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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Serrao</td>
<td>Sarah Quinn</td>
<td>Paul Taylor</td>
<td>Carole Malakoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Peterson</td>
<td>Sharon Spooner</td>
<td>Joshua Fischer</td>
<td>Pat Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Gastil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Morosco</td>
<td>Glenn Benigni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Kyriazi</td>
<td>Solomon Kamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Falcone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan Horner</td>
<td>Taafui Kamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Harless</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric French</td>
<td>Katie French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Mangan</td>
<td>Susan Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelley Parkerson</td>
<td>Brian Bevcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah J. Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.**
**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.
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 stats 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

Applicant:  
Bob Baumbach  
900 Middle Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Inspector:

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  

**Applicant:**  Gerald Lee Morosco  
1016 E Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203  

**Inspector:**  

**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.


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

Applicant:  
Gary Olden  
290 Colonial Drive  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15216

Inspector:

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


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  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh, Pa 15212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot and Block:</td>
<td>23-N-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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.
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.
## 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

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

**Inspector:**

**Council District:** 6th

**Application Received:** 2/12/16

**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.
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.
COUNSEL PRESENT:
On behalf of the Applicant:

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

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

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

MS. QUINN: I can tell you, we did receive additional e-mails and letters supporting the project. The other thing I have for you now -- it wasn't included in your minutes -- that is the court reporter's documentation of the discussion from last time regarding this. If you all need to refer back to it for any reason, there it is. I'm prepared to provide a staff report if you want me to.

MR. HOGAN: Why don't you give us an
update. We have determined that it meets the standard, at which point it is currently protected. The next step, we were all supposed to go do our research, come back, make sure that we are comfortable finding additional information. If staff has additional information they would like to present, we can take that now into testimony.

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

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

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

That's the staff report. I also have copies of the nominations if you would like
those. It was available online. I'm sure you guys are very familiar with that area.

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

MS. QUINN: No.

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

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

MS. PATROSS: I'm Lindsay Patross,
P-A-T-R-O-S-S.

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

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

You've already heard from me. There's a number of other people here to express their support. I did want to point out a few things that I mentioned last time. I'm here for two reasons. One, this is an important building with an abundance of historical significance. Justin will speak to that as well.
The second reason I nominated this building is community. I first walked into Albright the day before Thanksgiving five years ago. Albright has hosted a community Thanksgiving dinner which has provided a way for many more people than just the congregation to participate in this community.

Albright sits at the intersection of three neighborhoods: Bloomfield, Shadyside and Friendship. Albright also sits at the intersection of many different parts of Pittsburgh. A block away from UPMC Shadyside, it's also located near the busway and right on several main bus routes. It's ideally situated to be a community hub; inspired by some of the other successful examples of church preservation and reuse in Pittsburgh, including the Union Project on Northside, Nyia Page Community Center in Braddock and Calvary United Methodist Church in Allegheny West, which is an excellent example of neighbors working with the church.
to create a community space that everyone can be proud of.

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

During this upgrade Albright was a little bit ahead of its time and expanded to really function as a community center. The offices were rented to several different
nonprofits, including PULSE, the Pittsburgh Urban Leadership Service Experience, which has grown by leaps and bounds and last year doubled its footprint to expand into the Northside and transform Pittsburgh neighborhoods. Albright has a history of serving as an incubator for community projects. The social hall was used for exercise classes, Alcoholics Anonymous and many more community meetings.

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

In July of 2015 we held a community block party with the specific goal of asking neighbors what they need in their community. We learned a lot of information.
I will yield my time to the rest of the people who are here to speak.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

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

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

I would like to address the concerns of the opponents to designation. There is a belief among them that historic designation would interfere with the building owner's mission and free exercise of religion. Fortunately there is a precedent here, in 1989, the New York district court case known
as St. Bartholomew's Church versus the City of New York. The landmark decision in this case is a cornerstone of historic preservation case law and also exceptionally applicable to the nomination of the Albright building.

In this case St. Bartholomew's Church sought to demolish its landmark 1928 community house for construction of a 40 to 50 story commercial tower. The church applied for a certificate of appropriateness from the landmarks preservation commission and was denied. This lawsuit was filed claiming, among many other things, that the landmark law was unconstitutional to the extent that it impacts the property of any church because it interferes with the free exercise of religion. The church also claimed that the landmark law impermissibly burdens the exercise of religious belief restricting a church's ability to use its property as it wishes in support of its religious or charitable mission.
The court decided that the mere possibility that a church may at some time want to make a different use of its landmark property creates no more than an incidental burden on the practice of religion. Therefore, the designation of church buildings as landmarks does not in and of itself violate the free exercise clause. This is especially true since the landmark designation does not deprive the church to seek a certificate of appropriateness to alter its property if the nature of that property is such that it no longer can be used to carry out its religious or charitable mission.

I'm submitting to the record a brief of that case. All of this is beside the point. We the public have been openly informed that the Albright building is no longer a religious structure. On October 39th, 2015, an article published in the Post Gazette cited the owner's legal counsel saying the church hadn't been used as a place
of worship since November of 2013, and the
conference made a determination of
abandonment in January. This happens from
time to time, he said. Oftentimes churches
no longer serve the religious mission.

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

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

Thank you.
MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

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

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

The City Code requires the owner's consent for historic designation of a church. The owner here, the conference objects to it. As I mentioned before, the petitioners' argument that the owner's consent is not required because it's not used as a religious structure is factually and legally erroneous. It is factually erroneous, as Reverend Porter
will testify today -- he is present -- about religious worship.

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

Also it is legally incorrect because a church qualifies as a religious structure under the City Code. As I mentioned to you previously, the City Code defines religious structure as any or all of the following: Church, cathedral, mosque, temple, rectory convent or similar structure used as a place of religious worship. As a matter of both statutory construction, which is the doctrine of last antecedent, and the English language, the phrase: Used as a place of religious
worship, only modifies the words: Similar structure.

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

As the Reverend George Porter will testify, a portion of the property is being used for religious worship. Therefore, the principal use of the property has remained
unchanged for the last 100 years. It is a religious structure and cannot be designated. There's a very important reason -- I talked to you about that before -- that there is this provision. The requirement properly preserves the separation of church and state guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Pennsylvania Constitution. Improperly ignoring this requirement creates the very constitutional conflict that the City Code sought to avoid. Improperly ignoring the requirement would also violate federal law.

You should understand also, as I mentioned before, the Methodist Church has a process that has to be followed for historic designation. It's in our conference rules. This was not followed here. So the property cannot be designated as historic. A church is permitted to marshal its own assets and pursue its mission. The Methodist Church is obligated to use its assets toward its mission in urban communities. You should be
aware that the designation of this property as historic over our objection impermissibly infringes upon the church's free exercise of the Methodist Religion.

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

The conference has a vision for the use of the proceeds. As I mentioned before, and as you are aware, this property is under agreement of sale. By the way, the first listing agreement was signed by Abass Kamara on behalf of the local church. So they
wanted to sell this property at one point. The conference's vision is to use the net sale proceeds from the sale of this property to develop multiculturally and contextually driven ministry which includes -- please listen carefully, this is where the money would be used -- low income housing in this area -- that's the purpose -- two, feeding ministries with the poor; three, literacy programs; four, opportunities to create sustainable lifestyles in this community. All of which cannot be done with this burdensome building. That's the money that would be used for this purpose.

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

MR. HOGAN: I need you to wrap up.

MS. BENTZ: The United Methodist Church is a missional church. Outgrowths of
the United Methodist church include the Red Cross; Goodwill Industries; the Salvation Army; and Imagine No Malaria, where we are partnering with the Gates Foundation as well as the NBA to cure malaria in Africa.

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

Thank you very much.

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

Do you want him to testify now?

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

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

Please state your name for the record.

MR. PORTER: Reverend George Porter.

MR. HOGAN: Excuse me.
MS. BENTZ: Reverend Porter, what is your profession?

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

MS. BENTZ: Where else do you serve?

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

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

MR. PORTER: They are on the same block.

MS. BENTZ: What separates these churches?

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

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

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

MS. BENTZ: For the record, if I read
these dates, please correct me if they are incorrect.

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

Did I read those correctly?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

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

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

MS. BENTZ: How would you describe the
condition of the Albright Church?

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

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

MR. PORTER: Not at all.

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

MR. TAYLOR: My name is Paul Taylor.

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

MS. BENTZ: I do understand that.

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

MR. HOGAN: Correct.

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

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. HOGAN: Continuously as a
parsonage?

MS. BENTZ: Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Additional testimony.
MR. MOHN: My name is James Mohn. I live on Scaife Road in Sewickley, Pennsylvania 15143.

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

I live in Sewickley. My daughter goes to school on Morewood Avenue. I often shop at the marketplace on Centre Avenue, which is how Albright Methodist Church landed on my radar. Despite the fact that I don't live in the neighborhood, Albright's distinctive yet
dusty profile presents an undeniably strong
presence on the streetscape, even for the
occasional visitor.

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

I believe this property highlights the
sometimes challenging intersection of
thoughtful urban planning and the desires of
the commercial developer. If the developer
has signed an agreement with Albright's
owner, then the property is likely to be
developed, and a detailed proposal submitted
to the planning board. I respectfully
request that the developer challenge their
design team to flex their creative muscle.
Bring innovation and creativity to the
drafting board and define a viable program or
business model that complements the physical
conditions of an existing structure worthy of
landmark status. Create for yourself a
leadership role in the evolution of an urban
neighborhood in transition. Why not follow
in the footsteps of the visionary Pittsburgh
developers who successfully adapted the East
Liberty YMCA into the hugely popular and
admired Ace Hotel?

Kindly accept the responsibility to do
good work, not only for your development
business, but for the Centre Avenue corridor
and the neighbors of Albright Methodist. Use
this moment as an opportunity to demonstrate
your appreciation for Pittsburgh's unique
architectural legacy. It's my belief that
somewhere near Albright Church is a worn out
strip mall or a crippled convenience store
that's begging to be torn down and replaced
by a new Starbucks drive-thru.

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

I'm in favor of the nomination.

MR. HOGAN: Next.

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

I'm for keeping this thing around forever and ever. Very quick, research shows that there are over 2 million people who work on sites such as Ancestry.com and those sorts
of things. It proves that history is very important, very vibrant, and heritage so important to them that they spend millions and millions of dollars just to keep that around.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

MR. HOGAN: If you guys could, line up so that we can keep the pace going. That would be helpful.
MR. HAVEN: My name is Jennifer Haven.
I live at 205 South Pacific Avenue in
Friendship, 15224. Friendship is the
neighborhood over. I'm just a few blocks
away from Albright.

I'm a homeowner of a 112 year old
home. I have eight original stained glass
windows. I have six more that have been
recreated over the years since I've been
there for 14 years. There are so many homes
in Friendship with stained glass that we
actually have whole house tours that are
around the stained glass windows in our
homes. Friendshippers love stained glass.

We love old buildings. I really feel like
this church is a beacon to the neighborhood
and the surrounding communities, the glorious
and glamorous 100 plus year old homes that
surround it.

I'm not opposed to development. I
would gladly accept the commercial reuse of
this building. I would accept, of course, a
nonprofit reuse of this building. If you
have ever been to one of their Thanksgiving dinners, if you have ever seen the help that
the congregation -- by "congregation," I
don't mean religious congregation, I mean the
greater neighborhood, the three neighborhoods
and beyond coming together to support each
other at this building -- it's absolutely
incredible.

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

Thank you so much.

I addressed this body at the last meeting. I'm an attorney who represents members of the congregation of Albright, which still is in existence and has met at other locations since November of 2013, when the site stopped being used for religious purpose. As I pointed in out my last testimony -- I won't go into too much detail -- there is precedent for your body to designate a former religious structure as a nonreligious structure, and thus allow a nonowner, as in this case with Ms. Patross, to submit a designation and have this organization designate it as historic.

There's the Malta Temple and St. Mary's Academy.

A couple other things to point out. The record owner, the conference has entered into a contingent contract, as far as I know,
with Ross Development regarding putting in a Starbucks and retail locations. By entering into that contract, the owner -- excuse me, the developer, Ross, has equitable interest in the property, that is a certain level of ownership and claim to the title of the property. His plans are to use it for commercial purposes. In no way does he plan to use it for any religious purposes any anything tied to the Methodist Church.

I would also point out that the recent testimony provided here by Reverend Porter claims that religious services started taking place on the property in early December 2015. I would point out that services did not take place from November 2013 until December 2015. Interestingly, those services didn't start until a month after Ms. Patross submitted the nomination saying that no religious activity or services had occurred in two years. I find it convenient that, all of a sudden, after two years of no activity, they start to have religious services take place.
I would also object to Reverend Porter's characterizations of the quality of the structure and the property. He has admitted he is not an engineer. He is not an expert. Any of his descriptions have no merit or value.

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

I would also point out that there are plenty of instances where historic ordinances have been deemed not to abridge the First Amendment rights of a religious organization or entity, particularly when the contemplated use of the structure is wholly unrelated to the exercise of religion. I would say that
what the Methodist Conference is planning to
do with this building is not in any way tied
to their religious ideology. Thus, the
restrictions or possible designation as
historic under the historic ordinance is in
no way unconstitutional. The ordinance
itself is not unconstitutional.

Thank you.

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

MR. HOGAN: This is not a court.

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

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

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

MR. HOGAN: You're out of order.

MS. QUINN: For the record, I'm asking
that this be transcribed for Judge James,
please. I think the Judge would appreciate
that.
For the record, the engineers have been in the property and have seen the interior of the property. I would ask that the court reporter note that for Judge James. The internal portions of the property have been examined extensively by our engineers. That's all that I'll say.

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

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

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

Thank you.

MR. KAMARA: My name is Abass, like the fish, Kamara. I'll be brief, out of
respect for your time, and also out of respect for all the folks in the community who have shown up, most if not all of them to show their support for this building.

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

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

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

We just again want to thank you all for considering the historic designation. As
we have stated if our letters of support, we do support the historic designation for this property. I think that the history that it has displayed for the community through all of these years is very significant and the role that it has played.

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

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

I'm a bit conflicted talking about this process because I have very dear friends sitting here arguing for the demolition of this church and very dear friends who are arguing against it. I want to tell you, given my experience -- I want to reinforce the idea, given my experience in historic preservation. Ten years on Mt. Lebanon's historic preservation Board, I'm currently a
member of the Pennsylvania State Historic
preservation Board, although that has no
bearing here. I don't speak in any way on
their behalf. I also write and sell on a
regular basis to the Pittsburgh Tribune
Review a column on architecture, planning and
preservation. I want you to know, given all
of that background, I'm very much in favor of
the preservation of this church and its
designation.

One comment I want to make. I'm a
Methodist, not a Presbyterian. I'm a member
of the same congregation as Amy. I will say
that the discipline of the United Methodist
Church defines worship as a public event. If
there was worship -- which is the words she
and Reverend Porter used -- if there was
worship going on in that church in the times
he said there was, this was in a time period
when the basement entrance to the church and
exit was, blocked boarded in with plywood,
when the handicapped access was roped off,
and there was no evidence whatsoever of any
activity around that church. I was there many times during that period, either there or nearby, and walked by that church and looked at it.

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

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Is there additional testimony.

MS. BRADFORD: Hello, my name is Sarah Bradford. I live at 307 South Pacific Avenue friendship. I've been there since the '70s.
I am favor of having this deemed to be a historic site. I think, as Pittsburhgers, we have to fight tooth and nail for every structure that meets the criteria, that we have to do what we can to save them. The people that have already spoken, they've said a lot of great things. I don't have to repeat it. I just want to tell you I really support keeping this as a designated historic preservation building.

Thank you.

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

I just want to underscore the opportunity that this historical nomination has brought. It's clear, not only just in the sheer number of people who have shown their support for this historical building in person and virtually, but through friends of Albright, it's created the opportunity to engage nonprofits, other community groups, so
forth and so on. Members of the congregation current and otherwise are engaged with the community. The list goes on.

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

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


I guess what's most important to
discuss is both my connection to the location, which I pass every day going to work and on weekends when I am travelling through my city, and also the understanding that in my own neighborhood we have a church that serves as a linchpin for our community. A number of the folks who have spoken before have mentioned how important this particular structure is to the identity of their communities. I can understand how huge it would for Polish Hill to lose its church. Certainly it would recognize the same thing. I would hope as a Pittburgher that we work to preserve the structures that represent our heritage and our culture and our faith.

I know, as a president of a historic church out in rural Pennsylvania, not that we've got Starbucks knocking on our door to show up in Ebensburg, PA, if we did, we would certainly do everything that we could to preserve a structure that, I think, was so representative of a culture that has been built and preserved for generations. I would
hope that we as a community would make the
same prioritization with this building.

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MS. CERCONE-SCULLION: Good afternoon.

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

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

As we celebrate the 200th anniversary,
we do protect our military history. We guard
it so carefully. The religious history is so
important. During the industrial revolution,
when we had the Carnegies coming, and we had
a big wave of immigration, the Catholic
Church was able to build many churches and
provide them with pastors that spoke the language. So we saw a lot of Catholicism coming to Pittsburgh. People who spoke foreign languages were provided religious services. That was the time that we saw a big Anglican movement to try to get a place in history as well, to give people opportunity for not just Catholicism, but to have other religions as well. This is a part of the landscape of religion for everyone, and how important that movement was at the end of the 1800s and well into the 1900s.

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

Thank you very much.

MR. HOGAN: Any additional testimony.

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

I did write a letter. My reasons for
wanting it to be nominated are also listed in there. You've heard about the architecture and all of the special parts of the building, its windows and architect and the craftsman of the windows.

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

I also feel that this church helps to document the history of Pittsburgh, particularly of the immigrants, particularly of the German immigrants, who were one of the earliest and one of the largest groups of immigrants to come here. They are craftsmen. They are engineers. They are industrialists who played such an important role in building Pittsburgh. This helps to document the life of these German immigrants. They built this
church building not just as a church, but as a center for community and for service to the community.

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

Sadly, I have to say one more thing.

I do this regrettably. I have been a Methodist all of my life. That's, as you can tell, many, many years. I have listened to the testimony of the United Methodist Conference both last time and this time. I have been shocked. We moved to Highland Park. We have been looking for a Methodist Church. There isn't any in Highland Park. I
was never told when I needed to have alternative times to go that this was public worship going on. I was never notified. There was nothing on first Church's documentation of this. I have seen the building. I would be shocked that they would attempt to have worship with the doors blocked and the utilities turned off. I'm conflicted as to what this testimony means. It is shocking for me and my faith.

Thank you.

MS. HALDERMAN: Hello, my name is Cara Halderman. I'm at 2212 Perrysville Avenue. I'm the secretary for Preservation Pittsburgh. I know my organize has spoken at length on this topic before. I just want to reiterate today that we fully support the nomination of Albright United Methodist Church as a historic structure.

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MS. GRAY: My name is Lizabeth Gray. I live at 3823 Clement Way in lower
Lawrenceville.

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

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

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

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

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

MR. BURNS: I'll be brief. My name is John burns. I live at 6830 Thomas Boulevard in the Point Breeze section of Pittsburgh where I own a house. I previously lived in the Friendship area on Fairmont Street. I owned a home there.
I simply want to point out that such structures will never be built again. This structure is unique. I simply want to second and confirm and affirm what has previously been said in favor of nominating the church for historic designation.

Thank you.

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

I'm new to Pittsburgh. I've been here less than one year. My wife and I moved to Pittsburgh last May. Part of the attractiveness of it is the celebration of its history. I went to community college in Seattle, Washington. Seattle Central Community College, that neighborhood, Broadway has been gentrified. We lived in Washington D.C. for a number years, 14th and U, historic, cultural. It's been gentrified. As Pittsburgh grows, I think that's wonderful. I think that we also ought to
hang on to our wonderful assets. I think the nickname for Albright at one point was the Jewel Box of East Liberty, the Jewel Box of Baum Boulevard. You're not going to get that with a Starbucks.

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

Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Any additional testimony.

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

As noted at the last meeting, we reviewed the application and the merit of the application and had made a preliminary determination that the application and the structure of 486 South Graham Street met three of our criteria. No. 3, exemplification of distinguished architecture type, style and design. Item No. 4, work of an architect, engineer, designer or builder.
Item No. 10, unique location, designation, physical appearance and appearances.

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

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

This particular building is no different. As you heard today, its Gothic and Romanesque styles intertwine, creating an unusual structure here. That structure, along with the intuitiveness and the
creativity of the architect, came together
with a very lovely celebration on a pretty
unique corner.

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

At this point are there other
comments.

MR. GASTIL: I would like to comment.
I would just note that I think that
the three items which were identified as
among the criteria for designation, which
this fulfills, I would agree with them. I
think, both from the staff report from what
was presented to us to our own understanding,
I think that it is an exemplification of an
architectural type, style or design
distinguished by innovation, rarity,
uniqueness or overall quality of design,
detail, materials and craftsmanship. I think
it is the work of an architect whose
individual work is significant in the history and development of the City of Pittsburgh and the region.

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

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

MR. SERRAO: I would also like to make a comment notwithstanding some of the testimony that the building is in fairly good shape. I think it has -- most its integrity is intact. Considering what we normally see around here for older buildings, it's in excellent shape. I think that's part of the
charm of the building, that it hasn't been modified, damaged greatly. It's pretty much what you see is what you get. I think the integrity of the building is outstanding for its time.

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

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

As I said, I'm puzzled by that.

MR. HOGAN: Just to note the for the record, it was an e-mail received by us dated March 2nd, 2016, at 3:00 a.m. We are happy
to, as it is part of the record, be able to provide that.

Any other testimony or questions.

MR. FALCONE: Today was important to me. Reading the history of the building and being familiar with it was very important. I was particularly taken aback by a letter that we received by the descendants of the architect, who supported the designation. I think it echoed much of what we heard today from the public testimony, that this particular building has meaning well beyond just the building itself. We heard testimony today from people from friendship, Lawrenceville, Northside, Polish Hill, Bloomfield, the list goes on. Preservation is a public good. It was important to hear what the public had to say about this. It seems like there are a lot of Pittsburghers from all over the City who are very interested in this building and very interested to see that it continues to be part of the larger community as a landmark.
MR. HOGAN: Also for the record, I would like to note that we are in receipt of an updated petition. We actually have counted the names. It's 789 signatures in favor of the nomination. Some go into more detail than others. The petition I would like to be part of the record also. We also have the 44 letters that I noted earlier. Also all the testimony from both this hearing and the hearing that occurred in February, both in favor and in objection to the nomination.

With that, I would like to take a vote of the Commission. This vote would be a recommendation to City Council for designation of the property at 486 South Graham street, known as the Albright Methodist Church and parsonage, to that, acknowledging that we are making that recommendation with the full support and codification of Criteria 3, Criteria 4, Criteria 10, Criteria 5, Criteria 8 as being met in the determination. Meaning five of
the criteria of the ten, meaning that the
building does exemplify a significant
architectural pattern, style and significance
to our City.

With that, I ask for a vote.

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

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

MS. PETERSON: So moved.

MR. SERRAO: Second

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

All in favor.

MR. GASTIL: Aye.

MR. SERRAO: Aye.

MS. PETERSON: Aye.

MR. HOGAN: Aye.

MR. FALCONE: Aye.

MR. HOGAN: Opposed.

Abstention.
MR. HARLESS: Abstention.

MR. HOGAN: One abstention from Erik.

The motion carries with five approved, one abstention.

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

Once again, this is the start of the process. I thank you all for taking the time over the last few months. I also thank you very much for your continued support and continued pleasure and cherishment of our
City, just as I do.

Thank you all.

(The proceedings concluded at 4:41 p.m.)
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