



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 2, 2016
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>		
Joe Serrao	Sarah Quinn	Paul Taylor	Carole Malakoff	John Francona
Carol Peterson	Sharon Spooner	Joshua Fischer	Pat Russell	Jim McMullen
Raymond Gastil		Jerry Morosco	Glenn Benigni	Amy Bentz
Ernie Hogan		Nick Kyriazi	Solomon Kamara	Bob Baumbach
Matthew Falcone		Duncan Horner	Taafui Kamara	Lindsay Patross
Erik Harless		Eric French	Katie French	Lizabeth Gray
		Tom Mangan	Susan Branch	Randy Zotter
		Shelley Parkerson	Brian Bevcon	Tim Sera
		Sarah J. Bradford		

Old Business-None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the February 2016 meeting minutes, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Falcone seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the February 2016 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.

Other Business:

1. Ms. Quinn talks about the public hearing for the Card Carriage House at City Council. She also talks about the timeline for the ordinance revisions.

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.

913 Beech Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Howard Brokenbek
913 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-47

Inspector:

Applicant:

Howard Brokenbek
913 Beech Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/11/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alterations to after-the-fact rear carport.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Howard Brokenbek steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that he would like to address the concerns of his neighbors and talk about the changes he has to make on his carport project. He shows photos and plans and explains that he has framed in the side of the carport. He states that he will square off the rounded roof and add additional metal on top; there will no longer be any rounded elements on the carport. He talks about the fence that he installed, which has a gate in it for the upstairs tenant. He talks about the Allegheny West guidelines and the concerns of the LRC, and states that he did try to address most of them. He talks about the paint colors, which are the same ones that are on his house and carriage house. He shows the plot plan and explains the location of the carport and fence. He states that he has a letter from his neighbors and shows a photo of the location of their property. He states that he did go before the LRC and discuss the project, and they were in support of the changes.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that as long as he follows what he has submitted, he is fine with these plans. He asks for public comment.
 3. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that there is a big difference between the original structure that was denied and what he is proposing now. She states that it is a simple structure now, and they do support it.
-
-

Motion:

4. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a rear carport as submitted in the documents.
 5. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

911 Galveston Avenue

Allegheny West Historic District

Owner:

Delta Foundation
PO Box 100057
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233-0057

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 7-D-151

Inspector:

Applicant:

David Morgan
3308 Perrysville Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15214

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/12/16

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

Proposed Changes: Building renovations to remedy after-the-fact work.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Morgan steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that he was retained to bring the building into compliance. He states that there are three parts to the drawings: what was there prior to 2012, what was done in 2015 without a Certificate of Appropriateness, and what they are proposing for future work. He states that a portion of the storefront on either side of the entry doors was replaced with a new wooden storefront, and the glass panels in the bulkhead were replaced with wood panels with new trim. He states that the center portion of the storefront remained as-is, which has been a good resource in trying to bring the storefront back to what it was originally. He states that the entrance door to the upper floors has also not been altered. He states that there were also three flag brackets that were removed from the storefront.

He presents the plans for the proposed storefront work. He states that the transoms in the storefront would have been sash panels but were replaced with fixed glass; they are proposing to replace the sash windows and replicate the trim. He states that they will probably reuse the glass. He states that the trim on the bulkhead does not match what was there when it was glass; it is much simpler, although the rhythm and size of it is the same. He states that they are proposing to replicate what was there by adding more appropriate trim; they are not proposing to replace the wood panels with glass. They will leave the flag poles off and leave the apartment entry door and signboard will also remain as-is, with minor repairs and painting. The storefront entry door was replaced with an aluminum door, and they are proposing to replace it with a wood and glass entry door with side lites.

He talks about the side elevation and shows photos of the condition prior to the current ownership. He states that there was an air conditioner sticking out of a wood-framed opening and several blocked-in openings. The original door was replaced with a steel door with a transom above. They are proposing to replace the vinyl windows that were installed with wooden windows, with trim to match. They are asking to be able to keep the steel door for security in the alley. He talks about

the garage door, stating that there was an original wooden garage door that was replaced with a flush metal door which they are also asking to retain. He states that there are new light fixtures and security cameras that have been installed. He states that there was also an old wooden interior door and frame that was installed next to the garage which has been removed.

2. Mr. Serrao asks about the ADA ramp shown in the drawings.
 3. Mr. Morgan states that they are proposing to install an ADA ramp at the front of the building with a concrete ramp and steel pipe rail. He states that there is a similar ramp across the street. He also talks about the proposed color scheme. He states that there is currently a mix of vinyl and wood windows on the upper floors that were replaced at various times.
 4. Mr. Hogan goes back to the ramp and states that the side walkway isn't wide enough to accommodate a ramp. He asks what the height of the step is on the front.
 5. Mr. Morgan states that it is about 12 inches, and they would have to get an encroachment permit. He states that the rear gate is too narrow to accommodate an accessible entrance as well.
 6. The Commission discusses options for the ADA ramp.
 7. Mr. Hogan mentions a project where the bulk of the ramp was constructed inside.
 8. Mr. Serrao states that the Modern Cafe across the street is fine because the ramp is at the side door.
 9. Ms. Quinn asks if the One Step Program could be an option.
 10. Mr. Hogan states that 12 inches, or two steps, would be too steep for that program.
 11. The Commission reviews the drawings and discusses options.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks about the other entry on the front facade.
 13. Mr. Morgan states that there is a stair to the basement and the first floor on the other side of the door and it probably wouldn't be possible. The door is also original, and the probably would not be able to keep it if it needed to be ADA compliant.
 14. The Commission discusses further options for the ADA ramp.
 15. Mr. Hogan asks about the articulation of the lower window sash. He states that it looks like they are introducing trim that would mimic a window.
 16. Mr. Morgan states that is correct.
 17. Mr. Hogan asks why they would not consider replacing the glass.
 18. Mr. Morgan states that it was mainly for safety.
 19. Mr. Hogan states that they could allow a sash with a wood insert, but that would require them to alter the rest of the window to accept it.
 20. Mr. Morgan says **they could do that, but they would have to alter it so it wouldn't pull out.**
 21. Mr. Hogan states that this is a good attempt at trying to correct a wrong, but he is not sure they are there yet. He states that he would be willing to accept the garage
-
-

door if they can pay more attention to the front facade. He states that the molding starts to get there, but he is not sure that it will mimic what was there originally. He states that there are original pieces of fabric, so they can see what was there. He states that if this was not before them as after-the-fact work, they would still want to work with them on the design, and this is even more the case since it is replacement of the storefront after-the-fact.

22. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. He acknowledges an email received from the LRC dated February 29, 2016.
23. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium; she is representing the LRC. She states that the kickplate glass was wire glass in separate sections. They were painted over, and the LRC had recommended two years ago that they not be replaced but just be stripped of paint. She states that **a lot of the LRC's recommendations do coincide** with the proposed work. She states that they recommend that they use the two original angled storefront sections as models and reconstruct the storefront around it. They recommend that the glass be reinstalled in the kickplates to replicate the originals and that the storefront transoms be rebuilt. She states that the wood profiles that are used should replicate the originals; she also states that the wording is too general in the proposal regarding the wood profiles. With respect to the entry door, their experts say that the building would have had double doors originally, so they recommend research into the original entry doors before new ones are designed. She talks about the side elevation, stating that they do support replacement of the vinyl windows with wood. They recommend denial of the steel door and replacement with a wood door and also denial of the flush garage door and replacement with a paneled door. She states that they would like to see the light fixtures on the side be replaced with more appropriate fixtures. She recommends they give a finite amount of time, maybe six to nine months, for the applicant to rework the plans.
24. Mr. Hogan states that they should take some time to get this right. He states that the project is on the right track, but he would like to see further development of the drawings, especially with respect to the trim, transom, kickplate windows, and the display windows. He also requests cut sheets on fixtures and a cross section of the existing condition profiles and the proposed profiles. He states that they should try to replicate what is there. He entertains a motion to table for 30 days to give them time to submit that.
25. Mr. Serrao states that he agrees, and he also thinks that something should be done with the garage door.
26. Mr. Hogan states that what was replaced would not have been original. He states that they could look into an applied design to mimic the profile. He states that there probably would have been two barn-type doors there.

Motion:

27. Mr. Serrao motions to table the application for 30 days.
 28. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 29. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1004-1006 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

Inspector:

Applicant:

Bob Baumbach
900 Middle Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/12/15

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact rear renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bob Baumbach steps to the podium. He explains that he was the architect for several projects on this property, but he was not involved in this project. He is here representing the owner. He states that there are two houses involved in the project, and the work that was done without approval was on the rear of the houses. He shows a photo of the house before the work was done; the rear façade was not original and collapsed so it was taken down. The new façade has two windows which would probably historically been there as they match the size of the other windows, and they also installed French doors. He shows a photo of the masonry wall, stating that the wall that was initially covered in OSB is now clad in brick. He talks about the materials, stating that they used Jeld-Wen wood doors and Thermo True aluminum-clad windows, and they also installed an ipe wood fence. He presents the specs for the materials.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 3. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium. He asks if it is just the wall replacement before them today.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that they are also looking for approval of the windows, French doors, and the wood fence.
 5. Mr. Kyriazi states that the wall that was there had been butchered over the years and was nothing that anyone would want to preserve, and he thinks what they did is a reasonable approximation of what would have been there. He does have an **issue with the color of the brick and states that there wouldn't have been any brick sub sills. He states that he doesn't have a problem with the fence; it is modern, but it is not offensive.** He wonders how they got a building permit to replace the entire back wall without going through historic review.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public comment; there is none.
 7. Ms. Peterson asks about the aluminum-clad windows.
-
-

-
-
8. Mr. Hogan states that **typically they don't approve aluminum**-clad windows.
 9. Mr. Serrao states that it depends on where they are.
 10. Mr. Hogan states that the rear of the building is on a small alley and hard to see from the public right-of way. He states that if this project would have come before them prior to work being done, they would have made recommendations for different windows and sills and brick color.
 11. Mr. Falcone states that the fence is out of compliance with the guidelines for the district.
 12. Mr. Hogan states that they can consider this because it is on the alley, but on the other hand they are setting a precedent.
 13. Mr. Kyriazi steps back to the podium to agree that this would set a precedent. He asks how they obtained a building permit.
 14. The Commission states that they did not have a permit for the rear renovations.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the after-the-fact renovations as submitted.
 2. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan adds that he has reservations.
 4. Mr. Serrao agrees.
 5. Mr. Harless states that they should require some changes.
 6. Mr. Falcone agrees.
 7. Ms. Peterson agrees as well.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks if there is an amendment; there is none. He asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao and Mr. Gastil are in favor and Ms. Peterson, Mr. Falcone, and Mr. Harless are opposed. The motion is defeated and Mr. Hogan asks if they would like to attack this in a different way.
 9. Mr. Harless asks for the photo of the fence.
 10. Mr. Hogan says that the windows would have originally had wooden window sills. He states that they would have recommended concrete, sandstone, or wooden sills. He states that the addition was not original to the house at that height.
 11. Mr. Harless agrees on the sills. He states that they should look into making some changes on the details and come back.
 12. Mr. Hogan states that they can kick this back to the applicant and give them 30 days to revise the window sills and headers, the fence, and the light fixtures, and submit cut sheets and details.
 13. Mr. Baumbach states that he agrees on the headers. He states that the fence could be replaced, but the headers and sills are more permanent. He proposes that instead of coming back, he can instruct the owner to add the headers and sills and paint the brick if needed.
 14. Mr. Hogan asks what the desire of the Commission is.
-
-

-
-
15. **Mr. Serrao states that he doesn't** mind the fence.
 16. Mr. Hogan states that it is a small piece and recessed, but they never would have approved it.
 17. Ms. Peterson talks about the mortar.
 18. Mr. Hogan agrees that the mortar is a problem, and the only solution is to paint it.
 19. Mr. Gastil asks what the motion is.
 20. Mr. Hogan states that there is no motion on the table at this point. He states that a recommendation was made by the applicant that they could replace the headers and sills with stone. He states that he thinks that replacement of the mortar would be excessive, but asks the opinion of the other Commissioners.
 21. Mr. Gastil agrees that the headers and sills would enhance the building. He states that since the fence would not normally be approved, they should consider requiring it to be changed. He states that they could have it be a staff review.
 22. Mr. Hogan states that the motion would be to approve conditionally and require the owner to install stone headers and sills on the windows and to replace the fence with one that would meet the historic standards.
 23. Mr. Serrao motions.
 24. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 25. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1809 E. Carson Street **East Carson Street Historic District**

Owner:

Glenn Benigni
543 Burkes Drive
Coraopolis, Pa 15108

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-323

Inspector:

Applicant:

Gerald Lee Morosco
1016 E Carson Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 2/12/16

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

Proposed Changes: Alterations to previously approved plans.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Glen Benigni steps to the podium; he is the owner of the building and business. He states that the proposal is to enclose their patio, which currently just has a plastic tarp enclosure. He states that he had originally worked with his architect to renovate two of the facades into one, but that has become financially unfeasible. He states that they are now proposing to enclose the existing patio with accordion doors, a gate, and transom windows. He shows the floor plan and states that they are keeping the same depth of the facade.
 2. Mr. Gerald Morosco steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they are keeping the steel superstructure of the building but are removing the cross arms that came out and held banners, and they are trimming back the two on the end. He states that there are two steel columns that were enclosed in brick, and they will be removing the brick. He states that there is currently a fence that they will be replacing with a pair of swing gates, which can swing open if they are able in the future to have a sidewalk permit for outdoor dining. He states that they are adding a metal cornice element to conceal a steel beam. He states that this will create a rhythm and pattern of a storefront even though it is set back.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials.
 4. Mr. Morosco states that the storefront sections are aluminum, and they are making the top rail and two side stiles wider to mimic what a wood storefront would be, and the lower rail has a larger kick on it. The upper pieces are fixed-lite transoms, and the existing steel and metal cornice element will be painted. The fence will be wrought iron or aluminum. He states that for the newer Commissioners, he states that this type of storefront has been approved on similar buildings in the district. He states that the finish will be with colors as shown, and they can submit color chips to staff.
 5. Mr. Harless asks about the gate and how it swings.
-
-

-
-
6. Mr. Morosco states that it swings out but back in, so it will not be in the public right-of-way.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alterations as submitted in the drawings, with final color selections to be submitted to staff.
 2. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1200 Muriel Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Gary Olden
290 Colonial Drive
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-228

Inspector:

Applicant:

Gary Olden
290 Colonial Drive
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 1/22/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Façade renovations including door and window replacement, signage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Gary Olden steps to the podium; he is the owner of the business. He states that they are seeking approval for exterior renovations. He shows photos of the building, stating that he believes the Bedford Square side is in the historic district. He states that the plans are to replace the existing garage door with a glass garage door, infill a section which is currently just a section of painted wood, adding a storefront, add permanent planters, and install a new sign and lighting. He states that they have approval from Public Works for the bike racks and planters.
 2. Mr. Gastil asks about the materials.
 3. Mr. Olden states that the storefront will be aluminum and glass.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the Muriel Street side.
 5. Mr. Olden states that they will be installing new doors, lighting, and a blade sign.
 6. Mr. Gastil states that the large element on the Bedford Square side is the large window.
 7. Mr. Hogan states that they are also replacing the garage door. He states that they are also expanding the door size and adding a roof over it as well as lighting.
 8. Mr. Olden states that is correct.
 9. Mr. Falcone asks if they are removing the existing lighting on the Bedford Square side.
 10. Mr. Olden says yes.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 12. Mr. Hogan states that they should take the application in two parts: the renovations to the building and the signage. He asks for a motion for the renovations and cautions that they have not approve glass garage doors in the district.
-
-

-
-
13. Mr. Gastil asks if it makes a difference on a non-contributing building.
 14. Mr. Hogan states that it makes it easier that it is non-contributing, and also that they are approving replacement of a garage door with another garage door, on a cinder block garage building.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovations including installation of the new man-door and side lite, replacement of the existing garage door with a new glass garage door, and installation of lights and wooden planters as shown
 2. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 4. Mr. **Hogan asks for a motion on the signage. He states that he doesn't have an issue with it and it is back-lit.**
 5. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the signage.
 6. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 7. 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:

Applicant:

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

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 1/15/16

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

Proposed Changes: Renovation and construction of an addition.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Joshua Fisher steps to the podium representing the owner; he introduces Mr. Jim McMullen, the architect for the project, to explain the project.
2. Mr. McMullen states that they presented the application last month and have made some changes. He introduces the project again for those who were not present at the last meeting. He states that at the last meeting, there was a concern that the new addition was trying to look historic and mimic the existing building, and there were also concerns presented by the LRC including concerns with the addition on the existing building. He states that they have eliminated the addition; however, they do still need to locate a stair tower in the existing building. He states that they will push it back 30 feet and will show that it will not be visible.

He shows the new elevations and explains the changes they have made. On the existing building, he states that they have closely matched the original windows, and since the building will be one building with two pieces, they have relocated the entrance to the old gates of the existing building. They tried to make the entrance look more like the stable doors that would have been there originally. The windows will be painted and true divided with historic-looking sash profiles. He shows the side and rear elevations as well as the front elevation, and shows that the stair tower will not be visible from that angle. He talks about the materials, stating that the brick for the base and the windows on the addition will be carried over for the existing building; however, there will be significant differences between the old and new parts of the building. He states that the existing building has arched-top windows and the addition will have rectilinear windows. He states that the balconies on the structure will be a wire, narrow-profile assembly.

3. Mr. Hogan asks about the doors on the front and if they will be operable, as the plans don't show that they are doors.
 4. Mr. McMullen states that they will be operable.
-
-

-
-
5. Mr. Hogan states that he feels that the doors need work. He asks if there are any pictures of the existing condition of the windows.
 6. Mr. McMullen states that they did take photos on the inside and tried to replicate what was there. He shows the six-over-six condition on the historic photo.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks if the windows are aluminum.
 8. Mr. McMullen states that they can do wood; they will use the same material on the existing building and the new addition and differentiate them by the shape of the window.
 9. Mr. Hogan states that the doors need work and that they will also need cut sheets on the windows. He also states that since the palladium window is so important, they should give more detail on how they are restoring it.
 10. Mr. Falcone states that they should try go back to what was there originally.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 12. Ms. Carole Malakoff steps to the podium representing the LRC. She states that they have been working closely with the LRC and the project has come a long way since last month. She states that they have not seen this most recent version of the proposal, but they did review a similar plan. The LRC is pleased that the applicant has taken many of their recommendations, including elimination of the fourth floor on the existing building, retention of the original openings, retention of the building identification sign, and moving the main entrance. She states that the LRC recommends that they redesign the entrance doors to look like stable doors. She states that the windows are a concern, as they stated that the window would be wood-clad with fake or applied muntin; they would like to see wood windows with true divided lites. They also suggested that the door to the right replicate the original doorway, which they have done. They did discuss the materials, which they would like to see more about.
 13. Mr. Hogan states that they can possibly approve with staff review. He states that he would like more information on the windows and front doors. He states that they could construct a fixed door system to mimic the old door system, with a smaller operable door cut into it and a solid piece of wall glass to mimic a panel rather than the small glass windows. He states that they would also need to see cut sheets on materials. He states that they will need to follow cleaning and mortar guidelines.
 14. Ms. Peterson mentions the true divided-lite windows.
 15. Mr. Hogan states that they will need cut sheets for all of that. He entertains a motion for approval as submitted with the condition that they submit cut sheets and samples of the windows which should be true divided-lite, detailed drawings on a better articulation and material of the front doors, an analysis of the mortar and replacement in-kind, and samples of the brick, metal, and other addition materials, all submitted to staff for final approval.
-
-

Motion:

16. Mr. Serrao motions.

17. Ms. Peterson seconds.

18. 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
1435 Bedford Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Ward: 3rd

Lot and Block: 9-R-194

Inspector:

Applicant:

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

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 steps to the podium; he with Renaissance 3 Architects, the architect for the project. He states that they presented the project last month and explains that the proposal is for three 30 foot high separate stacks for exhaust. They were asked by the Commission to explore moving the stacks closer together to mimic a historic large stack on a school. He states that they worked with the **mechanical and structural engineers to alter the heights of the stacks so they don't** all discharge at the same height, and the stacks were able to be located three feet on center so from far away they read as one. They were also able to create a different support system and eliminate all of the support wires.
 2. Mr. Serrao states that it is good that they were able to group them together but asks what is preventing them from encasing the stacks to read as one.
 3. Mr. Russell states that they believed encasing would have made it look a lot larger. They also wanted to keep the same program as the interior, which is to expose all the mechanical systems.
 4. Mr. Serrao states that the interior is not historic.
 5. Mr. Hogan **states that they couldn't take the enclosure all the way up, but they** could go up to the shortest stack.
 6. Mr. Gastil states that it is an improvement.
 7. Mr. Hogan agrees, especially the elimination of the wires.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

9. Mr. Gastil motions to approve.
 10. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

100 Fifth Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:

Pittsburgh Properties
33 N 3rd Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 1-D-125

Inspector:

Applicant:

The Yard
100 Fifth Avenue, 2nd Floor
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/11/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Mike Allen steps to the podium; he is the owner of the restaurant in this space. He states that they are proposing a window replacement with a fiberglass product. He states that the existing windows are damaged and the fiberglass will be more efficient and durable. The color will be black to match the existing. He states that the current windows are operable but most are sealed shut; the new windows will also be operable.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks what part of the window they will be replacing.
 3. Mr. Allen explains and shows the photos and drawings.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that they are dividing the panes and interrupting the original rhythm of the windows. He states that if they could get a window that would open in or twist and pivot in the middle would be better.
 5. Mr. Allen states that the current windows do twist and pivot, but the issue is that they interfere with the inside of the restaurant.
 6. Mr. Gastil states that they could pivot the smaller windows to get air into the space.
 7. Mr. Hogan agrees that a compromise would be to keep the center window fixed and open the upper transoms and side panes.
 8. Mr. Allen states that they would like the large windows to open for their guests to engage with Market Square.
 9. Mr. Gastil inquires how far the large windows would pivot into the space—he states that it looks like four feet, which would be a loss of space for them. He states that they do understand the issues with the interior and the business, but they have to make sure that the rhythm of the outside is kept.
 10. Mr. Serrao states that this is a very significant building as well and one of the last original buildings left in Market Square.
-
-

-
-
11. Mr. Harless asks what they will do for a barrier.
 12. Mr. Allen states that they would install a railing to code on the inside.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment; there is none.
 14. Mr. Hogan states that they could possibly do a window that pivots in the middle so it could tilt in and be an awning.
 15. Mr. Gastil states that the goal is not to have airflow but to be open to the outside.
 16. Mr. Allen talks about the other buildings in Market Square that have operable windows including Sienna Mercato and Primantis.
 17. Mr. Serrao states that Sienna Mercato used a historically accurate storefront that is also a hangar door, and Primantis is a NanaWall which is another issue.
 18. Mr. Allen states that another option they had considered was collapsible windows like Primantis, but from what he is hearing it would not be a possibility.
 19. Mr. Serrao states that the center window could possibly swing out.
 20. Mr. Allen states that they could do an awning type window.
 21. Mr. Hogan states that the proportions of the window would need to be the same, and it would need to be submitted to staff.
 22. Ms. Quinn requests that the Commission be very specific about the materials and configuration.
 23. Mr. Serrao agrees that this is a big issue and should come back before the Commission.

Motion:

24. Mr. Serrao motions to table for 30 days for a revised, detailed design and clear photos of the existing exterior conditions.
 25. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 26. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1237 Monterey Street Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:

Gordan Eric French
1237 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-289

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 2/12/16

Applicant:

John D. Francona
1234 Resaca Place
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of a rear addition.

Discussion:

1. Mr. John Francona steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He shows photos of the alley and the existing rear of the house, which has an existing Juliet balcony. He shows the plan of the site and the plans for the addition, which includes a roof deck. He talks about the materials, including Hardie plank, a steel garage door, and wooden double-hung windows. They are planning to reuse the existing Juliet balcony. He presents the materials specifications.
2. Mr. Hogan asks if there are any other buildings in the neighborhood with board and batten siding.
3. Mr. Eric French steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that there are examples on Day Way and also Eloise Street at the corner.
4. Mr. Hogan quotes the guidelines for new construction from the Mexican War Streets guidelines.

The Historic Review Commission will review all plans for new construction to ensure that new buildings or additions are visually compatible with their surroundings. The Commission will take the following criteria into account when it makes its review:

The established architectural character of the area;

Building height;

Building proportions (height to width);

Building setbacks;

Materials;

Colors;

Proportions of openings (windows and doors);

Rhythm of solid wall to openings;

Roof shapes, styles and materials;

Landscaping (in general);

Architectural detail;

Rhythm of building spacing on the street;

Rhythm of porch/entrance projections; and

Vertical or horizontal character of the facade.

The Historic Review Commission will review favorably proposals that:

Design an exterior addition to an historic building or adjacent infill construction that is compatible with the historic character of the site, and which takes into account the size, proportions, facade composition, rhythm and proportion of openings, materials, and colors of neighboring buildings.

Locate additions on secondary facades so that character defining elements are not obscured or destroyed.

Design new additions to reflect the style and details of the existing building or to be contemporary.

Incorporate new onsite parking, when required, that is as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the character-defining features of the site.

Remove non-significant buildings, additions, or site features that detract from the historic character of the district.

He states that the guidelines do state that the new construction should be "compatible" or "contemporary".

5. Mr. Serrao states that he doesn't have an issue with the addition being contemporary.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that the siding is his only issue.
 7. Ms. Peterson states that she looked online and couldn't find examples of board and batten in the neighborhood.
 8. Mr. Hogan states that he knows of only one other board and batten structure, which is in Allegheny West on a carriage house.
 9. Mr. French states that there were many examples on the alleys, but many of them have been torn down.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 11. Mr. Duncan Horner steps to the podium; he is a neighbor. He states that he is just seeing the plans today, but he finds them acceptable. He states that it will fit in with the other structures on the alley. He states that the siding can be negotiated if needed.
-
-

12. Mr. Randy Zotter steps to the podium; he is a neighbor. He states that he is comfortable with the design, including the siding.

Motion:

13. Mr. Gastil motions to approve.

14. Mr. Serrao seconds.

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

16. Mr. Hogan states that final colors and materials should be submitted to staff.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

BEFORE THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH
HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION

- - -

IN RE: Petition to nominate Albright
United Methodist Church
for Historic Designation
486 South Graham Street

- - -

HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION:

- Ernie Hogan, Chairwoman
- Joseph Serrao, Commissioner
- Matthew Falcone, Commissioner
- Carol Peterson, Commissioner
- Erik Harless, Bureau of Permits, Licenses and
Inspections Assistant Director
- Raymond Gastil, City Planning Director

The within meeting of the City of Pittsburgh
Historic Review Commission, Reported by
Dylan C. DiRenna, 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, on
Wednesday, March 2, 2016, commencing at 3:36 p.m.

- - -

NETWORK DEPOSITION SERVICES
SUITE 1101, GULF TOWER
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15219
412-281-7908

- - -

1 COUNSEL PRESENT:

2 On behalf of the Applicant:

3 Amy E. Bentz, Esquire
4 Bentz Law Firm
5 680 Washington Road, Suite 200
6 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228

7 - - -

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. HOGAN: The next point I would
3 like to move to, continue the discussion
4 about the nomination for the Albright United
5 Methodist Church at 486 South Graham Street
6 in the East End.

7 Last meeting we took testimony from
8 both the petitioner and the general owner.
9 With that, we also allowed for public
10 testimony, because we had several people to
11 come in. At this point we would like to
12 continue public testimony.

13 MS. QUINN: I can tell you, we did
14 receive additional e-mails and letters
15 supporting the project. The other thing I
16 have for you now -- it wasn't included in
17 your minutes -- that is the court reporter's
18 documentation of the discussion from last
19 time regarding this. If you all need to
20 refer back to it for any reason, there it is.

21 I'm prepared to provide a staff report
22 if you want me to.

23 MR. HOGAN: Why don't you give us an

1 update. We have determined that it meets the
2 standard, at which point it is currently
3 protected. The next step, we were all
4 supposed to go do our research, come back,
5 make sure that we are comfortable finding
6 additional information. If staff has
7 additional information they would like to
8 present, we can take that now into testimony.

9 I think, from there we can move on to
10 additional public testimony.

11 MS. QUINN: Since our last hearing,
12 really what Sharon and I did was make a site
13 visit, check out the building and the area.
14 We did that last Friday. We found that the
15 building appeared to be in relatively good
16 condition compared to some of the other
17 historic buildings we look at, in particular
18 churches.

19 That's all I have to add. I can
20 answer any additional questions you guys may
21 have.

22 That's the staff report. I also have
23 copies of the nominations if you would like

1 those. It was available online. I'm sure
2 you guys are very familiar with that area.

3 MR. HOGAN: Any other things you want
4 to add at this point?

5 MS. QUINN: No.

6 MR. HOGAN: At this point I'd like to
7 acknowledge for the record 40 letters that we
8 have received since the last meeting, and
9 e-mails and other correspondence, petitions,
10 all in support. There are 40 items here, all
11 in support for the nomination, to be entered
12 into the record, various correspondence.

13 At this point I would like to open it
14 up to additional public testimony. What I
15 would like to do is limit testimony to 3
16 minutes per. If you could, sort of queue up,
17 so that we can keep it to a minimum of not
18 having to wait for people to come up. I need
19 each person who is going to testify to let me
20 know if you're in favor or against; your
21 name, address; if you're representing an
22 organization, who that is.

23 MS. PATROSS: I'm Lindsay Patross,

1 P-A-T-R-O-S-S.

2 I have some additional copies of
3 letters, as well as a petition with 810
4 signatures. We've gotten additional
5 signatures while we've been sitting here,
6 including the great grandson of the architect
7 has expressed his support for the historic
8 designation of the Albright church building.

9 Thank you again for being here. Thank
10 you mostly for your service. It has been an
11 incredibly educational experience to attend
12 several Historic Review Commission meetings
13 at this point. I appreciate the attention to
14 detail that you put into all of the projects
15 and properties you review here.

16 You've already heard from me. There's
17 a number of other people here to express
18 their support. I did want to point out a few
19 things that I mentioned last time. I'm here
20 for two reasons. One, this is an important
21 building with an abundance of historical
22 significance. Justin will speak to that as
23 well.

1 The second reason I nominated this
2 building is community. I first walked into
3 Albright the day before Thanksgiving five
4 years ago. Albright has hosted a community
5 Thanksgiving dinner which has provided a way
6 for many more people than just the
7 congregation to participate in this
8 community.

9 Albright sits at the intersection of
10 three neighborhoods: Bloomfield, Shadyside
11 and Friendship. Albright also sits at the
12 intersection of many different parts of
13 Pittsburgh. A block away from UPMC
14 Shadyside, it's also located near the busway
15 and right on several main bus routes. It's
16 ideally situated to be a community hub;
17 inspired by some of the other successful
18 examples of church preservation and reuse in
19 Pittsburgh, including the Union Project on
20 Northside, Nyia Page Community Center in
21 Braddock and Calvary United Methodist Church
22 in Allegheny West, which is an excellent
23 example of neighbors working with the church

1 to create a community space that everyone can
2 be proud of.

3 Albright was a little bit ahead of its
4 times in the 1990s. As Sarah mentioned, the
5 building is in pretty good condition. In the
6 late '90s Albright underwent a major
7 renovation to the social hall and the church
8 mechanics. You can see in the top photo
9 here -- this is looking at it from Graham
10 Street -- there's now an entrance to the
11 basement social hall. The building was
12 upgraded to be completely handicap
13 accessible. There is a working elevator, as
14 well as all of the internal HVAC and
15 mechanics was updated. This is not a case of
16 this is a building from the 1940s that has
17 not seen an update. It's my understanding
18 that everything inside the building is
19 relatively recent from the past 25 years.

20 During this upgrade Albright was a
21 little bit ahead of its time and expanded to
22 really function as a community center. The
23 offices were rented to several different

1 nonprofits, including PULSE, the Pittsburgh
2 Urban Leadership Service Experience, which
3 has grown by leaps and bounds and last year
4 doubled its footprint to expand into the
5 Northside and transform Pittsburgh
6 neighborhoods. Albright has a history of
7 serving as an incubator for community
8 projects. The social hall was used for
9 exercise classes, Alcoholics Anonymous and
10 many more community meetings.

11 Over the past year I have worked with
12 several people. We have created Friends of
13 Albright to support the efforts to bring this
14 building into the future for the City of
15 Pittsburgh. One of the things that I am most
16 proud of is the broad coalition of people,
17 many who you will hear from today, and
18 organizations that have come together to
19 think about the future for Albright.

20 In July of 2015 we held a community
21 block party with the specific goal of asking
22 neighbors what they need in their community.
23 We learned a lot of information.

1 I will yield my time to the rest of
2 the people who are here to speak.

3 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

4 MR. GREENAWALT: Good afternoon,
5 Commissioners. My name is my name is Justin
6 Greenawalt. I'm at 93 North Euclid Avenue,
7 Pittsburgh.

8 I was before this Commission last
9 month. I'm here again to reiterate my belief
10 that the Albright building is worthy of
11 historic designation. The Albright building
12 not only meets and exceeds the criteria for
13 historic designation, it is the definition of
14 what a landmark should be. The Albright
15 building is a work of art and an anchor in
16 the community. It deserves to stay.

17 I would like to address the concerns
18 of the opponents to designation. There is a
19 belief among them that historic designation
20 would interfere with the building owner's
21 mission and free exercise of religion.
22 Fortunately there is a precedent here, in
23 1989, the New York district court case known

1 as St. Bartholomew's Church versus the City
2 of new York. The landmark decision in this
3 case is a cornerstone of historic
4 preservation case law and also exceptionally
5 applicable to the nomination of the Albright
6 building.

7 In this case St. Bartholomew's Church
8 sought to demolish its landmark 1928
9 community house for construction of a 40 to
10 50 story commercial tower. The church
11 applied for a certificate of appropriateness
12 from the landmarks preservations commission
13 and was denied. This lawsuit was filed
14 claiming, among many other things, that the
15 landmark law was unconstitutional to the
16 extent that it impacts the property of any
17 church because it interferes with the free
18 exercise of religion. The church also
19 claimed that the landmark law impermissibly
20 burdens the exercise of religious belief
21 restricting a church's ability to use its
22 property as it wishes in support of its
23 religious or charitable mission.

1 The court decided that the mere
2 possibility that a church may at some time
3 want to make a different use of its landmark
4 property creates no more than an incidental
5 burden on the practice of religion.
6 Therefore, the designation of church
7 buildings as landmarks does not in and of
8 itself violate the free exercise clause.
9 This is especially true since the landmark
10 designation does not deprive the church to
11 seek a certificate of appropriateness to
12 alter its property if the nature of that
13 property is such that it no longer can be
14 used to carry out its religious or charitable
15 mission.

16 I'm submitting to the record a brief
17 of that case. All of this is beside the
18 point. We the public have been openly
19 informed that the Albright building is no
20 longer a religious structure. On October
21 39th, 2015, an article published in the Post
22 Gazette cited the owner's legal counsel
23 saying the church hadn't been used as a place

1 of worship since November of 2013, and the
2 conference made a determination of
3 abandonment in January. This happens from
4 time to time, he said. Oftentimes churches
5 no longer serve the religious mission.

6 As such, the Albright building is
7 eligible under Title 11 of the City of
8 Pittsburgh Municipal Code. This Commission
9 certainly can and should proceed with
10 designation.

11 To conclude, I would like to appeal to
12 the building's owner. I am not a member of
13 the Albright congregation. I was baptized
14 and raised in the United Methodist Church.
15 When I was asked by the congregation to fight
16 for this building, I understood their
17 position. This building wasn't just their
18 history. It was mine. I want you to be
19 aware that alienating your flock will do far
20 more to undermine your mission than the
21 landmark designation, preservation and reuse
22 of this remarkable building.

23 Thank you.

1 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

2 MS. BENTZ: My name is Amy Benz. I am
3 the chancellor and legal Counsel of the
4 United Methodist Conference, the record owner
5 of the property.

6 I think you should know that the owner
7 of record continues to maintain its objection
8 to this unlawful nomination. The owner has a
9 right to do so. We understand also that
10 Judge Joseph James of the Court of Common
11 Pleas of Allegheny County has required that a
12 transcript be kept of these proceedings for
13 his review of the legal issues related to the
14 property. I would hope that that be the
15 case.

16 The City Code requires the owner's
17 consent for historic designation of a church.
18 The owner here, the conference objects to it.
19 As I mentioned before, the petitioners'
20 argument that the owner's consent is not
21 required because it's not used as a religious
22 structure is factually and legally erroneous.
23 It is factually erroneous, as Reverend Porter

1 will testify today -- he is present -- about
2 religious worship.

3 The statement, the quote from the
4 Pittsburgh Post Gazette was misquoted. You
5 should understand that they should take the
6 entire quote. The quote was that the local
7 congregation ceased to use it as a place of
8 religious worship. It was in fact used by
9 the conference. You have testimony on the
10 record previously that both Reverend Porter,
11 as well as Reverend John Wilson had utilized
12 the church in that capacity.

13 Also it is legally incorrect because a
14 church qualifies as a religious structure
15 under the City Code. As I mentioned to you
16 previously, the City Code defines religious
17 structure as any or all of the following:
18 Church, cathedral, mosque, temple, rectory
19 convent or similar structure used as a place
20 of religious worship. As a matter of both
21 statutory construction, which is the doctrine
22 of last antecedent, and the English language,
23 the phrase: Used as a place of religious

1 worship, only modifies the words: Similar
2 structure.

3 You should understand that I'm going
4 to quote Pennsylvania law, not New York law,
5 which is not applicable here in the
6 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The
7 commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, that
8 would hear an appeal from this body several
9 lines up, has held that the mere failure to
10 use property for a certain period of time
11 does not constitute a change of its principal
12 use. That is the Simonitis,
13 S-I-M-O-N-I-T-I-S, versus Zoning Hearing
14 Board 865 Atlantic 2nd 284 Pennsylvania
15 Commonwealth Court 2005; additionally the
16 Heichel, H-E-I-C-H-E-L, versus Springfield
17 Township Zoning Hearing Board, 830 Atlantic
18 2nd 1081 Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court
19 2003.

20 As the Reverend George Porter will
21 testify, a portion of the property is being
22 used for religious worship. Therefore, the
23 principal use of the property has remained

1 unchanged for the last 100 years. It is a
2 religious structure and cannot be designated.
3 There's a very important reason -- I talked
4 to you about that before -- that there is
5 this provision. The requirement properly
6 preserves the separation of church and state
7 guaranteed by the United States Constitution
8 and the Pennsylvania Constitution.
9 Improperly ignoring this requirement creates
10 the very constitutional conflict that the
11 City Code sought to avoid. Improperly
12 ignoring the requirement would also violate
13 federal law.

14 You should understand also, as I
15 mentioned before, the Methodist Church has a
16 process that has to be followed for historic
17 designation. It's in our conference rules.
18 This was not followed here. So the property
19 cannot be designated as historic. A church
20 is permitted to marshal its own assets and
21 pursue its mission. The Methodist Church is
22 obligated to use its assets toward its
23 mission in urban communities. You should be

1 aware that the designation of this property
2 as historic over our objection impermissibly
3 infringes upon the church's free exercise of
4 the Methodist Religion.

5 The conference has a vision for the
6 use of this property. They can talk about
7 its condition. They should understand that
8 no one here has an engineering study. We
9 have preliminary engineering studies that
10 state -- this is CJL Engineering out of
11 Johnstown that came in with multiple traits
12 inside the property -- they have not been in
13 the property so they can't opine on that --
14 that it would take \$1.3 million to put this
15 entire property into suitable usage. You
16 have to understand, \$1.3 million is not in
17 good condition.

18 The conference has a vision for the
19 use of the proceeds. As I mentioned before,
20 and as you are aware, this property is under
21 agreement of sale. By the way, the first
22 listing agreement was signed by Abass Kamara
23 on behalf of the local church. So they

1 wanted to sell this property at one point.
2 The conference's vision is to use the net
3 sale proceeds from the sale of this property
4 to develop multiculturally and contextually
5 driven ministry which includes -- please
6 listen carefully, this is where the money
7 would be used -- low income housing in this
8 area -- that's the purpose -- two, feeding
9 ministries with the poor; three, literacy
10 programs; four, opportunities to create
11 sustainable lifestyles in this community.
12 All of which cannot be done with this
13 burdensome building. That's the money that
14 would be used for this purpose.

15 The conference has done this kind of
16 work before in western Pennsylvania, up in
17 Erie, Johnstown and elsewhere. You should
18 understand, low income housing we do. We do
19 met towers. We do met housing. We do it all
20 over the place.

21 MR. HOGAN: I need you to wrap up.

22 MS. BENTZ: The United Methodist
23 Church is a missional church. Outgrowths of

1 the United Methodist church include the Red
2 Cross; Goodwill Industries; the Salvation
3 Army; and Imagine No Malaria, where we are
4 partnering with the Gates Foundation as well
5 as the NBA to cure malaria in Africa.

6 The United Methodist Church should not
7 have you wrongfully designate this property
8 as historic. It's very nice they deem it
9 historic. They feel it has historic
10 significance. We own it. We object to it.
11 It cannot be designated.

12 Thank you very much.

13 I would also like to have the reverend
14 speak. I can do so at another time if the
15 Board is so inclined.

16 Do you want him to testify now?

17 MR. HOGAN: It's up to you. It's
18 random order. He has three minutes.

19 MS. BENTZ: Okay. I would like to
20 call him up.

21 Please state your name for the record.

22 MR. PORTER: Reverend George Porter.

23 MR. HOGAN: Excuse me.

1 MS. BENTZ: Reverend Porter, what is
2 your profession?

3 MR. PORTER: I'm the appointed pastor
4 to Albright United Methodist Church.

5 MS. BENTZ: Where else do you serve?

6 MR. PORTER: I serve as a pastor to
7 the First United Methodist Church of
8 Pittsburgh.

9 MS. BENTZ: Where are these churches
10 in location to each other?

11 MR. PORTER: They are on the same
12 block.

13 MS. BENTZ: What separates these
14 churches?

15 MR. PORTER: Basically a parking lot,
16 Wendy's parking lot.

17 MS. BENTZ: What are the activities
18 that have gone on at Albright?

19 MR. PORTER: Since December 4th, each
20 week, except for the week that I broke my
21 hand, I have conducted a religious worship
22 service each week at the church.

23 MS. BENTZ: For the record, if I read

1 these dates, please correct me if they are
2 incorrect.

3 I have the dates as December 4th,
4 2015; December 9th, 2015; December 18th,
5 2015; December 24th, 2015, the day before
6 Christmas; January 8th, 2016; January 13th,
7 2016; January 22nd, 2016; January 29th, 2016;
8 February 12th, 2016; February 19th, 2016;
9 February 27th, 2016.

10 Did I read those correctly?

11 MR. PORTER: Yes.

12 MS. BENTZ: Please describe what other
13 activities you envision going on in the
14 limited area of the church that you can use.

15 MR. PORTER: The only part that's
16 useable is behind the sanctuary at this point
17 in time. There has been an area cleared out.
18 If the weather does change -- the heat is not
19 on in the sanctuary. There's no utilities
20 except for some electricity. We envision
21 maybe a Bible study occurring there later on
22 in the spring.

23 MS. BENTZ: How would you describe the

1 condition of the Albright Church?

2 MR. PORTER: It's very difficult. I'm
3 not a construction expert or architectural
4 expert. It seems there's mold. The physical
5 plant is not operational. There's plaster
6 falling down inside. It's very difficult
7 inside to negotiate the building.

8 MS. BENTZ: Do you agree with those
9 that have stated that the church is in
10 pristine or pretty good condition?

11 MR. PORTER: Not at all.

12 MS. BENTZ: May I also call the
13 District Superintendent Paul Taylor, please.

14 MR. TAYLOR: My name is Paul Taylor.

15 MR. HOGAN: Before you start, for the
16 record, this is about public testimony.
17 You're actually taking testimony. I just
18 want to, for the record, note that you're
19 following and trying to argue. We are not a
20 court of law. We are a Public Commission.
21 What is in front of this today is really
22 about the significance of the building, and
23 does it meet the criteria of historic

1 standard.

2 MS. BENTZ: I do understand that.

3 We have received a letter that was
4 directed to the Conference Treasurer Larry
5 Bridge that states that we may not touch the
6 structure because a nomination has been
7 filed. We deem that to be a determination.
8 Also a nomination was accepted. That's why
9 this Commission is considering it. We feel
10 that to be some sort of determination.

11 MR. HOGAN: Correct.

12 MS. BENTZ: Actually the district
13 superintendent has previously spoken. The
14 only question I would have for him at this
15 juncture is there is a house adjacent,
16 connected, in fact, to the church. I would
17 ask if that property has ever been used for
18 any purpose other than as a parsonage.

19 MR. TAYLOR: No.

20 MR. HOGAN: Continuously as a
21 parsonage?

22 MS. BENTZ: Thank you.

23 MR. HOGAN: Additional testimony.

1 MR. MOHN: My name is James Mohn. I
2 live on Scaife Road in Sewickley,
3 Pennsylvania 15143.

4 For the past 30 years I have been
5 actively involved in the profession of
6 architecture. After visiting Pittsburgh over
7 a period of 20 years I enthusiastically
8 decided to relocate my family from Long
9 Island to Pittsburgh. Part of my enthusiasm
10 stemmed from the endless enjoyment I received
11 by driving the streets of Pittsburgh and
12 marveling at the profusion of beautifully
13 designed stone and masonry buildings built in
14 the early 20th century. Like so many others,
15 I continue to be impressed on a daily basis
16 by the City's unique and impressive
17 architectural story.

18 I live in Sewickley. My daughter goes
19 to school on Morewood Avenue. I often shop
20 at the marketplace on Centre Avenue, which is
21 how Albright Methodist Church landed on my
22 radar. Despite the fact that I don't live in
23 the neighborhood, Albright's distinctive yet

1 dusty profile presents an undeniably strong
2 presence on the streetscape, even for the
3 occasional visitor.

4 The building's pedigree is clear. It
5 offers a unique fusion of the 19th century
6 Romanesque and Gothic Revival styles. The
7 buildings quirky collection of Gothic towers
8 and battlements, combined with its
9 distinctive structural arched windows and
10 doorways crafted from solid stone blocks,
11 presents an architectural pallet of richness
12 and substance, a level of richness and
13 substance seldom seen in buildings made
14 today. To say that the building exudes charm
15 and character would be an understatement.

16 I believe this property highlights the
17 sometimes challenging intersection of
18 thoughtful urban planning and the desires of
19 the commercial developer. If the developer
20 has signed an agreement with Albright's
21 owner, then the property is likely to be
22 developed, and a detailed proposal submitted
23 to the planning board. I respectfully

1 request that the developer challenge their
2 design team to flex their creative muscle.
3 Bring innovation and creativity to the
4 drafting board and define a viable program or
5 business model that complements the physical
6 conditions of an existing structure worthy of
7 landmark status. Create for yourself a
8 leadership role in the evolution of an urban
9 neighborhood in transition. Why not follow
10 in the footsteps of the visionary Pittsburgh
11 developers who successfully adapted the East
12 Liberty YMCA into the hugely popular and
13 admired Ace Hotel?

14 Kindly accept the responsibility to do
15 good work, not only for your development
16 business, but for the Centre Avenue corridor
17 and the neighbors of Albright Methodist. Use
18 this moment as an opportunity to demonstrate
19 your appreciation for Pittsburgh's unique
20 architectural legacy. It's my belief that
21 somewhere near Albright Church is a worn out
22 strip mall or a crippled convenience store
23 that's begging to be torn down and replaced

1 by a new Starbucks drive-thru.

2 Buildings made with the objective of
3 realizing quick, easy and cheap represent a
4 sad and shallow legacy for the future of
5 Pittsburgh. Rather than demolishing
6 landmark-worthy structures in the interest of
7 immediate profit, let's commit ourselves to
8 developing projects that yield long-term
9 benefits by acknowledging the value of the
10 City's architectural history and its
11 commitment to buildings that elevate remind
12 us why we all love great cities like
13 Pittsburgh.

14 I'm in favor of the nomination.

15 MR. HOGAN: Next.

16 MR. MANGAN: Good afternoon. My name
17 is Tom Mangan. I'm a resident. I own a
18 house in the 400 block of South Graham. I'm
19 probably the closest person to the church.

20 I'm for keeping this thing around
21 forever and ever. Very quick, research shows
22 that there are over 2 million people who work
23 on sites such as Ancestry.com and those sorts

1 of things. It proves that history is very
2 important, very vibrant, and heritage so
3 important to them that they spend millions
4 and millions of dollars just to keep that
5 around.

6 Right now Pittsburgh is in the middle
7 of celebrating its 200th anniversary. If you
8 look around, you see signs everywhere
9 advertising the history of Pittsburgh and
10 help us celebrate this. One of the things
11 that challenges me is when we go do that in
12 this area, if we don't have this kind of
13 church around, people say, congratulations on
14 your 200 year anniversary, prove it.

15 What am I going to do, point to the
16 pizza place across the street, point to the
17 restaurant that's over there, point to the
18 Subway across the street?

19 Once places like this are gone,
20 they're gone. None of us certainly are ever
21 going to experience this again. I heard it
22 said something like 1.3 million to repair
23 this. I'll tell you what: What's it going

1 to cost to replace this?

2 This is irreplaceable. You cannot do
3 this sort of thing these days. One of the
4 things that I would suggest is this: We must
5 not erase history from our family tree. As I
6 said, people are so into Ancestry.com and
7 those sorts of things. We cannot and must
8 not erase historic landmarks from our family
9 tree. As a matter of fact, if you look at he
10 church, you see the black soot up there that
11 represent, that goes back years before many
12 of us were around. Again, it represents the
13 history of what we once were. He have to
14 preserve that as much as we can.

15 This church is the grand matriach
16 bringing together three specific families:
17 Friendship, Bloomfield and Shadyside. We've
18 got to maintain that. We got to keep that.
19 That is our heritage.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MR. HOGAN: If you guys could, line up
22 so that we can keep the pace going. That
23 would be helpful.

1 MR. HAVEN: My name is Jennifer Haven.
2 I live at 205 South Pacific Avenue in
3 Friendship, 15224. Friendship is the
4 neighborhood over. I'm just a few blocks
5 away from Albright.

6 I'm a homeowner of a 112 year old
7 home. I have eight original stained glass
8 windows. I have six more that have been
9 recreated over the years since I've been
10 there for 14 years. There are so many homes
11 in Friendship with stained glass that we
12 actually have whole house tours that are
13 around the stained glass windows in our
14 homes. Friendshippers love stained glass.
15 We love old buildings. I really feel like
16 this church is a beacon to the neighborhood
17 and the surrounding communities, the glorious
18 and glamorous 100 plus year old homes that
19 surround it.

20 I'm not opposed to development. I
21 would gladly accept the commercial reuse of
22 this building. I would accept, of course, a
23 nonprofit reuse of this building. If you

1 have ever been to one of their Thanksgiving
2 dinners, if you have ever seen the help that
3 the congregation -- by "congregation," I
4 don't mean religious congregation, I mean the
5 greater neighborhood, the three neighborhoods
6 and beyond coming together to support each
7 other at this building -- it's absolutely
8 incredible.

9 Two houses up from me I have people
10 that are diving into the Dumpster to get the
11 leftover food at Aldi. This is not a
12 neighborhood of high means. It's not a
13 neighborhood that needs high-end development
14 any more than any other part of the East End.
15 If you would allow this church to stay and
16 allow these people their mission to continue
17 with the community to advance, to allow them
18 to prosper, I would personally pledge my own
19 blood, sweat, tears, money, fundraising
20 efforts. \$1.3 million is really not that
21 difficult to overcome. We did it in Highland
22 Park. I think we can certainly do it here.

23 Thank you so much.

1 MR. BEVAN: Hello, my name is Brian
2 Bevan, B-R-I-A-N, B-E-V-A-N. I live at 3509
3 Penn Avenue in Pittsburgh. I'm in favor of
4 the historic nomination.

5 I addressed this body at the last
6 meeting. I'm an attorney who represents
7 members of the congregation of Albright,
8 which still is in existence and has met at
9 other locations since November of 2013, when
10 the site stopped being used for religious
11 purpose. As I pointed in out my last
12 testimony -- I won't go into too much
13 detail -- there is precedent for your body to
14 designate a former religious structure as a
15 nonreligious structure, and thus allow a
16 nonowner, as in this case with Ms. Patross,
17 to submit a designation and have this
18 organization designate it as historic.
19 There's the Malta Temple and St. Mary's
20 Academy.

21 A couple other things to point out.
22 The record owner, the conference has entered
23 into a contingent contract, as far as I know,

1 with Ross Development regarding putting in a
2 Starbucks and retail locations. By entering
3 into that contract, the owner -- excuse me,
4 the developer, Ross, has equitable interest
5 in the property, that is a certain level of
6 ownership and claim to the title of the
7 property. His plans are to use it for
8 commercial purposes. In no way does he plan
9 to use it for any religious purposes any
10 anything tied to the Methodist Church.

11 I would also point out that the recent
12 testimony provided here by Reverend Porter
13 claims that religious services started taking
14 place on the property in early December 2015.
15 I would point out that services did not take
16 place from November 2013 until December 2015.
17 Interestingly, those services didn't start
18 until a month after Ms. Patross submitted the
19 nomination saying that no religious activity
20 or services had occurred in two years. I
21 find it convenient that, all of a sudden,
22 after two years of no activity, they start to
23 have religious services take place.

1 I would also object to Reverend
2 Porter's characterizations of the quality of
3 the structure and the property. He has
4 admitted he is not an engineer. He is not an
5 expert. Any of his descriptions have no
6 merit or value.

7 I would also object to the
8 characterizations made by, I guess engineers
9 hired by the conference, that Ms. Bentz spoke
10 to. She admitted that they have not been
11 inside the building. If you haven't been
12 inside, I don't think -- it's my
13 understanding that they have not been inside
14 the building. If they haven't been inside, I
15 don't know how they can give an accurate
16 assessment.

17 I would also point out that there are
18 plenty of instances where historic ordinances
19 have been deemed not to abridge the First
20 Amendment rights of a religious organization
21 or entity, particularly when the contemplated
22 use of the structure is wholly unrelated to
23 the exercise of religion. I would say that

1 what the Methodist Conference is planning to
2 do with this building is not in any way tied
3 to their religious ideology. Thus, the
4 restrictions or possible designation as
5 historic under the historic ordinance is in
6 no way unconstitutional. The ordinance
7 itself is not unconstitutional.

8 Thank you.

9 MS. BENTZ: I want to correct two
10 things for the record, since we are keeping a
11 record for Judge James.

12 MR. HOGAN: This is not a court.

13 MS. BENTZ: Judge James has asked for
14 a transcript of these proceedings.

15 MR. HOGAN: I understand that. He
16 will get that.

17 MS. BENTZ: Let me make one statement,
18 please.

19 MR. HOGAN: You're out of order.

20 MS. QUINN: For the record, I'm asking
21 that this be transcribed for Judge James,
22 please. I think the Judge would appreciate
23 that.

1 For the record, the engineers have
2 been in the property and have seen the
3 interior of the property. I would ask that
4 the court reporter note that for Judge James.
5 The internal portions of the property have
6 been examined extensively by our engineers.
7 That's all that I'll say.

8 I do want to point out that the owner
9 should have an opportunity to speak at length
10 and not be limited.

11 MR. HOGAN: You did last month. You
12 were given freedom to speak last month.

13 I want to note for the record, before
14 this Commission, condition and renovation
15 cost to restore a building is not within the
16 determination of the code. The fact that
17 this building meets and exemplifies a
18 specific architectural style and condition is
19 the reason that this is in front of us and
20 the reason that will be considered.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. KAMARA: My name is Abass, like
23 the fish, Kamara. I'll be brief, out of

1 respect for your time, and also out of
2 respect for all the folks in the community
3 who have shown up, most if not all of them to
4 show their support for this building.

5 I think the mere presence of folks on
6 a Wednesday afternoon speaks volumes to the
7 fact that this building has a tremendous
8 impact on the community. Its historic nature
9 has been spoken to with great eloquence and
10 great detail previous to me. I'm just
11 thankful for the opportunity to see so many
12 folks who see the same beauty this building
13 as I do.

14 I thank you for your time. On behalf
15 of so many folks who are here and not here, I
16 want to thank those who have spoken on behalf
17 of this building. I look forward to working
18 with all of you in the future.

19 MR. CRAIG: My name is Matthew Craig.
20 I'm the Executive Director for the Young
21 Preservationists Association.

22 We just again want to thank you all
23 for considering the historic designation. As

1 we have stated if our letters of support, we
2 do support the historic designation for this
3 property. I think that the history that it
4 has displayed for the community through all
5 of these years is very significant and the
6 role that it has played.

7 We would also, as an aside, like to
8 offer our help to whoever ends up with the
9 building to help restore it, so that it can
10 continue to serve the community for another
11 100 years.

12 MR. CONTI: My name is John Conti,
13 C-O-N-T-I. I live in Highland Park at 5700
14 Bunker Hill Street.

15 I'm a bit conflicted talking about
16 this process because I have very dear friends
17 sitting here arguing for the demolition of
18 this church and very dear friends who are
19 arguing against it. I want to tell you,
20 given my experience -- I want to reinforce
21 the idea, given my experience in historic
22 preservation. Ten years on Mt. Lebanon's
23 historic preservation Board, I'm currently a

1 member of the Pennsylvania State Historic
2 preservation Board, although that has no
3 bearing here. I don't speak in any way on
4 their behalf. I also write and sell on a
5 regular basis to the Pittsburgh Tribune
6 Review a column on architecture, planning and
7 preservation. I want you to know, given all
8 of that background, I'm very much in favor of
9 the preservation of this church and its
10 designation.

11 One comment I want to make. I'm a
12 Methodist, not a Presbyterian. I'm a member
13 of the same congregation as Amy. I will say
14 that the discipline of the United Methodist
15 Church defines worship as a public event. If
16 there was worship -- which is the words she
17 and Reverend Porter used -- if there was
18 worship going on in that church in the times
19 he said there was, this was in a time period
20 when the basement entrance to the church and
21 exit was, blocked boarded in with plywood,
22 when the handicapped access was roped off,
23 and there was no evidence whatsoever of any

1 activity around that church. I was there
2 many times during that period, either there
3 or nearby, and walked by that church and
4 looked at it.

5 To the extent that the question of
6 continuous religious use bears on your
7 decision or anyone's decision, including that
8 of Judge James, I think that this whole
9 question of whether worship occurred there
10 has to be investigated thoroughly. I'm not
11 aware of any effort to reach out to former
12 members of the congregation to tell them that
13 there was worship. I am not aware of any
14 public announcements related to worship at
15 that church. Keep in that mind as you look
16 at this. I think that issue bears somewhat
17 further investigation.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. HOGAN: Is there additional
20 testimony.

21 MS. BRADFORD: Hello, my name is Sarah
22 Bradford. I live at 307 South Pacific Avenue
23 friendship. I've been there since the '70s.

1 I am favor of having this deemed to be
2 a historic site. I think, as Pittsburghers,
3 we have to fight tooth and nail for every
4 structure that meets the criteria, that we
5 have to do what we can to save them. The
6 people that have already spoken, they've said
7 a lot of great things. I don't have to
8 repeat it. I just want to tell you I really
9 support keeping this as a designated historic
10 preservation building.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. KAMARA: Hello, my name is Taafoi
13 Kamara; T as in truck, A-A, F as in Frank,
14 O-I; last name K-A-M-A-R-A. Albright United
15 Methodist Church.

16 I just want to underscore the
17 opportunity that this historical nomination
18 has brought. It's clear, not only just in
19 the sheer number of people who have shown
20 their support for this historical building in
21 person and virtually, but through friends of
22 Albright, it's created the opportunity to
23 engage nonprofits, other community groups, so

1 forth and so on. Members of the congregation
2 current and otherwise are engaged with the
3 community. The list goes on.

4 This is an opportunity to really take
5 advantage of that. I refer to the members of
6 the conference as colleagues in this regard.
7 We claim to be working towards the same
8 thing. There are people in need in the
9 neighborhood. That cannot be -- we can't
10 turn away from that. As opposed to this
11 being an opportunity to divide, it's really
12 an opportunity to unite around this building
13 which has been deemed as historic, as was
14 mentioned about the other nonprofit
15 opportunities and partnerships.

16 I want that to not be lost. There is
17 a real opportunity here. Let's not forget
18 the real meaning of Albright.

19 MR. RHOADES: Hello, my name is John
20 Rhoades, R-H-O-A-D-E-S. I live at 3030
21 Wiggins Street in the Polish Hill
22 neighborhood of Pittsburgh.

23 I guess what's most important to

1 discuss is both my connection to the
2 location, which I pass every day going to
3 work and on weekends when I am travelling
4 through my city, and also the understanding
5 that in my own neighborhood we have a church
6 that serves as a linchpin for our community.
7 A number of the folks who have spoken before
8 have mentioned how important this particular
9 structure is to the identity of their
10 communities. I can understand how huge it
11 would for Polish Hill to lose its church.
12 Certainly it would recognize the same thing.
13 I would hope as a Pittsburgher that we work
14 to preserve the structures that represent our
15 heritage and our culture and our faith.

16 I know, as a president of a historic
17 church out in rural Pennsylvania, not that
18 we've got Starbucks knocking on our door to
19 show up in Ebensburg, PA, if we did, we would
20 certainly do everything that we could to
21 preserve a structure that, I think, was so
22 representative of a culture that has been
23 built and preserved for generations. I would

1 hope that we as a community would make the
2 same prioritization with this building.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

5 MS. CERCONE-SCULLION: Good afternoon.

6 My name is Janet Cercone-Scullion. I
7 represent the Bloomfield Preservation and
8 Heritage Society.

9 As we speak about our 200th
10 anniversary of the City of Pittsburgh, I
11 would like to make note to have you know how
12 much we are in favor of keeping this church
13 as it is. It is so symbolic as a cornerstone
14 for three communities. It sits on the edge
15 of Bloomfield, but served Friendship and
16 served Shadyside as well.

17 As we celebrate the 200th anniversary,
18 we do protect our military history. We guard
19 it so carefully. The religious history is so
20 important. During the industrial revolution,
21 when we had the Carnegies coming, and we had
22 a big wave of immigration, the Catholic
23 Church was able to build many churches and

1 provide them with pastors that spoke the
2 language. So we saw a lot of Catholicism
3 coming to Pittsburgh. People who spoke
4 foreign languages were provided religious
5 services. That was the time that we saw a
6 big Anglican movement to try to get a place
7 in history as well, to give people
8 opportunity for not just Catholicism, but to
9 have other religions as well. This is a part
10 of the landscape of religion for everyone,
11 and how important that movement was at the
12 end of the 1800s and well into the 1900s.

13 I ask you to please consider our
14 religious history. The building is symbolic
15 of that. It all ties to that. There is so
16 much more to that than just the architecture.
17 Preserving our history is such a wonderful
18 responsibility that you have.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. HOGAN: Any additional testimony.

21 MS. CONTI: My name is Joy Conti. I
22 live in Highland Park.

23 I did write a letter. My reasons for

1 wanting it to be nominated are also listed in
2 there. You've heard about the architecture
3 and all of the special parts of the building,
4 its windows and architect and the craftsman
5 of the windows.

6 Two other points I want to emphasize.
7 It kind of goes along with what the previous
8 woman said. That is that the interior of the
9 building uniquely documents the history of
10 the German Evangelical Church, and how it
11 transitioned over many, many years to the
12 United Brethren, the Brethren, the Methodist
13 and then the United Methodist.

14 I also feel that this church helps to
15 document the history of Pittsburgh,
16 particularly of the immigrants, particularly
17 of the German immigrants, who were one of the
18 earliest and one of the largest groups of
19 immigrants to come here. They are craftsmen.
20 They are engineers. They are industrialists
21 who played such an important role in building
22 Pittsburgh. This helps to document the life
23 of these German immigrants. They built this

1 church building not just as a church, but as
2 a center for community and for service to the
3 community.

4 I believe, as we have heard others
5 say, the people who would want and are
6 willing to work and use this building in the
7 future as a center of outreach and service to
8 the community. We all know how centers of
9 community, whether it's community
10 interaction -- that these are the hallmarks
11 of a healthy community. They were the
12 hallmarks of a healthy community then. They
13 are the hallmark of a healthy community now
14 where you can bring people together.

15 Sadly, I have to say one more thing.
16 I do this regrettably. I have been a
17 Methodist all of my life. That's, as you can
18 tell, many, many years. I have listened to
19 the testimony of the United Methodist
20 Conference both last time and this time. I
21 have been shocked. We moved to Highland
22 Park. We have been looking for a Methodist
23 Church. There isn't any in Highland Park. I

1 was never told when I needed to have
2 alternative times to go that this was public
3 worship going on. I was never notified.
4 There was nothing on first Church's
5 documentation of this. I have seen the
6 building. I would be shocked that they would
7 attempt to have worship with the doors
8 blocked and the utilities turned off. I'm
9 conflicted as to what this testimony means.
10 It is shocking for me and my faith.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. HALDERMAN: Hello, my name is Cara
13 Halderman. I'm at 2212 Perrysville Avenue.

14 I'm the secretary for Preservation
15 Pittsburgh. I know my organize has spoken at
16 length on this topic before. I just want to
17 reiterate today that we fully support the
18 nomination of Albright United Methodist
19 Church as a historic structure.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

22 MS. GRAY: My name is Lizabeth Gray.

23 I live at 3823 Clement Way in lower

1 Lawrenceville.

2 For 8 and a half years I ran a pub in
3 the West End of London. Not a day went by
4 that I didn't have an American tourist come
5 in and say, this is so wonderful, look at
6 these buildings, look at the beauty, the
7 history.

8 That's what you're choosing here. Do
9 you want to have a building like the one on
10 the left? Or do you want more of what's on
11 the right, red boxes with windows?

12 To me, it's not about the commercial
13 aspect. It should be about the history.
14 That is your decision. Do you want to
15 preserve the history of this City?

16 Once it's gone, it's not coming back.

17 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

18 MR. BURNS: I'll be brief. My name is
19 John burns. I live at 6830 Thomas Boulevard
20 in the Point Breeze section of Pittsburgh
21 where I own a house. I previously lived in
22 the Friendship area on Fairmont Street. I
23 owned a home there.

1 I simply want to point out that such
2 structures will never be built again. This
3 structure is unique. I simply want to second
4 and confirm and affirm what has previously
5 been said in favor of nominating the church
6 for historic designation.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. MORGAN: My name is Ryan Morgan.
9 I live at 6600 northumberland street. I'm
10 here to testify in support of the historic
11 designation of Albright Church.

12 I'm new to Pittsburgh. I've been here
13 less than one year. My wife and I moved to
14 Pittsburgh last May. Part of the
15 attractiveness of it is the celebration of
16 its history. I went to community college in
17 Seattle, Washington. Seattle Central
18 Community College, that neighborhood,
19 Broadway has been gentrified. We lived in
20 Washington D.C. for a number years, 14th and
21 U, historic, cultural. It's been gentrified.

22 As Pittsburgh grows, I think that's
23 wonderful. I think that we also ought to

1 hang on to our wonderful assets. I think the
2 nickname for Albright at one point was the
3 Jewel Box of East Liberty, the Jewel Box of
4 Baum Boulevard. You're not going to get that
5 with a Starbucks.

6 I just want to reiterate my support
7 for this. I urge you to vote for the
8 historical designation.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. HOGAN: Any additional testimony.

11 Thank you. We will conclude public
12 testimony at this point. I would like to
13 move to internal discussion regarding the
14 merit of the designation.

15 As noted at the last meeting, we
16 reviewed the application and the merit of the
17 application and had made a preliminary
18 determination that the application and the
19 structure of 486 South Graham Street met
20 three of our criteria. No. 3,
21 exemplification of distinguished architecture
22 type, style and design. Item No. 4, work of
23 an architect, engineer, designer or builder.

1 Item No. 10, unique location, designation,
2 physical appearance and appearances.

3 As to some of the testimony today and
4 to the history that was provided by not only
5 the applicant or the nominator, as well as
6 our own in-house staff review of the
7 architecture and the architect, I still
8 believe that those items exemplify and
9 continue to stand strong. I think this is an
10 unusual structure.

11 Pittsburgh is very blessed to have
12 many of these still stand today and have been
13 the cornerstone and the points of
14 architecture throughout our community. In
15 many cases they help set the rhythm and the
16 style of what our neighborhoods meant and
17 exemplify the commitment of our residents to
18 our City as we built.

19 This particular building is no
20 different. As you heard today, its Gothic
21 and Romanesque styles intertwine, creating an
22 unusual structure here. That structure,
23 along with the intuitiveness and the

1 creativity of the architect, came together
2 with a very lovely celebration on a pretty
3 unique corner.

4 With that, this, as we heard
5 celebrates the history of Pittsburgh and is a
6 unique structure to Pittsburgh's history and
7 time line. With that point, I think I'll
8 stop.

9 At this point are there other
10 comments.

11 MR. GASTIL: I would like to comment.

12 I would just note that I think that
13 the three items which were identified as
14 among the criteria for designation, which
15 this fulfills, I would agree with them. I
16 think, both from the staff report from what
17 was presented to us to our own understanding,
18 I think that it is an exemplification of an
19 architectural type, style or design
20 distinguished by innovation, rarity,
21 uniqueness or overall quality of design,
22 detail, materials and craftsmanship. I think
23 it is the work of an architect whose

1 individual work is significant in the history
2 and development of the City of Pittsburgh and
3 the region.

4 I also think its unique location and
5 distinctive physical appearance represent an
6 established and familiar visual feature of
7 the neighborhood, community and the City.

8 MS. PETERSON: I agree with the three
9 items. I also think that the property is
10 significant under Items 5 and 8, which are
11 exemplification of important planning and
12 urban design techniques; and exemplification
13 of a significant pattern of neighborhood
14 development or settlement. I believe that
15 those are supported in the nomination for the
16 property that was turned in.

17 MR. SERRAO: I would also like to make
18 a comment notwithstanding some of the
19 testimony that the building is in fairly good
20 shape. I think it has -- most its integrity
21 is intact. Considering what we normally see
22 around here for older buildings, it's in
23 excellent shape. I think that's part of the

1 charm of the building, that it hasn't been
2 modified, damaged greatly. It's pretty much
3 what you see is what you get. I think the
4 integrity of the building is outstanding for
5 its time.

6 MS. PETERSON: I'm also a little bit
7 puzzled. There was testimony to the effect
8 that the parsonage has only been used by
9 people associated with the religious mission
10 of the church.

11 One of the letters that we received is
12 someone who identifies themselves as a
13 resident of the Albright parsonage from 2012
14 to 2014, Tricia Chicka, former resident of
15 the Albright parsonage now residing in Polish
16 Hill. That would seem to contradict the
17 assertion that the property was -- that that
18 section of the property was continuously in
19 religious use.

20 As I said, I'm puzzled by that.

21 MR. HOGAN: Just to note the for the
22 record, it was an e-mail received by us dated
23 March 2nd, 2016, at 3:00 a.m. We are happy

1 to, as it is part of the record, be able to
2 provide that.

3 Any other testimony or questions.

4 MR. FALCONE: Today was important to
5 me. Reading the history of the building and
6 being familiar with it was very important. I
7 was particularly taken aback by a letter that
8 we received by the descendants of the
9 architect, who supported the designation. I
10 think it echoed much of what we heard today
11 from the public testimony, that this
12 particular building has meaning well beyond
13 just the building itself. We heard testimony
14 today from people from friendship,
15 Lawrenceville, Northside, Polish Hill,
16 Bloomfield, the list goes on. Preservation
17 is a public good. It was important to hear
18 what the public had to say about this. It
19 seems like there are a lot of Pittsburghers
20 from all over the City who are very
21 interested in this building and very
22 interested to see that it continues to be
23 part of the larger community as a landmark.

1 MR. HOGAN: Also for the record, I
2 would like to note that we are in receipt of
3 an updated petition. We actually have
4 counted the names. It's 789 signatures in
5 favor of the nomination. Some go into more
6 detail than others. The petition I would
7 like to be part of the record also. We also
8 have the 44 letters that I noted earlier.
9 Also all the testimony from both this hearing
10 and the hearing that occurred in February,
11 both in favor and in objection to the
12 nomination.

13 With that, I would like to take a vote
14 of the Commission. This vote would be a
15 recommendation to City Council for
16 designation of the property at 486 South
17 Graham street, known as the Albright
18 Methodist Church and parsonage, to that,
19 acknowledging that we are making that
20 recommendation with the full support and
21 codification of Criteria 3, Criteria 4,
22 Criteria 10, Criteria 5, Criteria 8 as being
23 met in the determination. Meaning five of

1 the criteria of the ten, meaning that the
2 building does exemplify a significant
3 architectural pattern, style and significance
4 to our City.

5 With that, I ask for a vote.

6 MR. SERRAO: Don't we need a motion.

7 MR. HOGAN: I'm sorry, I'm getting
8 ahead of myself again. Is there a motion to
9 recommend nomination to City Council of 486
10 South Graham, understanding the five
11 criteria.

12 MS. PETERSON: So moved.

13 MR. SERRAO: Second

14 MR. HOGAN: Moved by Carol. Second by
15 Joe.

16 All in favor.

17 MR. GASTIL: Aye.

18 MR. SERRAO: Aye.

19 MS. PETERSON: Aye.

20 MR. HOGAN: Aye.

21 MR. FALCONE: Aye.

22 MR. HOGAN: Opposed.

23 Abstention.

1 MR. HARLESS: Abstention.

2 MR. HOGAN: One abstention from Erik.

3 The motion carries with five approved,
4 one abstention.

5 So the audience understands the
6 process now, this building will be
7 recommended and moved. Our recommendation
8 will go to the City Planning Commission.
9 That will be the next hearing. They will
10 take testimony and move from there. That
11 will be their decision at that point to
12 either recommend, as we are, or not. That
13 recommendation, along with their decision,
14 along with our recommendation will then
15 proceed to City Council. City Council will
16 then take under advisement and has the final
17 determination if it should be designated or
18 not.

19 Once again, this is the start of the
20 process. I thank you all for taking the time
21 over the last few months. I also thank you
22 very much for your continued support and
23 continued pleasure and cherishment of our

1 City, just as I do.

2 Thank you all.

3 (The proceedings concluded at

4 4:41 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Dylan C. DiRenna, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing sixty-two (62) pages are a true and correct transcript of my stenotypy notes taken of the proceedings held at the aforesaid address, on the aforesaid date.

Dylan C. DiRenna, Notary Public in
and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
My Commission Expires October 7, 2017.