Minutes of the Meeting of February 3, 2016
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Serrao</td>
<td>Sarah Quinn</td>
<td>Greg Maynes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Peterson</td>
<td>Sharon Spooner</td>
<td>Pat Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Gastil</td>
<td>David J. Barton</td>
<td>Gregory D. Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Hogan</td>
<td>Paul D. Taylor</td>
<td>Charles Heidlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Falcone</td>
<td>Kathleen Hagan</td>
<td>Brett Mahaffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Baumbach</td>
<td>Ryan Kabana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa McSwigan</td>
<td>Taafui Kamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Bernard</td>
<td>Lindsay Patross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Kitson</td>
<td>Andrew Reichert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Mangan</td>
<td>Michael Albright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Conrad</td>
<td>JoAnn Patross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abass B. Kamara</td>
<td>Janine Jelks-Seale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business

Mexican War Streets Art Guidelines:

1. Ms. Quinn states that she repeatedly offered to help to get something together for the Commission’s Jan 1st deadline, which has now passed. She states that she is looking for some guidance on how to handle it and suggests that they think about it for the next meeting. She states that Manchester is also interested in potentially updating their guidelines.
2. Mr. Hogan asks if all of the neighborhood guidelines will be updated.
3. Ms. Quinn says yes, that would be her hope, but it would need to come from within.
4. Mr. Hogan states that the Commission will need some guidance from staff to how to approach this as far as having discussions with the districts, etc.
5. Mr. Falcone asks if there was any response from the neighborhood.
6. Ms. Quinn says no, but she thought there had been some leadership turnover within the neighborhood groups.
7. Ms. Peterson suggests that staff try to contact them one more time now that the leadership has settled.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the November 2015 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Falcone seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. In regards to the December 2015 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. Peterson seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the December 2015 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Ms. Peterson seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries. In regards to the January 2016 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Falcone seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Other Business:

1. Ms. Quinn presents the finding of fact for the ordinance revisions for the Commission members to sign. She will present to the Planning Commission shortly. She also talks about the latest grant applications.
2. Mr. Serrao suggests that it might be worthwhile to review future findings of fact with the legal department.
3. Ms. Quinn states that a public hearing will be scheduled at City Council for the Card Carriage House shortly.

Adjourn:

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn the meeting.
Mr. Falcone seconds.
Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and meeting is adjourned.

The discussion of the agenda items follows.
808 Western Avenue

Allegeny West Historic District

Owner:  
Alissa Martin  
808 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd
Lot and Block: 8-A-16

Applicant:  
Alissa Martin  
808 Western Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th
Application Received: 1/11/16

National Register Status:  Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alteration to size of two rear windows.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jeb Jungwirth and Ms. Alissa Martin step to the podium; they are the owners of the property. Mr. Jungwirth states that they are looking to expand the size of two rear windows. He states that they removed a permanently installed external AC unit and increase the height of the windows by ten inches, which matches their other windows.

2. Mr. Hogan asks what point of view the provided photo was taken.

3. Mr. Jungwirth states that it was taken from the side alley; there is no rear alley.

4. Mr. Hogan asks what kind of windows they will be installing.

5. Ms. Martin and Mr. Jungwirth state that they are looking to match the other windows on the rear, which they believe are metal. Ms. Martin states they have not purchased the windows yet and will follow the recommendation of the Commission.

6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He acknowledges a letter sent from the LRC dated January 31, 2016.

7. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that it is an after-the-fact project. She states that the sills and headers of the windows now match the other windows. She states that the LRC looked at the other houses in the row and determined that of the eight buildings, six have small third floor windows and two have the larger windows. They determined that the windows will match the second and third floor large windows of other houses in the row. She states that in a phone conversation with Ms. Martin she stated that the windows would be wooden double-hung windows, which the LRC supports.

8. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
Motion:

9. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alteration and installation of two rear windows to match the existing windows on that façade.
10. Ms. Peterson seconds.
11. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the sill and the header are to match the other windows.
12. Mr. Serrao amends his motion.
13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
909 Western Avenue Allegheny West Historic District

Owner: Sally C Graubarth Trust
Sally C Graubarth Trust
1667 N Shadowview Path
Hernando, FL 34442

Ward: 22nd
Lot and Block: 7-D-168

Applicant: John D Francona
John D Francona
1234 Resaca Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th
Application Received: 1/14/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alteration to previously approved storefront.

Discussion:

1. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that when they got into the previously approved design they realized that the storefront glass was very large. They are proposing to break it up into smaller panes which they ended up preferring design wise as well. They are adding a transom bar in the large window that carries across from the existing transom above the door, and they will also be angling the entry.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about materials.

3. Mr. Francona states that it will be the same as before, a natural oak finish with a dark stain.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

5. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the LRC approves of the redesign.

6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none. He acknowledges a letter sent from the LRC dated January 31, 2016.

Motion:

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alteration as submitted.

8. Mr. Falcone seconds.

9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
Proposed Changes: Window replacement with composite material.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Brett Mahaffey and Mr. Ryan Kabana step to the podium; they are representing Andersen Windows. Mr. Mahaffey explains the project, stating that they will be installing 19 double-hung windows. He states that they will be done as inserts to preserve the interior wood trim. The material is a composite to look like wood and the windows are constructed like wood windows with mortise and tenon joinery. He states that the color will be a bone white rather than a stark plastic white color. He states that there are windows on the front that have stained-glass on the top sash, which they will be retaining, and they will replace the bottom sash with an operable awning; the windows will look like double-hung windows.

2. Mr. Hogan states that since this is essentially a sash replacement, he asks how the exterior brick mould and sills, etc. will be treated.

3. Mr. Mahaffey states that these elements have been neglected and need to be painted. He states that they will not be capping or changing anything, and the homeowners will have everything scraped and painted afterwards. He states that the sills on the house are wooden rather than cement and some have rotted, and those will be replaced and finished afterwards.

4. Mr. Serrao asks which windows will be replaced.

5. Mr. Mahaffey states that they will be replacing the second and third floor windows all the way around.

6. Mr. Falcone asks for more details on the treatment of the windows with stained glass.

7. Mr. Mahaffey shows additional pictures and reviews what they will be doing.

8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
Motion:

9. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion to approve the second and third floor windows with the Renewal by Andersen composite.

10. Mr. Serrao motions to approve.

11. Mr. Gastil seconds.

12. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
910 Cedar Avenue  Deutschtown Historic District

Owner: Charles Heidlage  Ward: 23rd
910 Cedar Avenue  Lot and Block: 23-M-224
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

910 Cedar Avenue  Application Received: 1/11/16
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Inspector:

National Register Status:  Listed: X  Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Revised design for after-the-fact railing and window grate.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Charles Heidlage steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that this is an after-the-fact application. He talks about the railing that is currently installed, which is slightly different than the previous railing and which they were told was not original and was also not up to code with respect to its height. He states that the sandstone slab was slightly compromised when the old railing was removed, so completed removal of the current railing is not advisable. He talks about the currently installed railing and how they developed the design. He states that if they do need to revise the design, they have come up with a compromise design, which he explains. The changes would be done by the company that handled the original design and installation, and the revisions would not further compromise the sandstone slab. He talks about the window box, which was previously approved by the HRC, and states that as it matches the railing it would be revised as well.

2. Mr. Hogan states that he still has an issue with the finial at the top. He states that the redesign, with the retention of the pickets and addition of the S-curves, does help get it closer to the original, but the original railing had a continuous design from the top bar down.

3. Mr. Heidlage says that part of the reason that was added was to increase the height to meet code.

4. Mr. Falcone asks if they have tried to find any historic photos.

5. Mr. Heidlage states that they did find an aerial photo of the area, which shows that the stairs are there but it does not show any details of the railing.

6. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a way to bring the curl in the design up to the top bar, which would keep the same language of the previous railing.

7. The Commission members sketch out some options.

8. Mr. Hogan explains his sketch, stating that the applicant could ask the contractor
to take the top curl of the main S and replicate it to fit in the top bar.

9. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

10. Ms. Kathleen Hagan steps to the podium; she is a member of the East Allegheny Community Council. She states that there is dissatisfaction in the neighborhood about the design that is there now and the fact that the original railing was removed. She states that there are no issues with the window grate.

11. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none. He asks for approval with direction for the applicant. He states that the final design can be submitted to staff.

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the modification of the railing as provided in the mark-up.


14. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
1006 Cedar Avenue

**Allegheny West Historic District**

**Owner:**
Pinnacle Redevelopment
145 27th Ph H Street
New York, Ny 10016-9039

**Ward:**
23rd

**Lot and Block:**
23-M-213

**Applicant:**
Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

**Inspector:**

**Council District:**
6th

**Application Received:**
11/13/15

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

**Proposed Changes:**
Construction of a rear rooftop deck.

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project and is working with the owner, Matt Hicks, who cannot attend today. He apologizes that there were some after-the-fact rear renovations that were done. He states that the renovations included replacement of shingles on the rear ell, in-kind replacement of gutters, reconstruction of the rear façade, installation of aluminum-clad windows and a steel door, and installation of an ipe wood fence. He states that he did get approval for the front renovations in 2014, which were completed, and he was asked to help with the application for the rooftop deck, for which he was before the Commission in December. He was not involved with the project during the rear renovations. The owner stated that the rear façade partially collapsed during construction, which necessitated its removal and reconstruction. He shows photos of the rear façade before, during, and after construction. He states that the original brick was reused, and the shadow lines of the original windows were visible so they reconstructed them in the same place.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about the deck and states that it looks like it would not be visible.

3. Mr. Baumbach says no, it would not be visible from the street. The only part that may be visible would be the railing.

4. Mr. Falcone asks if there are two sets of doors in the rear.

5. Mr. Baumbach says yes, there are two residences and two entrances with a privacy fence in between. He states that the ipe fence is to give some privacy from Moravian Way. On behalf of the owner, he states that the masonry work and windows were done in short order in 2014 in response to the wall collapsing, and the owner apologizes for not coming before the Commission. He believes that the owner had the best intention in choosing the materials for the fencing and paving as well.

6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

7. Ms. Kathleen Hagan steps to the podium. She raises a concern about a rooftop
deck in this small area being a nuisance to neighbors.

8. Ms. Peterson states that it would not be a concern of the Commission.

9. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that further after-the-fact work has been done. He states that they should address what is in front of them, which is the deck. He states that staff should file a 311 complaint and have PLI take a look at the after-the-fact work.

10. Ms. Quinn asks if it would be appropriate for the Commission to approve the application today and have staff hold off on issuing a Certificate until an application is received.

11. Mr. Hogan states that these are two separate issues and that he would rather close the application and have enforcement deal with the additional after-the-fact elements.

**Motion:**

12. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the application, including the deck and door.

13. Mr. Gastil seconds.

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

**836 W. North Avenue**  
*Individual Landmark*

**Owner:**  
Stables Development, LP  
322 N Shore Drive, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

**Ward:**  
22nd

**Lot and Block:**  
23-N-135

**Inspector:**  

**Ward:**  

**Lot and Block:**  

**Application Received:**  
1/15/16

**Applicant:**  
Stables Development, LP  
322 N Shore Drive, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

**Council District:**  
6th

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

**Proposed Changes:** Renovation and construction of an addition.

## Discussion:

1. Mr. Andrew Reichert steps to the podium; he represents the development team. He gives an overview of the project. He states that the property is outside of the Allegheny West Historic District and was nominated for individual historic status in 2007. He states that it has been mostly vacant, but they are planning to develop it and an adjoining vacant parcel into a residential development. He describes the existing stable building and briefly describes the proposed addition and new construction. He states that the new construction on the existing vacant land will be a four story structure that will connect to the existing building. They will also be adding a fourth story to the existing building. He states that they did pull the addition back and changed the materials to reduce the impact on the existing building.

2. Mr. Jim McMullen from JMAC Architects steps to the podium. He describes the proposal in further detail and goes over the floor plans. He talks about how they pulled the addition back to both lessen its impact and to create some outdoor space. He shows the elevations, stating that there are trying to replicate the fenestrations of the historic structure and maintain the appearance of the historic entryway. He states that they looked to developments such as the Heinz Lofts and the Macy's building which developed over time with several additions that had similar typeologies and materials but did not exactly match. He states that replicating the historic building would be a mistake, but they want to use elements of it while clearly showing that the building grew over time. He states that they have replicated the strong cornice line above the third floor and have pulled the fourth floor back to lessen its impact. He talks about the materials, stating that the addition will not be brick like the existing building but rather a non-metallic and non-masonry material, probably a composite. He states that the type of fenestrations and material for the new building will be brick, and it will have appropriate detailing and banding. He shows photos with the proposed building and addition added to show the impact on the street. He talks further about the
materials, showing specs for the wooden windows, cementitious siding, which will probably be batten, and the cleaning and repointing of the brick. He talks about the railings, stating that they are looking to use as transparent of a railing assembly as they can, so they are looking at a metal cable railing.

3. Mr. Serrao and Mr. Hogan ask for a picture of the existing building without the added windows.

4. Mr. Hogan expresses some concerns about the windows as presented. He also states that the code is specific in that any addition on a roof should not be seen from any public right-of-way, and this one clearly can be seen.

5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.

6. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that the LRC did meet with the applicant twice. She talks about the history of the structure and its nomination. She states that this is a challenging project as it needs to express its history as a stable as well as keep the character of the surrounding 19th century warehouses. They feel that this design does not accomplish this. They suggest that the windows on the existing building that can be seen from the public right-of-way be double-hung six-over-six wooden windows. They recommend that all the door and window openings remain the same, as well as the historic signage on the building. She states that the large arched window has two large vertical muntins that should be retained. They do not want to see a fourth floor addition on the building. She states that visually, the building is confusing in that it is not clear about if it is going to be one structure or two.

7. Mr. Serrao points out that sooner or later, the lots will have to be consolidated, and this will be considered an addition.

8. Ms. Malakoff states that in that case, the addition should be clearly less important and less detailed than the existing building. She states that they feel that this is not ready for approval and that the applicant should be tabled.

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

10. Mr. Hogan states that the setback of the addition is appropriate; however, he states that the materials should be very different from the historic fabric. He thinks that the rhythm, articulation, and openings of the addition should be in scale and appropriate. He states that the fourth floor addition is visible and thus not appropriate.

11. Mr. McMullen asks if the addition would be approved if it was not visible.

12. Mr. Serrao states that they would have to prove that it was not visible, and on this building it would be impossible.

13. Mr. Hogan states that if they want to develop a higher density on the new addition that is up to them, but they have to respect the historic structure, including the window fenestration, rhythm of the windows, the original muntins, and the stable doors. He states that they could then weaken those elements in the addition to make it clear that they are not trying to replicate the original building. He does give them credit for taking on the project as it is not an easy one; the neighborhood is important and this is an important piece of the fabric of the neighborhood. He states that the Commission is not going to create a new precedent by approving a visible roof addition.
14. Mr. Falcone agrees.

15. Mr. Serrao agrees. He states that the addition is a separate item and should be visibly different from the existing structure and more modern.

16. Mr. Hogan states that they can table the application so that the applicant can go back and make changes.

17. Mr. Reichert states that they would appreciate that. He states that they will have to possibly eliminate the fourth floor addition and will have to change their plan for egress.

**Motion:**

18. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.

19. Mr. Falcone seconds.

20. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
Connelly/Energy Innovation Center  
1435 Bedford Avenue  
Individual Landmark

Owner: Pittsburgh Gateways  
Pittsburgh Gateways  
1435 Bedford Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 3rd
Lot and Block: 9-R-194

Applicant: Renaissance 3 Architects  
48 S 14th Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Inspector:  
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 1/15/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of roof-mounted exhaust stacks.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Patrick Russell with Renaissance 3 Architects steps to the podium. He explains that most of this project is interior, but it will necessitate exterior exhaust stacks on the roof. He states that an analysis was done and the stacks do have to be as high as they are showing—31 feet—to be sure that they are able the exhaust all the air that they need to and prevent air from circulating back into the building. He states that they did look at other options, but this was the best solution. He states that this is a conservative solution, but is needed for safety in case something were to go wrong. He states that they are proposing three stacks on the roof, with guy wires to stabilize each stack. At the rear of the building, they will have to have the exhaust run up the outside of the building before going to the roof.

2. Mr. Hogan asks about the original exhaust system and if there was a chimney for the boiler. He states that a lot of the schools have massive smokestacks.

3. Mr. Russell states that he believes there was a smaller chimney or vent at one time on the other end of the building. He states that a lot of the exhaust also went through vents at the rear of the school, over the cliff and road.

4. Mr. Hogan asks if there is any danger of clustering the stacks together rather than having the three separate stacks.

5. Mr. Russell states that they need to be separate until they exit the building, but after that they could be put closer together.

6. The Commission discusses various options.

7. Mr. Hogan states that many of the schools have historically extremely tall chimneys for exhaust.

8. Mr. Falcone asks if they have any historic photos of the building.

9. Mr. Russell states that there are, but he hadn't noticed a chimney.
10. Mr. Gastil states that he thinks the applicant should explore grouping the stacks together and bring the application back to the Commission or staff for final review.

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

12. Mr. Serrao agrees with Mr. Gastil but that they should come back to the Commission.

13. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion.

**Motion:**

14. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.

15. Ms. Peterson seconds.

16. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
Westinghouse School  
1101 N. Murtland Street  
Individual Landmark

Owner: Pittsburgh Public Schools  
341 S Bellefield Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 12th  
Lot and Block: 125-D-200

Applicant: Greg Maynes, AIA  
438 S Main Street, 3rd Floor  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15220

Inspector:  
Council District: 6th  
Application Received: 1/14/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of an addition.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Greg Maynes steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the school is beginning a new program that will require housing a fire engine, so they are proposing an addition. He shows photos of the existing conditions, stating that there are three existing garage doors on the side of the building where an auto body shop was at some point. He states the doors were reduced when the building was renovated. He states that they are also proposing levelling a playground adjacent to the proposed addition and constructing an ancillary building for storage. He shows the plans and elevations of the proposed addition. He states that the elevation will look the same as the existing building but will just be extended out. They will be using the same detailing as is on the existing school building; it will be limestone-clad masonry as will be the ancillary building. They will use the same fenestration and detailing including the banding and base course. The garage door on the addition will be closer to the original, as they are talking it back to its original height. They will be modifying the other two garage doors but not taking them back to the full height.

2. Mr. Hogan asks where the addition is in relation to the front of the building.

3. Mr. Maynes states that it will be on the far side of the building. It will be minimally visible from the street.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for more details on the windows and masonry.

5. Mr. Maynes states again that they are just extruding the existing facade out, with fenestration pattern to match and limestone masonry to match.

6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
Motion:

7. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of an addition as submitted.
8. Ms. Peterson seconds.
9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
1430 Page Street
Manchester Historic District

Owner: Pittsburgh Public Schools
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 S Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 21st
Lot and Block: 7-B-202

Applicant: Michael McNamara
1305 Muriel Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 6th
Application Received: 1/8/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of a parking lot.

Discussion:
1. Mr. Mike Albright steps to the podium; he is with Gateway Engineers, who is working with IKM on behalf of the Pittsburgh Public Schools. He explains that the proposal is part of Conroy School. He presents the project materials as well as a letter of support from the community group. The school does not currently have any parking facilities and relies on street parking. He explains the proposal, stating that the property is currently vacant land. They will reconstruct the sidewalk and add landscaping as a screening buffer, including rain gardens to help with storm water runoff.

2. Mr. Hogan clarifies that there is just landscaping and no fencing or other structures.

3. Mr. Albright confirms that is correct.

4. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none. He acknowledges the letter of support from the community group dated January 13, 2016.

Motion:
5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve construction of a parking lot.

6. Mr. Falcone seconds.

7. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
BEFORE THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH
HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION

IN RE: Historic Nomination
Albright United Methodist Church
486 South Graham Street

COMMISSION MEMBERS:
Ernie Hogan, Acting Chairman
Raymond Gastil, Director of Planning
Joe Serrao
Carol Peterson
Matthew Falcone
Sarah Quinn

The within meeting of the City of Pittsburgh Historic Review Commission, Reported by Nina Warren Biehler, a Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was convened at the Robin Civic Building, 200 Ross Street, First Floor Hearing Room, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219, commencing at 2:50 o'clock p.m., on Wednesday, February 3, 2016.
PRESENT:

Nominated by:

Lindsay Patross

On behalf of the Property Owners:

Bentz Law Firm, P.C.
David J. Barton, Esquire
Suite 200
The Washington Center Building
680 Washington Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15228
MR. HOGAN: So the next item is nomination of 486 South Graham Street for historic designation.

MS. QUINN: I have a few loads of stuff to pass out to you guys.

MR. HOGAN: So a couple things, as far as process here, just so that I can get everybody up to speed. What we like to do with this is any time a property is nominated or a district is nominated the first step is for us to determine the validity of the application with regards to the historic status of the building and if it at least meets one of the criteria. With that we will then make a determination to schedule the public hearing for this property, to which we will take testimony.

Today we would like to review, with staff's discussions, the status of the application and staff review with regards to the valor of it meeting one of the ten points of historic designation and the completeness
MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, if I may, good afternoon, my name is David Barton, I'm the attorney for the property owner. At some point we'd like to have the opportunity to give comment on the initial validity of the nomination, whether it's an appropriate nomination, and I do have some testimony that we would offer to the commission on that, essentially, jurisdictional subject.

MR. HOGAN: At this point usually, with regards to the merit of the application, we -- to my knowledge, it's been perfected, otherwise it would not be on my agenda, and has been reviewed internally. So this is not for us to determine, you know, the validity of that application, other than for the historic statute that we are governed by, which is, does it meet the standard of historic preservation.

MR. BARTON: Essentially, the owner would be offering that under Chapter 11 of the City Code the nomination is improper,
and we have some evidence to offer to the commission today.

MR. HOGAN: I understand your position, as well as read the documents, and, clearly, there's been a determination made that this is in standing and should be considered. And I think that, basically, to my knowledge, and based on the letters that I have read, which you sent us all, the acknowledgment of abandonment as a religious facility.

MR. BARTON: I think it is a religious structure under the City Code, it remains to be a religious structure.

MR. HOGAN: According to all your letters, it actually recites that it is the building that housed the formerly known as Albright United Methodist. That it acknowledged that in November of '13 the congregation of the United Methodist Church of Albright ceased using the church building as a place of divine -- the exact wording was, divine worship, and at that point it was abandoned.

MR. BARTON: Well, the
declaration of abandonment, if you will, in quotation marks, was a matter of church law.

But, in fact, I have testimony --

witnesses today that will testify that religious worship is ongoing and has been.

MR. HOGAN: Yeah, that's out of my privy to determine.

MR. BARTON: The difficulty with that is, religious worship is ongoing at the site, which renders it a religious structure.

MR. HOGAN: Again, this is out of my privy, from that standpoint. My standpoint as the commission is to review this as does this application have merit for historic standing.

MS. QUINN: Can I interject for a second?

MR. HOGAN: Sure.

MS. QUINN: We've had this come up before and, at this point, it's really the owner's responsibility to say whether they support the nomination or not based on the criteria for review under Title 11 of the City Code. So that's what -- that's what we would be hearing -- the commission would be
hearing today is of things related to Title 11 of the City Code and not the legal matters relating to how the nomination came to us.

MR. BARTON: We'd also have testimony with respect to that.

MS. QUINN: Okay. There will be time for that.

MR. HOGAN: That's applicable.

MR. BARTON: Thank you.

MS. QUINN: You guys ready?

MR. FALCONE: Can I say, before we start, please?

MR. HOGAN: Sure, go ahead.

MR. FALCONE: I just want to say, before we actually start with this, I would like to disclose that Preservation Pittsburgh has been heavily involved with this nomination. I'll be working -- I should say, I'm also president of Preservation Pittsburgh.

There's been a committee within the organization that has helped the Albright folks research and record their history over the past several months and also develop or complete the nomination form.
You'll see that as president of Preservation Pittsburgh my signature is on the page for a form for error.

That's it.

MS. QUINN: Well, the property in question for today is known as 486 South Graham Street, also known as the Albright United Methodist Church and parsonage. It's one property on -- well, it's on one parcel, so everything included within that parcel will be up for consideration today.

The owner of the property is the United Methodist Church of Western Pennsylvania.

The property was nominated by Ms. Lindsay Patross and the nomination was January 20th, 2016.

The dates of construction are, roughly, 1905 and 1906.

The building at 486 South Graham Street sits on a small knoll overlooking the intersection of Centre Avenue and South Graham Street at the nexus of several East End neighborhoods, Bloomfield, Friendship and Shadyside. The building is one of the few
unaltered structures remaining from the neighborhood's early period of development. The building is constructed of masonry and wood. And the church is a roughhewn Cleveland bluestone. The stone cladding appears on three elevations visible from the street. And the parsonage and the rear of the church are of orange brick and simply detailed.

And you guys -- you have a copy of the nomination form I just provided you. The architectural description in there is extremely detailed and complete, so we'll just leave that for something for you all to read.

Okay, the history of the church is, Albright United Methodist Church is one of the city's oldest congregations, formed in 1843 and organized in 1845 as the Zion Church of Pittsburgh of the Evangelical Association. The building at 486 South Graham Street is only the third permanent home of this 172-year-old congregation.

In the spring and summer of 1905 architect Chancey W. Hodgdon prepared plans
for a new stone church in Pittsburgh's burgeoning East End. On August 11, 1905 the Zion Evangelical Church purchased a lot measuring 120 by 145 feet at the intersection of Centre Avenue and South Graham Street for $19,200. This is the location for the church.

On Page 4 there is a list of criteria for designation for a historic district or structure within the City of Pittsburgh. Criteria 1 through 10, those are listed there, for your review. And, in addition, the ordinance says that the property must maintain architectural integrity, which means that it retains the character and defining features of what makes the building what it is.

Each of these criteria -- and I'll go through them individually, listing the ones that I feel apply in this case. I feel that Criteria 3, exemplification of a distinguished architectural type, style or design does apply in this case. Of significance, the Albright
building owes a great deal of debt to Richardson and his design sensibilities, but it is not a direct imitation.

Each of the stained glass windows, which are 39 in total, can be directly attributed to Pittsburgh's S.S. Marshall & Brothers, founded in 1872 in Allegheny City. S.S. Marshall & Brothers is one of the oldest art glass studios in the country that continued to manufacture pressed flint and lime glass, an older method of creating stained glass. This labor-intensive process required the completion of individual molds.

The design of the art windows is keeping with Lutheran design principles popular at the time and emphasizes geometric and curvilinear designs with symbolic representation interspersed to connote a room's specific function.

The building meets historic significance under Criteria 4, which is the work of an architect, engineer, designer or builder.

The building is among the best-
known existing works of architect Chancey W. Hodgdon. Also one of the few to remain largely intact, unaltered and functioning in its original intended capacity as a community space.

In comparison to some late 19th, early 20th century Pittsburgh-based architects, Chancey W. Hodgdon is relatively unknown today. His lack of notoriety, however, should not be a reflection on his caliber or quality of his work. A host of engineering and architectural journals document many of his commissions. He designed everything from modest row houses to well-appointed single-family homes, from commercial store fronts to industrial garages and warehouses. Much of what remains today of his work is his ecclesiastical buildings.

The majority of his known buildings span from 1889 to 1925. The Albright building appears to be one of his first known commissions for an ecclesiastical building. It is one with which Hodgdon was clearly pleased. This building served as inspiration for many of his later
ecclesiastical works. Hodgdon was a regional architect, designing buildings as far south as Canonsburg, Pennsylvania and as far north as Mars and Tarentum.

The building also meets the significance Criteria No. 10, which is a unique location and distinctive physical appearance or presence.

The building is a distinctive feature of the Baum/Centre corridor and of Pittsburgh's greater East End. For 109 years it has visually anchored the corner of Centre Avenue and South Graham Street. The building imparts a sense of place to its section of the East End otherwise consumed by cars and meritless commercial store fronts.

Under the aspects of integrity, the exterior of the building looks much the same as the day it was dedicated, exhibiting the soot-blackened stone that has become a hallmark of any historically meritorious Pittsburgh building.

The only visible modern changes to the building have been the addition of an ADA compliant entrance on the ground level of
the South Graham Street facade and an asphalt composite shingle roof installed on the main church structure.

Because this property meets at least one criteria for significance, and it's only required to meet one, and the property maintains its historic integrity, I recommend that this nomination be held for -- the nomination should be considered potentially viable and, therefore, should be voted in the affirmative.

MR. HOGAN: So at this point I'd like to say, if the nominator would like to speak on behalf of the application.

MS. PATROSS: Yes, I would.

Thank you. Thank you all for the work you're doing.

And I have sat through several Historic Review Commission meetings and I'm aware that these are long and sometimes uncomfortable, I know it's a little warm in here, but I appreciate the work you're doing and I care very deeply about the historic nature of this neighborhood.

And that's what brings me here
today, as I'm honored to have an opportunity
to talk to you about the building located at
486 South Graham Street.

My name is Lindsay Patross. I'm
a life-long Pittsburgher, I grew up in
Squirrel Hill and Point Breeze and I now live
in Shadyside, so this is very much part of my
neighborhood.

I come here and I've nominated
this building for two reasons.

One, this is a 109-year-old
building that houses much more than 109 years
of history and very significant architecture.
There are pieces of this building that were
part of the original church that was located
downtown, so there are a number of elements,
if you look at the history of the City of
Pittsburgh, as people moved from downtown to
the East End, that are part of this building.
It also houses the largest collection of S.S.
Marshall glass.

In a moment I'm going to yield my
time to Justin Greenawalt, who can speak
point by point on some of the elements of
this building, because we're here to talk
about history.

The second reason that brings me here is about the fabric of our neighborhoods. And one of the reasons people come to Pittsburgh and want to live in this city are architectural. And I'm very concerned about what transformations have occurred in the city, particularly in the Baum corridor area, and so I think it's very important to me to see a conversation and, hopefully, a historic designation for this building.

I first walked into Albright five years ago to volunteer at the community Thanksgiving dinner. And when I walked in the door I thought, are there really any hungry people in this neighborhood? What's really the need here? And what I learned is there are a lot of -- there is a lot of need in this neighborhood. Not only are there hungry people, but there are people that need a place for fellowship.

But just because this building does not serve a purpose on Sunday mornings doesn't mean it should be torn down and that
it can't function -- continue to function as a community space. And I think we have an incredible opportunity, especially given that the building sits technically in Bloomfield, that this is actually where Bloomfield meets Friendship and Shadyside, so it's the intersection of three neighborhoods and it's the intersection of a lot of different Pittsburgh communities, some that are very much changing. It's a walk away from UPMC, there are a bunch of high-rising that houses seniors and students.

There's a lot of opportunities and Pittsburgh had a tremendous amount of success recently in church re-purposing. The Union Project in Highland Park is just one example, Mr. Small's in Millvale, Neu Kirche on the North Side, the Nyia Page Community Center in Braddock.

Some of the greatest inspirations for thinking about re-purposing Albright comes from the Methodist church. The Toy Lending Library is housed in the church next door and has been a great example of a community church re-purposing, as well as
Calvary United Methodist Church, which is located on the North Side, which is another excellent example of neighbors coming together to rethink about how these buildings fit into their community.

I personally have created Friends of Albright. I'm not a member of the congregation.

I have met with a number of leaders in both the neighborhood and around the city, around historic preservation, but what are the needs for the neighborhood. Talking with Councilwoman Grose, I learned that there is not a senior center in Bloomfield and people need to get in their cars and drive. So there are no places for people to walk and have lunch.

I have met with the executive director of the Union Project several times, there is a need for artist and visiting lecture housing. The parsonage, up until a year ago, was rented as housing and could be ready to go.

There are additional needs in terms of I talked with Reverend Randy Bush,
from East Liberty Presbyterian Church; talked
with Mark Heckmann, the chair of the board of
the Union Project and a number of other
organizations, with both people talking about
community spaces and re-purposing historic
buildings.

Albright is in exceptional shape
and, actually, a little bit ahead of its
time. In the '90s it was remodeled and that
is when they added the entrance on Graham
Street, making it a much more usable
community space, the basement no longer
became a basement, but a street-level
entrance. It was upgraded with an elevator
and office space and, actually, PULSE, the
Pittsburgh Urban Leadership Service
Experience, which has since expanded, was
originally housed in one of the rental
offices in the union -- in this building. It
was some of the PULSE alums that went on to
found the Union Project and restore that
building.

Before I hand this over to Justin
I want to mention two things.
One, the Friends of Albright has
put together a feasible, financially-
sustainable plan for not only -- for really
capitalizing on the opportunity of this
historic building serving as a community
space. We're here to talk about history, but
I can answer any questions about that
individually.

I have a stack of letters of
support, as well as a petition. When I
printed it before I came here it was at 301
signatures, more people have signed and I
will forward that to you.

I want to read one of the
comments from the petition signers. We've
had even a neighborhood resident who is
currently living in Prague sign the petition.

But I'll end on this, one of the
tremendous benefits of living in this area is
the presence of historic buildings with
character, such as Albright Church, so easy
to tear down, impossible to replace.

I will be happy to take
questions.

We're going to have Justin
Greenawalt walk you through the specifics of
the historic nature of this building.
There's a lot of exciting things here.

MR. GREENAWALT: Good afternoon,
Commissioners, my name is Justin Greenawalt,
and I'm an architectural historian and I meet
the Secretary of the Interior's professional
qualification standards for the evaluation of
historic structures.

A lot of what I had to say Sarah
has already said, so I'm going to try not to
restate, you know, anything that's already
been put out there.

But one of the key things that I
really feel that needs to be realized is that
the Albright building illustrates an often
untold story in Pittsburgh, you know, the
late 19th and early 20th century migration of
religious and educational institutions from
downtown to the East End.

And, you know, with completion of
the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1852 and 1853
and the subsequent development of the East
End, many Pittsburghers decided to relocate,
and the those major institutions just
followed them. Among those were the
University of Pittsburgh, Chatham College,
St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Andrew, Third Presbyterian, First United Methodist, Rodef Shalom, Tree of Life and many, many others.
And in 1905 the Zion Evangelical Church chose to do the same.

Moving forward -- I mean, I would -- a lot of what I had to say has already been stated, so, I mean, I would really just say that to replicate this building would not only be impractical, it would be impossible. And, fortunately, for the Albright building, the integrity, as we've discussed, is good.

You know, I'd like to quote one of our supporters in saying that the viability is not a question, the building is viable, very viable and pretty much immediately.

As Lindsay said, changes for immediate use, you know, it's been made ADA compliant with ground-level entrance, there's an elevator that serves all floors, all major systems have been upgraded, the stained glass windows have been meticulously cared for and
many show evidence of recent preventative maintenance.

Now, some of our opponents would argue that there has been some water damage in the building and, yes, that is accurate. A roof leak caused some damage in the corner of the sanctuary, a leaking waterline caused some damage in the basement, the fellowship hall, that volunteer help helped to clean that up last year. These issues are isolated, they've caused no significant damage or irreparable damage to the structure of the building.

In stark contrast, a request for proposals was recently issued for the former Saints Peter and Paul, in Larimer, a building that is exponentially larger and is in a far more dire state of disrepair. Now, I fully understand that not every building can or even should be saved, but if there's hope for Saints Peter and Paul then there's surely hope for Albright.

You know, I'd like to conclude by saying that the goals of historic preservationists and the real estate
developers, they need not be mutually exclusive. It's time that we work together to build a community that we both want to see, and that starts with historic designation.

So I would just ask that you advance this nomination.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MS. PATROSS: Can I give you a copy of that petition and letters of support?

MS. QUINN: Yes.

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

All right. At this point, if you would like to proceed.

MR. BARTON: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, good afternoon again. My name is David Barton, counsel for the United Methodist Conference in Western Pennsylvania, the owner of 486 South Graham. And at this point I would like to offer, as evidence, a copy of the deed that's filed of record.

MR. SERRAO: Are there multiple copies here?

MS. QUINN: Yes.
MR. SERRAO: Okay.

MR. BARTON: The owner today of this structure is asking this commission to simply follow the City Code, in that churches require the consent of the owner to be nominated. There's a reason why this requirement was put into the City Code, and I'll touch on that in just a little bit.

First, I would say that, as I think the commission may be aware, the owner is not in favor of this nomination and, in that regard, I would offer copies of the letter of September 15th from Amy Bentz to Assistant City Solicitor Daniel Friedson.

MR. HOGAN: We have the copies of those records and we will note, after your testimony, for the record, to admit them.

MR. BARTON: And I brought extra copies, so if I could ask to have them --

MR. HOGAN: We have them all.

MS. QUINN: I just handed them out today.

MR. HOGAN: We have them, all four letters. A letter dated January 26th; November 23rd, 2015; September 15th, 2015;
and September 15th, 2015.

MR. BARTON: Thank you.

MR. SERRAO: I think you sent it to us under separate cover, correct?

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. SERRAO: Okay.

MR. HOGAN: We have it.

MR. BEVAN: Members of the Commission, I apologize for interrupting, my name is Brian Bevan --

MR. HOGAN: You have to --

MR. BEVAN: My name is Brian Bevan, I am counsel for some members of the congregation of Albright --

MS. BENTZ: There is no congregation.

MR. BEVAN: Former members of the congregation.

I guess I'm just -- I'm making a point here is, I'm a little -- it's my understanding, based upon what you said before we admitted any testimony about the historical nature of the building, that the issue of religious structure versus non-religious structure was not going to be
discussed. It sounds like they're going down
the road of discussing that, and I guess --

MR. HOGAN: Yeah, so, I would ask
that you retain your thoughts at this point.
At this point we would -- I'm going to allow
the owner to sort of state their position and
their document, of which we need to evaluate
will be based on what we know to be fact in
the law and what we are guided by.

MR. BARTON: Well, I would just
add, then, that since I -- I have prepared
some statements in favor of that, so I would
like a chance to respond.

MR. HOGAN: So let me just back
up about process.

So at this point this commission,
I don't believe, was in a position to have
the full hearing today, a public hearing,
because we are, at this point, determining
the fact, does it meet the historic criteria
to move forward.

We can take additional testimony,
which would most likely happen at our March
meeting, on the public comment period of
this.
So I ask you to retain your thoughts at this point so that we could at least get through both the petitioner and the owner, and that way we can then take into a fact what is in front of us. Okay?

MR. BEVAN: Thank you.

MR. SERRAO: There is no vote today.

MS. PATROSS: As the submitter, I would like to add that I nominated this as not a religious structure and that was included in my nomination.

MR. HOGAN: No, we know that.

Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Continuing on, I want to address, though, one thing briefly. As the chairman indicated, this commission is going to listen to some facts and make some determinations based on those facts and the law.

And, you know, there's an argument out there Ms. Patross has made that it's no longer a church because no divine worship is taking place there. That is
incorrect, and we'll have some testimony for that in just a moment. Worship, in fact, is taking place there.

And this would be a good time just to pause for a moment and talk about some important legal principles. And we're all vaguely familiar with the concept of separation of church and state. And I just want to note that Pennsylvania was founded on the principles of freedom of religious worship, and how they apply in today's laws. So the state constitution applies, the United States constitution applies.

And the fundamentally important thing here is that it's not for the government, the commission, any government, to say what is or isn't religious worship. That's clearly over the line for any government to say what you're doing constitutes or doesn't constitute religious worship.

And the pastor will testify that religious services took place through the fall of 2015 and into 2016. The Methodist Church has maintained the property throughout
the winter and secured it.

In fact, there's been some theft and the Pittsburgh police are investigating those thefts of some of the architectural elements, I suppose, would be a fair representation, from the structure.

Some, but not all of the religious services were conducted by Reverend George Porter, of First Church, a Methodist church not far away at all, close to the Graham Street neighborhood and serving many former parishioners who once worshiped at the -- a lot of times referred to as the Albright Church.

The nomination form, I would submit, contains a fraudulent statement designed to trick this commission into believing that the nomination is proper. It states, The last recorded use of the property was residential. That is plainly false.

Now, we'll offer testimony to indicate and to prove to this commission that there is a parsonage on the site, connected to the church, and it was occupied by a seminary student, who also served as a pastor
to a local church, Emanuel United Methodist
Church, in the West End.

And we think that that notation
of the last use as being residential is just
plainly false and I think it's designed to
induce the commission to think this isn't a
religious structure under the City Code so
that this nomination might proceed forward.

A religious structure, under
Chapter 11 of the City Code, is defined as
any of the following, church, cathedral,
mosque, temple, rectory, convent, comma, or
similar structure used as a place of
religious worship.

And at Albright there is worship
services going on currently.

Even if it wasn't being used
currently, and although that's not the case
here, the wording of the City Code, I think,
provides that it is a church until a contrary
use is established. In fact, that's a
fundamental principle of land use law and
zoning law.

But fundamentally, in my
estimation, it all comes back to, look, it's
not for the government to say what is or is
not religious worship, that is plainly over
the line and the founding fathers of our
commonwealth and the constitutional provision
of Pennsylvania, which traces directly, with
very few changes, back to the constitution of
1776, is a fundamental part of our
commonwealth's law.

With that, I would next call upon
Amy Bentz, B-e-n-t-z, who is chancellor of
the Methodist Church for the Western
Pennsylvania area.

Ms. Bentz.

MS. BENTZ: Thank you.

I believe there was some
discussion at the beginning here that you
have received the correspondence. But since
we do have a court reporter present, I would
like to make sure that you have all of my
correspondence.

I do serve as chancellor and
legal counsel to the Methodist Conference in
Western Pennsylvania. In that regard, that
geographically consists of about a 1,000
churches in Western Pennsylvania. The gap is
from, essentially, West Virginia up to Erie
and over almost to Harrisburg, and all of the
Methodist-related organizations.

MS. QUINN: I did provide them
with the envelopes that you had mailed.

MS. BENTZ: Great. Thank you.

MS. QUINN: So they have
everything.

MS. BENTZ: And I appreciate
that. Thank you.

It's very important to know, and
I think there's no dispute, that the
conference of the Methodist Church owns the
property.

MR. HOGAN: Correct.

MS. BENTZ: And, as Mr. Barton
stated, the City Code is very clear that a
religious structure may not, under any
circumstance, be designated as historic
without the owner's consent.

I'm here to tell you that in my
numerous items of communication and
correspondence, copies of which you have, the
conference, I stated, opposes this property
as a religious structure.
It cannot be designated as a historic landmark without our consent.

And just for the record -- and these letters, by the way, were written to Attorney Dan Friedson, who is the assistant city solicitor for the City of Pittsburgh, who I believe can serve as your counsel in some capacity. And they clearly articulated that the conference opposes the designation and does not consent.

Secondly, with regard to the error in the nomination form about the residential listing, as Mr. Barton pointed out, there's a parsonage that's attached to it currently serving Emanuel United Methodist Church, a Methodist church, is the pastor, and that pastor is in that parsonage.

We are using the church for religious worship. We don't have to be.

Chapter 11 of your City Code -- our City Code provides very clearly that a religious structure is a church, a cathedral, a mosque, a temple, a rectory, a convent, comma, or similar structure used as a place of religious worship.
I put the word, comma, in there so you can see common English interpretation, the doctrine of English Law and all applicable law saws that you may not, under any circumstance, designate the structure as an historic landmark. It doesn't matter if the people in the community want to use it for that purpose, it cannot be used for that purpose.

And we have the free exercise clause of the United States Constitution that tells us that. It would be a wholly improper separation or merging of church and state for you to tell us that this can be an historic landmark.

And I will tell you that the United Methodist Conference is prepared to take this up through the courts and will.

And, finally, I'd like to point out, well, actually a couple of things. It's very important that — to the Methodist Church that a structure not be designated as historic without our consent, and let me tell you why. Because the Methodist Church codifies, in its rules, a procedure for any
of its properties to be designated as historic. And it has to go through our archives and history. It has to go through several steps to be approved.

And the reason that is is because we have a religious asset, we want to marshal our assets for our mission, our religious mission, which is feeding the poor and helping those in the community, among other very important tasks.

Because historic designation of a church has the potential for affecting how the church may marshal its assets and, in turn, pursue its mission, we take this very seriously. So we are repeatedly opposing this.

Improperly granting this as an historic landmark creates a constitutional conflict. I cannot say that any clearer. Now, you may say that's not for today, we don't have it here on our nomination. I wrote to you all and said it should not be there. I also indicated that the owner opposes it.

It is being used as a religious
location, and even if you interpret the City
Code differently to say that the worship has
to be going on, which it doesn't, it is.
Reverend George Porter, who serves First
Church in Pittsburgh, is holding weekly
worship services and Bible studies there.
Reverend John Wilson, conference secretary,
has had key religious experiences there.

You may not, with all due
respect, designate this as historic over our
opposition. Not only do we not consent, we
oppose it.

So, in conclusion, this is a
church. Under your City Code it may not be
designated without our consent and we oppose
it.

Secondly, there's religious
activity going on there, too.

And, third, please stay out of
the areas where you are not permitted to be
in. This is a matter where it's a religious
structure, it may -- they may feel it's
important for historical significance, but
under RLUIPA, which I might point out is the
Religious Land Use and Institutionalized
Persons Act, which is a federal statute, and
the City Code, to designate this would be
improper.

Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Next, Mr. Chairman,
b briefly, the owner would call Reverend Paul
Taylor.

MS. QUINN: Should we start
timing for public comment?

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

MS. QUINN: Four minutes? Four
minutes or three?

MR. HOGAN: Three.

MR. BARTON: Can you state your
name and spell your last name for the court
reporter, Reverend?

REV. TAYLOR: Yes, Paul D.
Taylor, T-a-y-l-o-r.

MR. BARTON: And how are you
currently employed, Reverend Taylor?

REV. TAYLOR: I am the Pittsburgh
District Superintendent for the Western PA
Conference of the United Methodist Church.
And I have responsibility for the churches in
the Pittsburgh region.
MR. BARTON: And are you aware of whether there have been any religious worship services at 486 South Graham Street, at the Albright Church, in the second half of 2015 or so far in 2016?

REV. TAYLOR: Ah, yes. Yes, I am aware. I do know that our conference secretary, John Wilson, has worshiped in that space September, October and November of 2015 and every week in the month of December of 2015. And so far in 2016 George Porter has led a group of persons, on a weekly basis, worshiping in the space.

MR. BARTON: Okay. And are you aware of who has been residing in the parsonage?

REV. TAYLOR: Yes, Matt -- Matthew Dean, who is appointed pastor at Emanuel United Methodist Church, lived in that facility while, number one, he was completing his work, seminary training, at Union Theological Seminary, and subsequent to graduation he was appointed as pastor at Emanuel, on the North Side, and he and his wife resided in that property as the
parsonage for Emanuel United Methodist Church.

MR. BARTON: Is there anything else you'd like to add that I didn't ask?

REV. TAYLOR: We -- in my role as Pittsburgh District Superintendent, I can say that we've had numerous conversations with the people here and when I became district superintendent, on July 1, 2014, the Albright congregation, which was still functioning at that time, had already begun steps to sell the property and to list the property and also had received three offers on that property.

And at a charge conference we approved the discontinuance of that place as a congregation.

MR. HOGAN: Excuse me, is there currently a sales agreement in place on this property?

MR. BARTON: There is, yes.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Lastly, the property owner would call Reverend Greg Cox.

Good afternoon, Reverend Cox.
Can you state your name and spell your last name?

REV. COX: Yes, it's Reverend Gregory Cox, C-o-x.

MR. BARTON: And how are you employed, Reverend Cox?

REV. COX: I'm the Director of Connectional Ministries in the Western Pennsylvania Conference of the United Methodist Church, working alongside of our bishop and our district superintendents.

MR. BARTON: Can you explain what some of your duties are briefly?

REV. COX: My role and function within the annual conference is to give direction and oversight to the overall ministries, that include not only our camping and outreach ministries, but also our missional outreach, that encompasses all of our congregations in Western Pennsylvania, including those within Pittsburgh and in Allegheny County.

MR. BARTON: And do you have an opinion as to what effect it would have if the Albright Church was designated historic
by the Historic Review Commission?

REV. COX: Any historic landmark designation prevents the annual conference from fulfilling a larger vision for ministry and outreach within Western Pennsylvania, particularly within the boundaries of the city. Our discipline is clear that any time that ministry assets from a former congregation or former membership are to be designated for urban ministry.

We're currently developing plans within that area, within our parish and community development and also our ethnic and local church concerns team at developing strategies that is consistent with our multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and also African-American new church plans. Planting zones are a part of that conversation, and that's language that we use within United Methodist circles to describe ways in which new ministries can exist.

Unfortunately, the present building does not provide an opportunity for relevant and cultural ministry to continue in that area.
MR. BARTON: Thank you.

In conclusion, and I won't be repetitious too much more, as is obvious, of course, the Western Pennsylvania Conference, the owner of the property, does oppose this nomination.

And I would urge that caution to the commission, because an interpretation of the City Code that says it's not a religious structure involves an improper determination by the commission or, as I said before, any level of government, what is or isn't religious worship. In fact, the testimony is that religious worship is taking place. By definition under the City Code it's a religious structure, which can only be nominated by the owner.

With that I would respectfully request that the correspondence and the deed that I offered to the commission be moved into evidence and, in conclusion, would respectfully request that the commission make the determination that this nomination is inappropriate under the City Code and that it be dismissed.
Thank you very much.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

So from a procedural standpoint,

I just want to formally acknowledge, as to

Attorney Amy Bentz noted, the letters as so

noted into the record. One addressed to

Director Gastil.

So I'd like to just acknowledge,

for the record, the letter dated

January 26th, to Director Gastil, from Amy

Bentz, arguing the fact that they don't

believe that there's standing for this

nomination.

Letter dated November 23rd into

the record, to Attorney Daniel Friedson,

Assistant City Solicitor, arguing how

religious structure is noted.

Letter dated September 15th, to

Daniel Friedson, attorney, Assistant City

Solicitor, further articulating how, through

abandonment, the deed transferred to the

congress.

MS. BENTZ: Conference.

MR. HOGAN: The conference, I'm

sorry.
And then, lastly, a letter dated September 15th, which first outlined that which was the supplemental letter that I believe you sent on the thing.

Also to be acknowledged is a letter dated November 13th, 2015, that was provided us that further questions the nomination.

The initial nomination document, I would like to acknowledge for the record.

The petition provided by the petitioner of 301 signatures, to date, in support of the nomination in historic -- 301, as well as 24 individual e-mails and records, to be a part of the record, also showing support for the nomination.

At this point I'd like to open it to public testimony at three minutes -- oh, and the deed.

MR. SERRAO: Don't forget the deed.

MR. HOGAN: The deed that shows that the conference is the noted owner.

Lastly, again, I'd like to just sort of go forward. As far as a process, we
will take three minute testimonies, from the point -- I would ask that if you could stress the point of the application, at this point, which is does it meet the historic standards that are set out in Chapter 11.

And from there we will move forward.

Also, I do want to just note for the record and remind everyone that Commissioner Falcone noted his involvement in the nomination.

Our code is very clear in that we, as commissioners, have the right to participate in nominations, nominate buildings and structures and districts, and also participate in those votes.

And that he's also noted that there was no remuneration or benefit to his organization as part of that process in providing historic preservation material or data or facts on that.

So with that, can I take the first public testimony?

MS. BENTZ: Just one quick question, if I may?
MR. HOGAN: Um-hum.

MS. BENTZ: Amy Bentz again, chancellor for the United Methodist Church and the owner of the property.

My only question, for the record is, I understand that a nomination can be made by a member of the board -- or the commission, my only question, for clarification is, if this gentleman will be participating in a vote or recommendation, and, if so, I want that noted on the record.

MR. HOGAN: He will be participating in the vote.

MS. BENTZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: As per the code allows him to.

MR. BEVAN: My name is Brian Bevan, I'm counsel for some of the former members of the congregation of Albright. I just want to make a few points in response to arguments made by the owner. You know, they emphasized a lot about separation between church and state. You know, I would just say, about those arguments, that those are arguments that, I
think, are not proper for this forum. I think that is something that they should take up with city council. City council enacted the ordinance.

And I will say that the Historic Review Commission, on two prior occurrences in 2008, with the Malta Temple and with St. Lawrence's Academy in Lawrenceville, and this was part of an addendum submitted with a nomination, did make the determination that what was formerly a religious structure is now no longer a religious structure and, thus, the consent of the owner is not needed to designate it an historic structure under the City Code.

So I emphasize to you that you, as a commission, do have the authority, under the ordinance, to designate what was formerly a religious structure, a non-religious structure.

And they've emphasized these points. While there may be some merit to them, I don't think there's merit here. They should go to city council and try and get the ordinance amended, if they take issue with
that. It shouldn't be brought up here.

And I would just emphasize that the arguments that were made, as to the Malta Temple and the St. Lawrence Academy, it was opinion offered at meetings from the city solicitor's office. And so what is important is what is the current and most immediate use of the structure.

When the nomination was submitted I was unaware of any actual religious activity that was taking place there.

There may have been a seminarian living there, he was providing services at a property not Albright.

And, you know, someone has testified that apparently some services are taking place there. I think it would be more credible if the person actually providing those services or anyone who attended and had records of those services presented them, I haven't seen any of that submitted.

So what I would say is that the current most immediate use, as far as we know, has not been anything close to religious activity.
You do have the authority to designate it non-religious and to move the nomination forward. I point you to the letters from -- letters that have been submitted, one, August 21st, 2015, from Attorney Barton, to Attorney David Tule; one letter from the conference, dated January 28th, 2015, recognizing the abandonment vote, and in both statements they recognize that no divine worship, as identified, that language is specifically in the ordinance, it's says no divine worship has happened at Albright since November 2013. We're now two years and three months from that point. This is their language.

MR. SERRAO: You need to wrap it up, your three minutes are up.

MR. BEVAN: I point to that, as well as Attorney Barton's statement in an article in the Post-Gazette reaffirming that no divine worship has taken place.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MR. KAMARA: My name is Abass B. Kamara, A-b-a-s-s, middle initial, B., last
name, Kamara, K-a-m-a-r-a.

Out of respect for the board,
A, many of us appreciate your time and
attention to this matter. I'll be as brief
as possible.

This has been a very informative
meeting. I was unaware of these services
going on at Albright. As a former member of
the congregation, we look forward to an
invitation to attend or observe in the
future.

My understanding is that this
hearing is to seal up the historic nature of
the building. I think those issues have been
brought to light repeatedly in terms of the
years that the building has existed at that
corner, some of the important architectural
history that is connected to the building.

I know that a large crux of this
conversation concerns abandonment, which I,
as a member of the congregation, was told
this building was no longer fit for religious
services. Again, this is interesting and
heartwarming news to hear today.

And I think it's important to
remember how important this building is to
the fabric of the East End. It was mentioned
earlier that there's a lot of dramatic
changes going on in the East End and I think
a facility, religious or otherwise, that can
be a tool for as many folks, as the
conference mentioned, reaching out to the
poor, for society, is a great help.
And if you give me a quick point
of personal privilege, I'd like to enter some
names into the record, Zainabu Kallon Kamara,
Lillian Treece, Tom Treece, members of the
Albright congregation who have passed whose
memory we are trying to keep alive.
Thank you.
MR. HOGAN: Next.
MR. BARTON: Thank you.
Mr. Kamara mentioned a point of
personal privilege, which is actually why
I arise for no more than 60 seconds, and
that is that Mr. Bevan mentioned my letter
to Attorney Tule, using the phrase
abandonment --
MR. HOGAN: You know, sir --
MR. BARTON: Just 15 seconds, if
you would.

And that is that abandonment is a church law concept, versus religious structure under the City Code, and they're not the same.

That concludes my comment.

MR. HOGAN: All right, thank you.

But can we keep it, please, to the public testimony at this point. I really don't want to get into --

MS. BRANDT: Good afternoon, my name is Susan Brandt, I live at 300 Liberty Avenue, and I'm a member of Preservation Pittsburgh, speaking on behalf of Albright Methodist Church.

The Albright Methodist Church has served Shadyside and Bloomfield for 199 years. It continues to be a landmark in the fast expanding Baum/Centre corridor. 275 units of residential housing are about to be built within two blocks of the church. Sitting on a knoll above the surrounding area, the Albright Church visually anchors this corridor.

Built for $37,885 at the
beginning of the 19th century, the building now stands empty and threatened by demolition. What fate will that building be?

We are asking for your help today to ensure its welfare, adding it to the impressive list of City of Pittsburgh landmark properties.

There is no doubt that this is a valuable piece of real estate. The windows alone, created by Pittsburgh's S.S. Marshall, are priceless. There are also no doubt that this building, of such magnificence, would not be built at 486 South Graham Avenue today. Economics, however, is not the purview of this commission.

When a religious function can no longer be viable, these spectacular religious buildings can be adapted for new users. The wonderful spaces that the architect created for the Albright Church are full of light and open spaces and lend themselves to adaptive reuse, whether for a congregation or two, or a new use entirely.

Diana Nelson Jones writes in November 2015, In the early 19th and 20th
centuries those qualities impelled church
congregations to build for majestic results.
They built the most fitting tribute to God
they could. But as time and life trial
shifted and the society around the
congregations dwindled, merged or disappeared
the congregations were forced to leave.
That is exactly what happened to
Albright.

During the middle of the 20th
century, people and planners no longer cared
about the Richardsonian Romanesque
architecture, new and shiny was their model.
Tear down and build new was their slogan.
As preservationists, we believe
there is a better way, a more sustainable way
to recycle our religious properties. Modify
use and go forward, save your historic
building.

St. Peter and Paul, in far worse
condition than Albright, is ready to begin
its new life, finally. For this spectacular
building, the East Liberty Development
Corporation has received a substantial grant
to begin --
MR. SERRAO: You need to wrap up, your time is up, as well.

MS. BRANDT: Albright U.M. Church, with your nomination of this magnificent building can endure to serve the growing neighborhood.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MS. QUINN: Can I ask, if you want to provide public comment, please que up behind there so we can all move forward.

MS. HAVEN: Hi, my name is Jennifer Haven. I had submitted a letter from the Friendship Community Group. I'm also here on my own behalf, I live a few blocks from the Albright Church.

"The Baum/Centre corridor has served for decades as the backdoor to East End communities. Recent development has only continued this trend.

"With proper planning and design we can create a unique urban community that will become a focus for research, retail residential and artistic development. I envision a corridor that is planned by all of the adjacent communities to connect and build
a new East End."

That was spoken by Bill Peduto when he was council -- when he was the councilor for District 8 in 2003. I don't think anything has changed and, if anything at all, things have gotten more -- more desperate in the corridor. We have a lot of buildings coming down and replaced with new construction that can't possibly replace the significant historical importance of the buildings that lived a hundred years before.

I ask that today you listen to the over 300 community members that supported this nomination and their desire to carry out their mission of feeding the poor and helping those in the community, as evidenced by their annual Albright Thanksgiving dinner, and the list of petition signatories, you can see that we're a very multi-racial, multi-cultural and just an incredible mix of people that do support this nomination.

Thank you so much.

MR. MANGAN: Good afternoon, my name is Tom Mangan, I live on the 400 block of South Graham, so I'm probably one of the
closest people to the church.

I walk by the church almost every single day, I walk my dog there. And I find it interesting because I've never, since I've been here in ten years, in the past few years I've actually never experienced or heard a church service going on, never seen the lights on, I don't even see them shoveling the snow, so I'm a little curious of when these church services are happening.

But one of the things that drew me to the Friendship neighborhood is the architecture, it's the property values, it's the architectural style that you don't get anywhere else. And, sure, you might, you know, tear down the church and build something new, but it's kind of like, let's tear down a hundred-year-old oak tree and plant a seedling. I guess, what, it's not going to -- we're never going to experience that sort of magnificence again. And it's up to us to preserve those things, because that's what brings the property value -- keeps the property values where they are.

Our neighborhood, in the '60s and
'70s, had a pretty rough time, people were tearing -- or converting the homes from these grand Victorian homes into -- you know, chopped up into apartments, you know, some of them four, five, six, eight units and some even more. And now the neighborhood is taking those back, reconverting them back into single-family homes, to get that character, to get that charm. And if we don't have these churches around then we fail to have that experience. History for us was a draw. For a lot of people coming into this neighborhood, history is a draw. Suburbia is everywhere, we don't need to tear down stuff and we can go anywhere else to go to a Chuck E. Cheese or a coffee shop. You know, we've got this, it's irreplaceable, let's keep it and keep the value that's there. Also, it's a very walkable neighborhood, it's got so much that we can offer. Again, what we do not want to experience is just this neighborhood, this area turning into the neighborhood over
there, the neighborhood over there, that you can get anywhere else. This is a one-of-a-kind asset, as people mentioned. It's the intersection of three tremendous neighborhoods here, you don't get this experience anywhere else, that's the draw. Our property values continue to increase because of that experience, not in spite of it.

So we should do our best -- I ask the gentlemen and ladies here do your best to maintain that, to preserve that, because once it's gone again it does not come back.

Thank you for your time.

MS. McSWIGAN: Hi, I'm Melissa McSwigan, 40131 Bigelow Boulevard, 15,213.

Perhaps it's just the circles that I travel in, but without much or any provocation on my part, many people, many who pay attention to historic preservation, are complaining in the rapid pace of development in Pittsburgh, lack of affordable housing, work quality, the construction materials and design and the fear of losing Pittsburgh's unique character. This character is a lot of
what attracted the development in the first place.

Not everyone seems to be wowed by the maximum profit per square foot of much of the housing being built in the city. It feels to me and others that we are losing community control of our neighborhoods to money and power.

And it seems to me that the situation with Albright fits right in there, with the church to be torn down for a drive-thru Starbucks and not a house of worship.

With so much development going on in our city, it's important that we provide proper protections to the places that make Pittsburgh special and allow community groups to have a say in how Pittsburgh grows, and this is why I'm supporting the nomination.

Thank you.

MS. SAWYER: Hello, my name is Katy Sawyer, I'm chair of the board of directors of the Young Preservationists Association.

I'm here simply today to express that the YPA supports the nomination of the
former home of the Albright Methodist Church
as a city historic landmark. We believe that
it meets the basic criteria for the Historic
Review Commission to discuss and decide
further.

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MR. MORDEN: Hi, my name's Ryan
Morden, I live at 6600 Northumberland Street
here in Pittsburgh.

And I just want to echo the
support for advancing this historic
nomination for the reasons mentioned earlier.

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Next?

Okay. Well, there will be a
public hearing next month, so.

So, at this point I think we --
the commission should take into account the
thought and the nomination and the materials
in front of us to make a determination of
does this move to us holding a public
hearing. Out of courtesy today, we took
testimony from the individuals who took time
out of their day so that we could start to
form the record.

I think we heard very loud and clear, you know, as our city progresses and develops the fabric of our city becomes even more critical to its future. And I think that as we move forward in how our city was and has evolved, structures like the Albright are important pieces that codify how Pittsburgh has progressed and the rich fabric that came from the people that used these facilities and worshiped and played in their neighborhoods.

Once again, I think, you know, we don't take these processes lightly. There's been a lot of information provided, which has brought us here today, but I also do think that, as we, a city, move forward, and you heard pretty clearly that there is significant opportunity to celebrate our history and, in many cases, good examples of re-purposing our history into new lives for its future. And I think, really, the point of where there has been significant investment already in the Baum/Centre corridor, once again this particular piece
becomes an important component in that fabric
as we move forward.

I want to say, as far as I'm concerned, I believe that the materials
provided today are very true and in keeping
with the information necessary for us to be
able to move to the next step, which would be
saying that this building does, in my opinion, codify and represent the historic
structure and that it does meet at least the two noted criteria from exemplifying the state and the form of architecture that this building celebrates and how that architecture has been preserved, as well as preserving further --

MS. QUINN: It was three criteria, architect and the visual.

MR. HOGAN: With regards to the architect who created the building, the -- so item -- it's Item 3, right?

MR. SERRAO: 3, 4 and 10.

MR. HOGAN: 3, 4 and 10. So we're saying that Item 3 is exemplification of the distinguished architecture type, style and design. Clearly this was a very rich and
opulent building as it was constructed, A, by
the price tag alone.

Two, the work of the architect,
engineer and designer in order to really sort
of codify and really create such a robust and
elegant structure.

And then, lastly, the unique
location and destination and physical
appearance and how it commands its site and
projects what the fabric of that corridor was
and continues to be.

So does anyone else have any
other --

MR. GASTIL: I'd only add to say
that I think if you look at 3, 4 and 10, I
think some of the things we've heard today,
including the overall quality of design,
detail, materials and craftsmanship -- I just
want to note that on the items in the
criteria for designation, when we think
simply of the glass work alone, Item No. 3
seems to be really quite relevant in terms of
quality of design, detail, materials and
craftsmanship.

I'd also say that I think we can
really make a case of -- I really think that all three of these items, the unique location and the distinctive physical appearance; the identification as the work of an architect, designer or engineer or builder with work significant in the history and development of the City of Pittsburgh, as well as I mentioned already in 3, I'd like to echo that I think that that case has been made.

MS. PETERSON: I've come across this architect before in various research that I've done, so I do think that he has some significance, at least in the Pittsburgh region, Southwestern Pennsylvania.

MR. SERRAO: I'll concur. I think, especially, also, to pick up the points that the building is in very -- it's pretty much intact. That's one of the things that also give it the certain quality, that it hasn't been altered too greatly, if at all. And that historic fabric has been maintained and it comes through.

MR. HOGAN: Anything else?

MS. PETERSON: I think it's potentially also significant under criteria
8, exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement.

MR. GASTIL: I think that both 7 and 8 are potentially --

MR. HOGAN: I would want to understand that a little more.

MR. GASTIL: I think 3, 4 and 10 are the strongest.

MR. HOGAN: Yeah. I think if there is a case to be made it would be helpful to understand that a little more.

I would agree with you, I think, once again, if we look back at the way the street scapes of our city have come to be, that this was a significant emulation of how that pattern was developed.

MS. PETERSON: Yes. And there was testimony as to, you know, linking this with other congregations and institutions even from downtown to the East End.

MR. SERRAO: Well, I think it goes back to the idea that East Liberty was a religious center in general, with all the different religious structures, that there was a tremendous amount of them and they're
all of excellent quality.

MS. PETERSON: Yes.

MR. HOGAN: All right. So with that, we, at this point, believe the application complete with regards to does have merit of historic standing and is warranted of a public hearing to be held in the March commission.

So I would ask if someone would propose a motion to codify that the nomination, as submitted, does meet the historic standard -- the points --

MS. PETERSON: So move.

MR. HOGAN: Is there a second?

MR. SERRAO: I'll second.

MR. HOGAN: It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor?

(Thereupon, there was a chorus of ayes.)

MR. HOGAN: Is there any abstentions?

The motion carries unanimous.

So the next meeting of the Historic Review Commission will be in March, the first Wednesday, of which we will further
debate the value.

And we would ask that if at that meeting you could come prepared to argue the fact that if this -- if you do feel that this commission, with regards to the historic content and the value of the historic nature of the code, we would look forward to those comments.

Again, we will hold public testimony to three minutes during that period.

And from that point, then, we will deliberate and make a decision and recommendation if it extends beyond to the planning commission.

So can I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. SERRAO: So moved.

MR. FALCONE: Second.

MR. HOGAN: All in favor?

(Thereupon, there was a chorus of ayes.)

MR. HOGAN: Motion approved.

(Thereupon, at 4:04 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)
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