



**Division of Zoning and Development Review**  
City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning  
200 Ross Street, Third Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of March 4, 2015  
Beginning at 12:30 PM  
200 Ross Street  
First Floor Hearing Room  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<b><i>Members</i></b>	<b><i>Staff</i></b>	<b><i>Others</i></b>	
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	Dave Bauer	Sarah Sims Erwin
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Angelique Bamberg	Alex Carik
Ray Gastil		Carole Malakoff	Richard Worl
Ernie Hogan		David Menk	Josh Larrinc
		Clarence Vinton	Joseph Stasa
		Chris Gates	Carol Peterson
		Bill Kolano	Brendan Schubert
		Scott Towler	Rich Lieb
		Kirsten Armstrong	Duncan Horner
		Tim Frew	Jaime Bromley
		Lara Sullivan	Stephen Pascal
		Norman Cleary	

**Old Business**—None.

**New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes are tabled until the April meeting.

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

**Adjourn:**

Mr. Hogan motions to adjourn the meeting.

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

**Lake Elizabeth**

**Allegheny Commons Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

City of Pittsburgh  
414 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-B-150

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

PWSA  
1200 Penn Avenue, Suite 100  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 11/14/14

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Installation of electrical mixers and utility boxes for lake.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Brendan Schubert steps to the podium; he is the manager of external affairs for PWSA. He also introduces Rich Lieb, the project manager and engineer for the project. He explains that PWSA has been looking for opportunities for water conservation projects, and they looked at Lake Elizabeth, as in one year it uses over 200 million gallons of water. They went through the community process and worked with the Allegheny Commons Initiative and went through several alternatives. Their first rendition had a fountain, but because of the historic nature of the lake they eliminated it and found a way to keep all of their changes under the surface of the lake, with little to no visible disturbance. They will be using the existing electronic chamber as well. He states that although there will be no visible changes, they can run through the presentation for the Commission.
  2. Mr. Lieb makes a presentation about the changes, including the water conservation features and the benefits to the lake and wildlife.
  3. Mr. Schubert adds that he gave Ms. Quinn a letter of support for the project from the Allegheny Commons Initiative.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve installation of mechanical units as submitted.
  6. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**705 Brighton Road**

**Allegheny West Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

705 Brighton Rd Associates LP  
1008 Brianna Lane  
Bethel Park, Pa 15102

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 8-A-158

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Jeff Slack  
Pfaffman + Associates  
223 Fourth Avenue Suite 800  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/10/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Building and carriage house renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Jeff Slack steps to the podium; he is with Pfaffman+Associates, the architecture firm for the project. He states that they met with the LRC and they are in support of the project. He talks a bit about the history of the house. He shows the original elevations of the house and a historic photo showing the historic conditions. He shows photos of the existing conditions. He shows drawings and explains the work items. On the third floor, the work items include repairing the chimneys, repointing vegetation, repointing and cleaning brick, and window replacement of non-original windows with wooden windows in the same style. On the second floor, the work items include replacement of more windows, restoration of historic windows in the turret and installation of casement windows in the kitchen wing to complement those on the first floor. He states that in every case where they are adding something, they are relying on either historic documentation or taking cues from the house itself. At the front of the house there is an existing balcony which has its original stone parapet. The parapet is too low for code standards, so they are proposing a railing behind it to meet code and provide safety. On the first floor they are again replacing windows, reconstructing the original coffered ceiling of the porch, restoring stained glass transoms in the turret and restoring leaded glass windows. They will be installing new exterior lighting based on design elements of the house. They will be repointing and cleaning brick and sandstone and restoring historic brick molds throughout the house. There are additional work items in the front of the house, including replacement of the porch floor, replacement of the front door, and restoration of the brick walkway. Work items for the rear carriage house include window replacement, relocation of a side door and window, and enlargement of the opening of the carriage house and replacement of the door. They will be removing the paint from the carriage house as well. He talks about the balcony railing, stating that they simplified it after meeting with the LRC; the ornate railing does have precedent on the house, but they have decided to make it less busy and are proposing a simple wrought-iron design that will disappear on the front of the
- 
-

---

---

house. He shows images of design elements from this house, and another house designed by the same architect, that are guiding their design choices.

2. Mr. Hogan asks for more information on the railing they are tucking behind the parapet.
3. Mr. Slack states that they will be using vertical pickets with a simple twist and a railing on top, all to be up to code.
4. Mr. Harless asks if the use will remain single-family residence.
5. Mr. Slack says yes, the house will be single family as will the carriage house.
6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
7. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that after they met with the applicants they all agreed that their submission was the most well documented and detailed that they have seen. She believes the project will be a showcase for historic preservation in Pittsburgh. She states that they had concerns about the railing and have not seen the new design. They also had concerns about the addition of the casement windows. They are fine with the widening of the carriage house door.
8. Mr. Hogan asks for additional testimony; there is none.
9. Ms. Quinn echoes Ms. Malakoff's comments about the quality of the submission.

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the restoration for the building and carriage house, as shown in the revised drawings.
  11. Mr. Harless seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**910 Cedar Avenue**

**Deuschtown Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Charles Heidlage  
910 Cedar Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-224

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**

Germaine Gladu  
600 Fountain Street  
Blawnox, Pa 15238

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 12/6/14

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** After-the-fact installation of railings and door.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Germaine Gladu steps to the podium; she represents the custom ironwork company that did the work on the property. She states that there had been some confusion; the owner was supposed to have gotten historic approval and never did. She talks about the style of the home, from the history provided to her by the owner. She states that it was designed in an eclectic manner that includes elements of Second Empire, Queen Anne, and Richardsonian Romanesque. Before she goes into more detail about the railing, she explains that she is also presenting for the company that is installing the front doors. She didn't have a picture of them last time, so she presents a picture and explains that it is an exact replica of the original and uses the glass from the original door. She states that she wants to answer some of the questions that were raised at the last meeting. She shows images of some of the neighboring properties on Cedar. She states that what makes them all similar is that they each have a decorative frieze at either the top or the bottom and some sort of design element on the vertical bar, and they are similar to her company's design for this property. The other question that came up was that it was possibly too ornate. She shows images of other railings from around the Northside, one around the corner that does have a top and bottom frieze with a vertical bar and ornamentation, and others that are also highly ornamental. She also addresses the window guards, stating that there was a question about the height. She states that standard practice is to stop at the center sash or above, and she shows photos from around the neighborhood to that effect. She also shows a photo of 916 Cedar, which was approved and has a guard that goes all the way across both windows. The Commission raised the concern last time that there should have been two separate guards, but they did it this way because the center mullion has beveled brick that stands out and is very narrow and could be easily damaged if they drilled into even the mortar. She states that the window guard does not stand out in reality as much as it does in the photos. She talks about the design process, stating that it was hard to find a way to complement to different styles of the building. She feels that since it is ornamentation and not part of the building, the homeowners
- 
-

---

---

should have some leeway in the design choice. They consulted the book *Wrought Iron In Architecture* for reference, which she shows pages from, and also found inspiration in Second Empire homes in Bed-Stuy, Brooklyn, which she shows photos of. They also took cues from the building itself. She points out a stone carving at the right side of the window guard, which has a leaf detail and a circular detail, and they incorporated those into the frieze. They used a square collar to pick up on the dentils in the building, and they used a sphere on the window guards to match the original post. They goosenecked the railing from the post to bring it up to code, and they did a scroll feature to match the scroll frieze and light fixture. She shows pictures of the original railing which show its poor condition. She also feels that the existing railing weighed down the building, and they were unable to determine whether it was original or not.

2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  3. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He states that he appreciates all the thought that went into this presentation, however, he thinks that the design of the railing should have been replicated. He does understand about the code issues with the height, and wishes that there could be some exceptions made in historic districts.
  4. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He thought that the applicant was required to redesign the railing and wishes that it had been done.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none. He states that he respects the opinions of the owner, but at the same time still disagrees about the railing. He believes that the original railing was appropriate and complemented the structure. He states that the front doors are appropriate, and that they can possibly accept the window grate. He states that he understands that they needed to change the railing for code purposes, but he thinks the design should have been replicated, as there is no evidence that the railing was not original and in any case it was there when the district was created.
  6. Mr. Harless states that there is some consideration that they can give to historic structures when elements are being repaired rather than replaced.
  7. Mr. Serrao states that he agrees that the door and window grate are acceptable. He understands the argument for the railing, but can't accept that it was replaced not in-kind.
  8. Ms. Gladu states again that normally her company doesn't work this way, after-the-fact, and they would normally have sought approval. She wasn't under the impression that they needed to redesign the railing, so she sought to make a case for the replacement railing. She states that to solve the problem, they can easily introduce an S-scroll into the replacement railing. She asks about the railing on the previous application, since they were permitted to make it less ornate.
  9. Mr. Hogan states that the difference is that it is a new element, much like the window grate, rather than an existing element that was changed.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of the new front door and window grate. The new railing is not approved, and the applicant should resubmit a design that more adequately reflects what was removed while meeting current code.
  11. Mr. Hogan clarifies that if it is a direct replacement in-kind, it can be approved by staff, but any modifications must come back to the Commission. He also reiterates that there is no glass block allowed on the front of the building, since there was some question at the last meeting if glass block had been installed in the basement windows. [There is no glass block in the basement window.]
  12. Mr. Harless seconds.
  13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

***406-408 Foreland Street***

***Deuschtown Historic District***

---

---

**Owner:**

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominick DeGennaro  
211 S. Evaline Street #1  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15224

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-S-255, 256

Inspector: Pat Brown

**Applicant:**

Sarah Sims Erwin & Dominick DeGennaro  
211 S. Evaline Street #1  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15224

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/16/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Change in siding material.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Sarah Sims Erwin steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that they are looking to use Hardie board siding on the property. She was not able to attend the last meeting and is looking for direction from the Commission.
  2. Ms. Quinn asks if the Commission reviewed the email from staff about the condition of the property and existing siding; they did.
  3. Mr. Hogan acknowledges for the record that staff did visit the property to review existing conditions. He notes that the owners and contractor expressed an intention to remove and reinstall/replace the siding; he suggests just replacing the siding that needs to be replaced and then using spray foam insulation from the inside. He acknowledges that the siding is deteriorated and that there is a mix of different siding sizes on the façade, and that they are trying to bring some unity to the façade.
  4. Ms. Erwin asks if the spray foam could be used with the existing siding.
  5. Mr. Hogan says yes.
  6. Mr. Serrao agrees, stating they can remove the extremely damaged portions only and save what they can.
  7. Ms. Erwin says that they were told that spray foam would blow through all the holes in the siding.
  8. Mr. Serrao says they are back to their original discussion of Hardie vs. wood.
  9. Mr. Hogan says Hardie has only been allowed in certain situations in historic districts, namely in the rear of buildings. He states that the issue is that this is a façade, and the wooden siding has a rhythm to it that would be lost.
  10. Ms. Quinn presents some research from staff about the rhythm of the siding.
  11. Ms. Erwin states that they would love to do a restoration, but so much of the siding
- 
-

---

---

is in such terrible condition. She states that her neighbors want to see the existing siding restored, but she wonders if they only are able to save a small percentage, if it still counts as a restoration.

12. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that there are many new materials available, and they haven't yet evaluated the appropriateness of the materials. He also states that this is a significant property.
13. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
14. Mr. Duncan Horner steps to the podium. He is a neighbor and owns property in the Mexican War Streets and has used Hardie plank for years. He has also used it in New Orleans, where Hardie is acceptable per the guidelines. He states that the owners are facing many challenges with the project, and he feels that the Commission should take into account what is reasonable to bear.
15. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He suggests alternate methods of insulation. He states that the Commission should give leniency to the owner as far as the trim work, as there is quite a bit of damage. He does not support Hardie plank for this application, although it can be useful in other situations.
16. Ms. Carol Peterson steps to the podium. She does not feel the Hardie would be appropriate in this situation, because of the property's age and significance.
17. The Commission discusses the application. It is decided that the applicant should repair and replace in-kind with wood siding.

---

---

**Motion:**

18. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application.
  19. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Gastil, and Mr. Serrao are in favor and Mr. Harless dissents. Motion carries.
- 
-

---

---

**1908 E. Carson Street**      **East Carson Street Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Mike Alberter  
Carmella's  
1908 E. Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-J-393

Inspector: Brian Ralston

**Applicant:**

Alex Carik  
2523 Brownsville Road  
Pittsburgh, PA 15210

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 2/12/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Signage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Alex Carik from Carik Signs steps to the podium. He explains the project, stating that they are proposing to put a projecting sign above the allowed 12 feet, at 13.8 feet. The current use of the second floor is an office area for the business. They are proposing to place the sign at this location because of the existing lights which would block it. The sign will be double-sided and under 8 square feet, and will be made of an architectural material called Dibond. There will be two accent lights incorporated into the sign.
  2. Mr. Hogan states that they generally approve projecting signs below the signboard area. He states that there has been some signage on for second floor businesses in the district.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He reads for the record an email from the LRC. They have reviewed the proposal and have no objections.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the blade sign as submitted.
  5. [Second is inaudible].
  6. Mr. Hogan notes for the record that due to the nature of the façade, this was the only place to put a blade sign.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**260 Forbes Avenue**

**Market Square Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

GMS Commercial, LP  
95 W Beau Street Suite 600  
Washington, Pa 15301

Ward: 1st

Lot and Block: 1-H-184

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Kolano Design  
6026 Centre Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Signage.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bill Kolano of Kolano Design steps to the podium. He is representing Jones Lang LaSalle, who are proposing to place their logo “JLL” on this building. He states that there will be three signs, one of which is on the portion of the building that is inside the historic district. He goes over the parts of the code that are relevant to the sign. He states that the signage is well below what is allowed in the district. The letters are about six feet high. The logo will be red and the letters will be white, both lit by LEDs on a dimmer to comply with city regulations.
  2. Mr. Gastil asks where they stand as far as Planning and Zoning review.
  3. Mr. Kolano says they are going to CDAP within the next month and the Planning Commission in early April.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the signage as submitted.
  6. Mr. Harless seconds.
  7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Hogan, Mr. Serrao, and Mr. Harless are in favor and Mr. Gastil abstains. Motion carries.
- 
-

**409 Eloise Street**

**Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Jake Bier  
1216 Arch Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-P-5

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Arctecon Inc  
3441 Butler Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Façade renovations.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Dave Bauer from KSBA Architects steps to the podium. He also introduces Jake Bier, the owner of the property. He states that the previous owner had stated renovations on the building without any permits. He states that they are looking to keep it as a two unit building, but are proposing some changes. They are proposing renovations to the entrance to have just two doors, one for the first floor apartment and basement and one for the second floor apartment. The windows are aluminum, which they are proposing to replace with all wooden double-hung windows, to be painted. They will be restoring and reglazing the original basement windows. They will be removing the “cage” window grates on the first floor. On the rear of the building they will be constructing a new porch and an upper deck.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials for the deck.
  3. Mr. Bauer says that the frame will be wood, with AZEK flooring and aluminum railings.
  4. The Commission determines that the side and rear of the building are not visible from the public right-of-way.
  5. Mr. Bauer says that the front railing is currently just a 2x4. They are proposing to replace it with a simple metal railing.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve the window replacement from aluminum to painted wood, front door relocation, front railing installation, and construction of a rear deck.
  8. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the renovations to the building envelope with new wood windows all the way around, deck at the rear of the property, new railing, and new front doors.
  9. Mr. Gastil seconds.
  10. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**1224 Monterey Street Mexican War Streets Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Richard Worl  
Monterey Street Project  
1228 Monterey St  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-265

Inspector: Jim King

**Applicant:**

Richard Worl  
Monterey Street Project  
1228 Monterey St  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/10/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Demolition of rear addition and fence.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Richard Worl steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that the property is a 1970s infill house in between two original, historic houses. They are proposing to demolish an addition in the back, which was built later, is not on footers, and is collapsing. There is also a wall in the rear that they are proposing to demolish. They will be replacing all the windows on the building envelope with wooden windows.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be changing the size of the windows.
  3. Mr. Worl says they will be moving the location of the door and windows on the front. He shows photos of the building. He says that the house has a third story in the rear, but the front just has a dormer, so they would like to build that up to a full third story with a mansard-style roof. He shows drawing and some design elements that they will be using, such as the corbels, the fence for the second-floor deck, and the light fixtures.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks about materials.
  5. Mr. Worl introduces his contractor, Mr. David Menk.
  6. Mr. Menk steps to the podium. He says that right now there is a modular wire-cut brick on the façade that they will be removing and replacing with standard red brick. The mansard would be an imitation slate product. The windows will be wooden. The rear of the building will be clad in a product called “smart siding”, which will have a smooth texture.
  7. Mr. Hogan states that they will have to modify the railing to a more simple design, which can be either all wood or all metal.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  9. Ms. Carol Peterson steps to the podium. She expresses a concern that the house may not be 1970s infill, as it seems to match the house next door from the photos.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the renovation and demolition, with the exception of the railing, which should be redesigned and submitted to staff.
  11. Mr. Harless seconds.
  12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**4215 Fifth Avenue**

**Oakland Civic Center Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Oakland Fifth Ave Hotel Assoc  
409 Broad Street Suite 203  
Sewickley, Pa 15153

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-R-110

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

Oakland Fifth Ave Hotel Assoc  
409 Broad Street Suite 203  
Sewickley, Pa 15153

Council District: 8th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Construction of an 11-story hotel.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Serrao states that he was advised by staff that this is an informational presentation only.
  2. Mr. Bill Sidik steps to the podium; he is counsel for the developer for the hotel. He states that they have started meeting with community groups and are getting feedback for the project. They expect to come back for a full hearing soon. He talks about the site, which is the long narrow lot behind the Pittsburgh Athletic Association and bordering the former Syria Mosque site parking lot. They are looking to find ways to get the height and parking they need while maintaining a presence on the street. Right now it is an 11-story building, but that may change. He introduces Clarence Vinson, the architect.
  3. Mr. Vinson steps to the podium; he is with PFUS Architecture. He goes through the slides showing the impact on the neighborhood from various angles. He shows the various elevations and plans. He talks about the materials.
  4. Mr. Serrao asks about the mechanical systems.
  5. Mr. Vinson goes over the mechanical systems.
  6. Mr. Hogan states that he is concerned about how it will fit in with the other buildings in the district. They went through this process with the university dorm that was constructed a block away, and tried to work with them to minimize the effect of the new construction on the contributing buildings. He feels that they could be more in keeping with the rhythm and form of the PAA.
  7. Mr. Serro mentions the Hornbostel dorms across the street, which are great buildings that are in the background. He states that the issue may be more with materiality than form.
  8. No motion is made, as this was just an informational presentation.
- 
-

**930 Penn Avenue**

**Penn-Liberty Historic District**

---

---

**Owner:**

Tolmer Foods  
1401 Harrison Avenue  
Jeannette, Pa 15644

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-105

Inspector: Bob Molyneaux

**Applicant:**

Joseph Stasa  
PO Box 155  
Zelienople, Pa 16063

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Replacement of door.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Joe Stasa with Elite Builders Group steps to the podium; he is the contractor for the project. He explains the project, stating that they need to replace the main entry doors, which are full-view glass doors, with a traditional extruded aluminum entry system. There is already that type of system on the vestibule inside.
  2. Mr. Hogan asks if the transom is being retained.
  3. Mr. Stasa says they will be replacing the glass on the transom. They will be taking out everything up to the header where the sign is and installing the new system. He states they can work with the color and perhaps use a bronze instead.
  4. The Commission agrees they should use a bronze color.
  5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
- 
- 

**Motion:**

6. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the door replacement as submitted, with the color to be bronze.
  7. Mr. Harless seconds.
  8. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**Iron City Brewery**  
**3340 Liberty Avenue**

**Individual Landmark**

---

---

**Owner:**

Collier Development  
5020 Thoms Run Road  
Oakdale, Pa 15071

Ward: 6th

Lot and Block: 26-A-300

Inspector: Mark Sanders

**Applicant:**

Collier Development  
5020 Thoms Run Road  
Oakdale, Pa 15071

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 2/13/15

---

---

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

**Proposed Changes:** Demolition of wall.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Tim Frew steps to the podium; he is representing Collier Development. He explains that they are proposing to remove a wall. They have discovered that they have some tunnels that exit from their property and run under Liberty Avenue. At least one of the tunnels has collapsed. The wall in question used to house transformers for Duquesne Light, but they have since been removed. They are proposing to take this wall down and secure and shore the adjacent wall on both sides. They would then excavate down to the roof of the collapsed tunnel and initiate the filling process, and then they would investigate the other tunnels to see what is needed. The wall would not be put back up, a fence would be put in its place instead.
  2. The Commission discusses the shoring of the wall that is to remain.
  3. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
  4. Ms. Carol Peterson steps to the podium. She is testifying as a member of Lawrenceville Stakeholders, which nominated the complex in 2009. She states that they oppose the demolition or removal of anything that is a contributing element of the property as designated in the nomination. She adds that the owners have not even complied with past building permits. They removed part of the smokestack in 2012, and though their building permit indicated they were to replace it in kind, they never did. The surrounding neighborhoods are very concerned about the stewardship of this property.
  5. Mr. Harless states that this is a safety issue that needs to be addressed, with tunnels collapsing under Liberty Avenue.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks how the tunnels are accessed.
  7. Mr. Frew indicates on the plan how they are accessed through the buildings on the property. They were originally used for underground storage.
- 
-

- 
- 
8. Mr. Hogan states that he does have concerns. He asks if there have been engineering reports submitted on how they are going to accomplish this. He doesn't want to see them start work and have parts of contributing buildings start to collapse.
  9. Mr. Frew states that they have worked with Mr. Harless closely and will have an on-site engineer supervising the process.
  10. Mr. Harless says they have received engineering drawings.
  11. Mr. Serrao says he does have reservations, because as the testimony stated, they have not done too well by the HRC.
  12. Mr. Chris Gates has additional testimony, he steps to the podium. He states that he is disturbed that part of the wall that is historic is marked for demolition; this portion is adjacent to and supports the historic façade. He believes that the wall should be rebuilt along Liberty Avenue; enough has already been lost on this property. He also thinks a more appropriate fence than chain-link should be put up.
  13. Mr. Hogan agrees that chain-link is not allowed on historic structures. He asks for any additional testimony; there is none.
  14. The Commission discusses the application. They decide that the facade should be restored along Liberty Avenue once the remediation work is done.

---

---

**Motion:**

15. Mr. Hogan entertains a motion to approve dismantling the existing structure, the walls of the power enclosure, to allow the remediation of the failing tunnels, with the replacement with in-kind materials of the façade along Liberty Avenue.
  16. Mr. Serrao motions.
  17. Mr. Harless seconds.
  18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**160 43<sup>rd</sup> Street—Turney House**

**Historic Nomination**

---

---

**Owner:**

Carol Peterson  
172 46<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 9th

Lot and Block: 49-B-791

Inspector: Gabe Mastroberardino

**Applicant:**

Carol Peterson  
172 46<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 1/9/15

---

---

**National Register Status: Listed:**

**Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Nomination.

---

---

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Quinn states that the Commission's job today is to take public testimony and make a recommendation to City Council. She states that she did brief the Commission at the last meeting, where she stated that the property appears to meet two of the criteria for historic designation. The first is "exemplification of a distinctive architectural type, style or design" as it is one of the few remaining examples of Greek Revival architecture in the neighborhood. The second is "exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development" as it was one of the earliest buildings in the neighborhood and represents buildings of the time. She also stated that it appears to meet the standards for integrity.
  2. Mr. Hogan confirms for the record that the Commission was briefed by staff. He asks for comments from the nominator.
  3. Ms. Peterson steps to the podium to discuss the nomination with the Commission. She states that she nominated the property so that when she sold it, which she actually did as of last week, it would be protected from inappropriate alterations or demolition. She believes it to be one of the most significant properties in the neighborhood.
  4. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
  5. Mr. Chris Gates steps to the podium. He states that he supports the nomination. He states that it is important to protect these properties, as demolition discourages investment in neighborhoods.
  6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none.
- 
-

---

---

**Motion:**

7. Mr. Hogan states that based on their findings, the property does appear to meet the standards for historic designation, namely criteria 3, “exemplification of a distinctive architectural type, style or design”, and criteria 8, “exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development”. He recommends that the Commission recommends the property to City Council for historic designation.
  8. Mr. Harless seconds.
  9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
- 
-

**160 43<sup>rd</sup> Street—Walton House**

**Historic Nomination**

**Owner:**

Chan Real Estate LP  
172 46<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 9th

Lot and Block: 49-B-791

Inspector: Gabe Mastroberardino

**Applicant:**

Carol Peterson  
172 46<sup>th</sup> Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Council District: 7th

Application Received: 1/9/15

**National Register Status: Listed:**

**Eligible:**

**Proposed Changes:** Nomination.

**Discussion:**

1. Ms. Quinn makes a short presentation on the property. She states that as far as integrity, the location and original design of the property are intact, but the materials have changed significantly. She does not believe the property meets the threshold for significance for historic designation. She states that it is of a common shape in the neighborhood and city, and it no longer maintains integrity of materials. She states there is a potential for a larger nomination including this property.
2. Ms. Carol Peterson, the nominator, steps to the podium to discuss the nomination with the Commission.
3. Mr. Hogan asks if she is the owner.
4. Ms. Peterson says that she is not.
5. Mr. Hogan asks if the owner is in support of the nomination.
6. Ms. Peterson says she doesn't think so.
7. Ms. Quinn states that she received a letter from the owner's counsel, in which they did not express an opinion but asked for additional information. She also spoke with the architect, who was just trying to get a sense of what historic designation would mean for the property. She states that it seems like they are looking to do a lot of interior work rather than exterior.
8. Ms. Peterson talks about the nomination. She states that the original clapboard siding is still under the insulbrick. She states the Lawrenceville Stakeholders voted to nominate the property because they believe it is an important part of the streetscape and a good example of the type of house being built at that time in the neighborhood. They also feel the nomination is important because the owner had planned to demolish all of the houses on the lot and build a double house with front-loading garages and imitation materials, which they do not think is appropriate. She states that she thinks the property meets at least two of the

---

---

criteria for designation.

9. Mr. Hogan states that he believes the property is an important part of the fabric of the neighborhood and city. He states that he is struggling with individual nominations like this, as he feels that there may need to be a larger nomination of surrounding structures to truly represent the pattern of neighborhood development. He likes the idea, as he knows the neighborhood is struggling with the pressures of development. He asks about the surrounding fabric.
10. Ms. Peterson describes the development of the surrounding neighborhood. She states that these houses exemplify wood-frame construction in the area better than most.
11. Ms. Quinn states that if a district were to be created, this property would most likely be contributing.
12. Ms. Peterson states that she would love to have a district, and states that the neighborhood needs to have a conversation about that.
13. Mr. Harless asks for clarification about which criteria the nomination said that the property meets. It is criteria 8 and 10.
14. Ms. Quinn states that what they do today has an impact on review. A positive recommendation will require historic review for any project, whereas a non-positive recommendation will only prevent demolition and will not require review.
15. The Commission discusses the nomination, the options they have for the nomination, and also the options for nominating a larger district in Lawrenceville.

---

---

**Motion:**

16. Mr. Hogan states that the recommendation of the Commission at this time is that the property does not meet the criteria for designation.
  17. Mr. Hogan seconds the nomination to move it forward.
  18. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Gastil and Mr. Harless are in favor and Mr. Hogan is opposed. Motion carries.
  19. Mr. Hogan states that they will move to a public hearing in April. The Commission's position may change or may stay the same.
- 
-

**Certificates of Appropriateness Report – March 2015**

<b>Staff Approval</b>	<b>C of A Number</b>	<b>Date Issued</b>	<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Historic District</b>	<b>Work Approved</b>
Y	15-018	2-Mar-15	3445 Parkview Avenue	Oakland Square	In-kind window replacement
Y	15-019	2-Mar-15	913 Brighton Road	Allegheny West	Painting
Y	15-020	4-Mar-15	328 Lincoln Avenue	Individual	In-kind replacement of masonry piers
N	15-021	9-Mar-15	910 Cedar Avenue	Deushtown	After-the-fact railing, door, and glass block
N	15-022	9-Mar-15	705 Brighton Road	Allegheny West	Building and carriage house renovations
N	15-023	9-Mar-15	1908 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage
N	15-024	9-Mar-15	930 Penn Avenue	Penn-Liberty	Door replacment
N	15-025	9-Mar-15	260 Forbes Avenue	Market Square	Signage

N	15-026	9-Mar-15	409 Eloise Street	Mexican War Streets	Façade renovations
N	15-027	9-Mar-15	3340 Liberty Avenue	Individual	Demolition of wall
N	15-028	9-Mar-15	Lake Elizabeth	Allegheny Commons Park	Installation of electrical mixers and utility boxes for lake
Y	15-029	10-Mar-15	1008 Cedar Avenue	Deutschtown	In-kind rear window replacement
Y	15-030	11-Mar-15	431 Market Street	Market Square	Signage
N	15-031	16-Mar-15	15 Oakland Square	Oakland Square	Window replacement and installation of railing
N	15-032	16-Mar-15	826 Ridge Avenue	Allegheny West	Exterior improvements to steps and landscaping
N	15-033	17-Mar-15	1224 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	Demolition of rear addition and fence
Y	15-034	30-Mar-15	930 N. Lincoln Avenue	Allegheny West	In-kind window replacement and painting