsound and not viable. They also are incorporating elements of the existing building into their new design. He states that they are happy to meet with the LRC.
9. Mr. Hogan says that he doesn't want to get into the viability of the existing structure and says that it has other issues such as the mismatch of the facades. He appreciates that they incorporated the gridded industrial style windows, but he agrees with some of the issues that the LRC raised about the appropriateness of other elements such as the other windows. He also talks about what they are doing with the number of additional floors.
10. Mr. McMullen says it was originally four stories, with brick going all the way up to the second floor, but they brought it down.
11. Mr. Hogan says this is a significant change and it changes the whole articulation of the structure. He says they need to find a way to respect the block and the way it was constructed originally. He says they should look at the window rhythm on the second floor and the scale and massing of the upper floors.
12. Mr. McMullen says they will look at revising the plans and also meet with the LRC. He asks if they can proceed with demolition while they do that.
13. Mr. Hogan says no, they will have to table the whole application.

Motion:

14. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application until next month.
 15. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 16. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

855 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

The Salvation Army
44-54 S. 9th Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-G-44

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

John A. Martine
Strada Architecture LLC
925 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/7/14

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

Proposed Changes: Signage for new building.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Tom Price steps to the podium; he is with Strada Architecture. He states that this is the signage for the new Salvation Army building; the building was approved by the HRC in 2008 and was on hold for a while, but has finally been completed. He goes over the signage proposal, stating that the signage over the entrance to the left will be black aluminum letters that will be halo-lit, with a face-lit logo. On the other side of the building, there will be another sign on the corner tower element, again with black back-lit lettering and another face-lit logo.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium; the LRC discussed the application and has no problem with it.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the signage.
 5. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1302 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

Sayer Real Estate
1302 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-31

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Ayhan Sayer
1302 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 2/25/14

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

Proposed Changes: Storefront restoration and window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Nathan Hart steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the owner Ayhan Sayer is also present. He states that the project is a restoration of what is one half of a Victorian building from the turn of the century. They are proposing to replace the vinyl windows on the upper floors with wood arch-top windows to fill the existing openings, and they will be scraping and painting the wooden trim. They will also be removing the paint from the brick and repointing. On the storefront level they are looking to install a more traditional storefront. They have done some exploratory work but unfortunately none of the original transom is there, but he has developed what he and the LRC consider to be a balanced treatment of the transoms. The storefront will be an aluminum bronze-colored storefront, with either wood or composite trim material. They will reuse or replace in kind the existing gooseneck fixtures. He shows a sample of the material for the tile at the base; it is meant to look as much like stone as possible. As far as the brick on either side of the storefront, they have not done exploratory work to determine the condition of the brick and at this point they are planning to cover it with wooden trim, but they are open to other options. If it is in good condition they are willing to restore it rather than cover it.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a sandstone base.
 3. Mr. Hart says no, it is just painted concrete.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the retractable windows on the storefront.
 5. Mr. Hart says that the space will be a restaurant, and the owner would like to be able to open it to the street.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks about the size of the windows.
 7. Mr. Hart says they are roughly 6'8" high and the opening is 7'2" wide total.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 9. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium. He states that Mr. Hart has been
-
-

proactive in tweaking the design to get the proportions right for the transoms, as in the late 1800s and early 1900s the transoms tended to be equal despite what was going on below them in the storefront. He states that the building and its neighbor were built as one building with a continuous cornice. The pilaster that separates the subject building from the separate one on the corner is encroached on by that buildings storefront, so they have that sliver of a pilaster on the right side and three quarters of one on the left, and he is not sure if applied wood trim would be the best treatment for those areas. He thinks tile or brick might be better. The other issue is with the operable window system, and he believes the Commission retains the ability to judge proportion relative to the storefront. He and the LRC believe the scheme would be stronger if the entry door was centered in the available space or moved to the other side of the space. He says it is very important to get this building right due to its importance on the block and the importance of the block to the neighborhood. He speaks a bit more about the history of the building and its previous modifications.

10. Mr. Serrao asks if they would be willing to move the door to the other side.
11. Mr. Hart says they put the door where they did for better flow into and out of the space.
12. Mr. Hogan says that he has a problem with the proportions of the doors and windows, although he understands the challenges of the operable system.
13. Ms. McClellan asks about the renovations of the next door property and if the entrances would have been symmetrical.
14. Mr. Hogan says that the next door property had much of the original material remaining under later additions, which this building does not have. He says that where the door is currently is probably original. They are proposing to place the doors next to each other and change the articulation in addition to shifting the doorway over. He asks if the current doorway is centered.
15. Mr. Hart says it is not quite centered, it was probably placed there to mirror the building next door.
16. Mr. Hogan says he is inclined to figure out a way to compliment the other building, which will eat into the operable window system.
17. The Commission discusses and agrees the door should be moved. Mr. Hogan states the transoms and above as well as the entry door to the upper floor are all fine, but they would like to see the storefront door in the same area as the existing entrance door.
18. Mr. Serrao says that a revised drawing would be able to be approved by staff.

Motion:

19. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the storefront restoration and window replacement with the condition that the ground floor elevation and door location be brought to staff for final approval. The door is to stay within its original plane.
 20. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 21. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

2000 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

5 Oaks Development
1817 E. Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-K-14

Inspector: Brian Ralston

Applicant:

Classic Deck Impressions
2953 Brevard Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15227

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 4/17/14

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

Proposed Changes: Construction of a rooftop deck.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Paul Schmitt steps to the podium; he is with Classic Deck Impressions. He shows pictures of the existing building and roof area, explaining that the deck should be minimally visible; the deck will be 100 feet off of East Carson and the top floor of the front building will provide additional screening. He says that the only visible element will be the black metal railing, which he has provided a sample of. The deck will only be 16 by 18 feet, and it will sit back four feet from the parapet wall on each side.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if the deck is being installed directly on the roof membrane.
 3. Mr. Schmitt says that was the original design, but at the suggestion of a structural engineer they have gone to a system where it will be supported by the parapet and 6 x 16 inch beams.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks what the intended use of the deck will be.
 5. Mr. Schmitt says it will just be for recreational use, there is no business use for it.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks where the floor of the deck is in relation to the parapet.
 7. Mr. Schmitt says that the top of the deck surface will be approximately even with the parapet, and recessed back about four feet on each side.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks what the requirements are for deck setbacks.
 9. Ms. Quinn says the Commission generally requires eight to ten feet.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 11. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium. He states the LRC's position on roof decks, relative to the ordinance, namely that historic roof features should be retained and any additions should be placed out of view.
 12. Mr. Hogan states for the record that he received a phone call from Councilman Kraus' office expressing concerns about the proposal. He asks for any other public
-
-

testimony; there is none.

13. Mr. Serrao asks about the size of the deck.
14. Mr. Schmitt says it is 18 feet along the front façade and 16 feet going back. The building is 24 feet wide. He states that the only thing that will be visible from certain angles is six to eight inches of railing.
15. Mr. Hogan says the Commission has standards for roof decks, including the requirement for them to be set back eight to ten feet. In this case, that would give them a roof deck only eight feet wide.
16. Mr. Schmitt asks if they are concerned with the view from East Carson or from the alley as well.
17. Mr. Hogan says it is from any public right of way.
18. Mr. Serrao asks if they can move the deck to the other side of the building, although it looks like they have ductwork there.
19. Mr. Hogan says they will still have to do a walkway from the door, which is at the parapet, so it still would be visible.
20. Mr. Serrao says they can look into lowering the deck into the roof with the help of a structural engineer. He also states that depending on what is on the other side of the wall, they can look into moving the door to the other side of the building and building the deck there.
21. The Commission reviews the building plans and agrees that may be a viable solution.
22. Mr. Hogan states that they won't be able to have a canopy or roofing on the deck.
23. Mr. Schmitt says they have no plans for that.

Motion:

24. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
 25. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

**542 Fourth Avenue
Allegheny County Morgue**

Individual Landmark

Owner:

Allegheny County
542 Fourth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 2-J-44

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Apostolou Architects, Inc
47 Bailey Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15211

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/15/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Security camera installation.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Alex Apostolou steps to the podium; she is the architect for the project. She states that they are proposing ten new exterior security cameras for the building. Previously there were two old cameras, one at the front door and one at the back. The new cameras typically come in white or black, but they found out that they can be custom painted without voiding the warranty, so they will be painting them gray. The cameras are bracket mounted.
2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

3. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of security cameras as submitted, with the color to be “Colonial Gray”.
 4. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

221 Fourth Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

William Benter
2901 Smallman Street, Apt 5D
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-181

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Stephen Mrdjenovich
5411 Penn Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/14/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Renovations to roof deck, awning, and siding of 19th floor unit.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Gary Carlough from GBBN Architects steps to the podium. He introduces Bill Benter, the owner, and Rick McClure, who represents the building's condominium owners' association. He thanks Mr. Hogan for coming out and viewing the existing roof deck. He introduces Mr. Stephen Mrdjenovich, who will go over the updates to the roof deck proposal since they presented it last month.
 2. Mr. Mrdjenovich steps to the podium. He goes over the proposal as it was presented last month. He states that they have altered the project to remove the canopies and their metal support structure. They have also worked with a structural engineer to tie the roof deck in to the structural steel of the building and lower the whole deck by eight inches to reduce visibility. They will use non-reflective glass railings, which have been used on the observation deck of the Rockefeller Center. He states that he included a letter of support from the condominium association of the building.
 3. Rick McClure steps to the podium; he voices his and the condominium owners' association's support for the project.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the renovations to the roof deck and siding of the 19th floor unit.
 6. Ms. McClellan seconds.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

25 Market Square

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

Nick Nicholas
25 Market Square
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-D-130

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

Applicant:

Sipp + Tepe Architects LLC
PO Box 332
N. Lima, Oh 44452

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/17/14

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of rooftop deck and railing.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Doug Sipp steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He introduces Jordan Nicholas who is representing the owner and Pete Landis who is representing the tenants of the building. He explains the project, stating that they would like to add a rooftop deck. They want to make it as inconspicuous as possible, and all that will be visible is the metal handrail at the front. There will also be a front and rear stair tower for egress; the front stair will be visible so they have set it back 12 feet from the roof edge, which is about 24 feet from the front of the building. They will install a stainless steel grid and encourage vines to grow on it.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the dimensions of the roof deck.
 3. Mr. Sipp says it will be about 40 feet wide by 50 feet deep.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the parapet and if the deck sits below it.
 5. Mr. Sipp says it is about sixteen inches high and the deck does sit below it.
 6. Mr. Hogan reiterates the Commission's stance that the deck should not be visible from any angle. This will be the first roof deck in the Square itself, and they want to be very careful about setting the standard. He is uncomfortable with it going all the way up to the front, and has concerns about the view from the side. He is also concerned about roofing and awnings going up on top to extend the life of the deck into the colder months.
 7. Mr. Sipp says they can look into pulling the deck back from the front and away from the side wall. He asks if the Commission would rather see a glass rail than a metal rail.
 8. Mr. Hogan says the glass is good because it takes the visual out of it, but it is very expensive. He suggests that they revise the design and include more photos, because the district does go quite far down Forbes with sight lines to this building. He is not so concerned with the view from above, just from the public right-of-way.
-
-

9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.

Motion:

10. Ms. McClellan motions to table the application for 30 days.

11. Mr. Harless seconds.

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

3440 Parkview Avenue

Oakland Square Historic District

Owner:

Andrea Boykowycz
3440 Parkview Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 28-S-118

Inspector: Mark Sanders

Applicant:

Andrea Boykowycz
3440 Parkview Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 4/17/14

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

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Andrea Boykowycz steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that her house is a non-contributing structure, built in 1952 from a contractor's kit. She states that their proposal is to add a small front porch, and to extend the small bedroom above to be flush with the porch. She says this is needed to correct an issue with the front steps, and it will give more useable area inside as well as help the house relate better to the street. They will be removing the existing aluminum awnings, and replacing the aluminum casement windows with more appropriate windows.
 2. Ms. Quinn asks if they have started work yet, as she received a call from a concerned neighbor.
 3. Ms. Boykowycz says they have not started work.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if they are planning any rear changes to the building.
 5. Ms. Boykowycz says no, not at this time.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be using brick to match the existing.
 7. Ms. Boykowycz says yes. She also introduces her father Mr. Walter Boykowycz, who is the architect for the project.
 8. Mr. Boykowycz steps to the podium to give other details of the project including materials. He says the intent is to emulate the look of the neighbor's porch, which has an arch.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 10. Mr. Nathan Hart steps to the podium; he is a neighbor and the original nominator of the district. He expresses his support for the project, as the building is non-contributing and the understated renovations will improve the building without calling attention to it.
-
-

Motion:

11. Ms. McClellan motions to approve the building renovations as submitted in the drawings dated May 1, 2013.
 12. Mr. Harless seconds.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-