



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 June 1, 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	Sharon Spooner	Anthony Poli	David Slate	Morgan Kronk
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	Scott Bofinger	Eric Contakos	Robert Grimes
Raymond Gastil		Paul Bissell	Todd Reeves	Lisa Carver
Ernie Hogan		Joe Winkmann	G Radkoff	Millard Landis
Matthew Falcone		Virginia Landis	Heather Fletcher	Chad Melberg
		Bob Russ		

Old Business-None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the May 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 May 2016 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao motions to approve and Mr. Harless seconds. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.

Other Business:

1. Ms. Quinn talks about the Card Carriage House nomination; she states that the legislation timed out and it is a deemed approval. She also talks about a grant that was received for survey.
2. The Commission discusses a process for making recommendations to the state historic preservation plan.
3. Mr. Hogan mentions the unresolved window enforcement issue on N. Lincoln Street.
4. Mr. Harless asks for the address and states that he will look into it.

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.

501 Avery Street

Deuschtown Historic District

Owner:

N. Davis Enterprises LLC
400 Island Avenue
McKees Rocks, Pa 15136

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 8-D-172

Inspector:

Applicant:

William G. West, Jr.
406 10th Street
Oakmont, Pa 15139

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 3/18/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Building renovations including window replacement and garage door.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bill West steps to the podium; he is representing the developer. He states that they have not made any changes to their proposal. He states that what he would like to do is review how they have come to this point and why there aren't any changes. He talks about their original proposal in April and the reasoning behind it. They then, per the HRC's recommendations, explored alternate options and came back in May with reasons that the alternate options would not work for them. Another option that was brought up at that meeting was an entrance on the side, accessible via the Deuschtown Square homeowners association entrance. They made a proposal to the HoA to purchase an access easement and contribute to the ongoing maintenance of that easement, which was rejected. He states that it was rejected because of the misunderstanding of giving up property rights. In this HoA there is really no common area, just back-to-back parcels, so it probably would have taken a vote of 32 in favor in order for it to pass.

They also looked at some other options. On the other side of the building, there is not enough room to get a turning radius for parking. He states that they are here today to tell the Commission that the only way to create a parking solution for a residential use is to get into the building. They can't come in from the Avery Street side because of the elevation difference to Lockhart Street. He states that they want to proceed with the project but can't do it without parking. He states that to get a variance from Zoning for 12 parking spaces will be difficult. He states that they are looking for permission to enter the building off of Lockhart Street and they will continue to explore acceptable options.

2. Mr. Serrao states that the Commission did already provide them with options. Whether the options are feasible for them or not is not for the Commission to decide.
 3. Mr. Harless asks if they are being asked to approve the concept but not necessarily the design.
-
-

-
-
4. Mr. West says that is correct.
 5. Mr. Gastil asks if they would be looking at approving with the condition that the final design be submitted to staff or come back to Commission.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that this is the first he is hearing that the applicant would be willing to consider alterations to the design, but he states that they are still asking for permission for a penetration into a historic façade, with further details to follow. He states that the approval would still be based on what they have before them.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
 8. Mr. Morgan Cronk steps to the podium; he is representing the building's current ownership. He gives a brief history of their ownership of the building and the development of their proposal. He states that if the applicant does not purchase the building, they do not have any direct plans for the site, and new plans would take years.
 9. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium representing the East Allegheny community Council. He states that he was the one that originally submitted the paperwork leading to the creation of the Deutschtown historic district and he is a preservationist. He doesn't own or like cars, but he states that this comes down to preserving the integrity of the building versus providing parking to save the building. He states that if a church congregation wanted to use this as a church, they would not be required to provide parking; a small congregation would not have an adverse effect on the neighborhood, but they would not be able to maintain the church. A large congregation would have a severe impact on the neighborhood in terms of parking. He states that if it is not used as a church, it will be a non-conforming use in a residential zone and will be required to provide parking; if the parking is inside, it will satisfy the concerns of the neighbors that are in opposition. He is also upset that the Deutschtown Square HoA failed to see the proposal as an advantage to them. He states that the building has been vacant for 10 years, and he is concerned how much longer it is going to last.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none. He states that he understands the challenges in restoration and repurposing buildings, but he thinks that the Commission and ordinance exist for the preservation of buildings as constructed. They are always open to creative solutions, but he can't see how, under the ordinance, he can approve such a radical alteration that will set a precedent throughout all the historic districts. He states that the arguments he heard are all economic hardship issues, which fall under a different part of the ordinance.
 11. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that the building is a significant structure. He states that the economic argument is one that they hear frequently and is a conundrum for the Commission. He states that the economic issues may be a factor but are not under the purview of the Commission. He states that he thinks a creative solution is possible, but he can't see doing this to this building at this time.
 12. Mr. Gastil reviews what the Commission has suggested so far. He states that they can establish whether they can ever accept an entrance on Lockhart Street or not.
 13. Mr. Serrao states that they never said that an entrance there was unacceptable, just this proposed entrance.
-
-

-
-
14. Mr. Hogan states that any penetration that is notable and a deviation from the current structure would be unacceptable. If there is a creative solution like the one at Sienna, he would be willing to entertain it, but it has been dismissed as a possibility because of engineering challenges. He states that the way he sees it, per the ordinance and the fact that this is the primary façade of the church, the option would be to not approve the application as submitted, and the applicant can file for hardship or come back with a new proposal.
 15. Mr. Harless states that they have the application as submitted, and asks if they are ruling based on that or based on the testimony.
 16. Mr. Serrao states that they should rule based on the application, as they gave the applicant a chance to make alterations and they did not.
 17. Mr. Hogan states that they should err on the side of caution with approving anything, as in the past when they have approved applications and the applicant has proceeded with only part of the proposal, they have had to live with the results.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application as submitted in the documents.
 2. Mr. Gastil seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Gastil, and Mr. Hogan are in favor, Mr. Falcone abstains, and Mr. Harless votes not in favor.
-
-

1010 Cedar Avenue

Deuschtown Historic District

Owner:

Paul Bissell
Brent Bissell
Justin Mistovich

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 23-M-209

Inspector:

Applicant:

Paul Bissell
Brent Bissell
Justin Mistovich

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/13/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Relocation of HVAC units.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Anthony Poli steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that they are asking for a reconsideration of the location of the HVAC units on the building. He talks about the history of the project and the installation of the HVAC units on the roof. He states that the neighborhood in general has actually been supportive of the project. He shows photos of various views of the units and visibility. He states that their team approached Rob Pfaffman about the project, and although he did not take on the project he did visit the site and agreed that the units were not visible unless you were across the street. He states that they do plan to screen the units.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that they proposed screening previously, which was not approved, and the units were approved to be located on the ground.
 3. Ms. Quinn agrees that is the case.
 4. Mr. Poli states that they are proposing not to move them. They are asking for a reconsideration based on several factors such as the photographs provided showing the visibility of the units.
 5. Mr. Hogan states that the photographs show that the units are visible, which was the reason for denial in the first place.
 6. Mr. Serrao agrees.
 7. Mr. Poli states that the location of the units on the ground with screening as approved is more conspicuous than anything on the roof, and noisier as well in the front or back yard. The neighborhood has talked about the possibility of a wrought iron screen with a safety rail or green screening. He states that the issue is not cost, but the best location for the units.
 8. Mr. Hogan states that they are at a disadvantage being at the intersection of two major streets, unlike neighboring properties that may not have so many sight lines. He states that the issue is that these units were installed after-the-fact and were
-
-

denied, and now they are coming back asking for the Commission to change its opinion. This puts him as the chairperson in a really uncomfortable place as he is being asked to reverse his opinion. He asks if anyone that has ever been denied for visibility of roof elements should be allowed to come back and reopen their case for the Commission to approve after-the-fact. He states that he understands the applicant's position and that he was put in a difficult place by the non-compliant work that was previously done.

9. Mr. Poli states that if the application had been submitted correctly, it would have been found that the best location for the units would be on the roof.
10. Mr. Hogan states that at the time of the decision, the project as a whole and what can be seen and not seen was all looked at. He states that it is a big issue when applicants don't listen to what they've been approved for, go ahead and do what they want, and then come back and ask for forgiveness. He states that it puts the Commission and the community in a bad place. He states that it should not have been placed on the agenda but should have rather been a hardship case so it could be considered different. As is, they can only consider the ordinance, and the units cannot be approved per the ordinance as they are visible.
11. The Commission discusses the process for economic hardship.
12. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
13. Mr. Nick Kyriazi steps to the podium representing the East Allegheny community Council. He states that he doesn't think that this is an economic issue. He states that he understand being hard on people that don't care about preservation and are just trying to make money. He states that the owners have invested more in the building than it is worth and are ardent preservationists. He states that the ownership has gotten conflicting information from various agencies and inspectors that don't talk to each other. He states that the building had been vacant for years and the owners have gone above and beyond to restore it. He states that they are required to install parking, but if they put the HVAC on the ground they will lose parking. He states that they are being given the run around by the city's agencies and that the HRC is adding to that, and he states that he is sorry that he ever nominated Deutschtown as a historic district at this point.
14. Mr. Hogan asks for additional public testimony; there is none. He states that unfortunately bad advice was given by a contractor who proceeded despite what was approved. He states that if that were not the case there could have been a different outcome.

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the application as submitted in the documents.
 2. Mr. Harless seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Harless and Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Falcone are in favor and Mr. Gastil abstains. Motion carries.
-
-

925 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

CoGo's Co.
2589 Boyce Plaza Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15241

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-G-66

Inspector:

Applicant:

CoGo's Co.
2589 Boyce Plaza Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15241

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 5/13/16

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

Proposed Changes: Installation of LED signage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. David Slate with Interstate Sign Company steps to the podium. He states that the gas station has converted to another brand and they are looking to change the sign. They are looking to use an LED price sign, which is actually smaller than the existing sign. They are also changing the pole to a retro curved pole rather than the standard straight pole.
 2. Mr. Robert Grimes with CoGo's steps to the podium and explains that they also used a retro Citgo logo for the sign. He states that he doesn't know if it was approved, but there is also an LED sign on the gas station across the street.
 3. Mr. Hogan states that it was not approved.
 4. Mr. Grimes states that the sign will still be internally lit but will be less bright than the existing sign. He states that the LED will not be a message sign.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
 6. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium on behalf of the LRC. He states that the signage as submitted does not comply with the signage guidelines, specifically the requirement that signs should be no taller than 8 feet and no bigger than 25 square feet. He shows photos of other signage in the district that does and does not comply and states that some of the signage may have been grandfathered in. He states that they understand the convenience of the LED signage but states that the size is an issue. He states that if the sign pre-dates the district, which seems to be the case, the LRC recommends that they keep the pole and lighting as is, replace the graphics, and avoid making the sign bigger or taller.
 7. Mr. Grimes states that the new sign is smaller than the existing; at 5 x 10 it is 5 square feet smaller than the existing sign.
 8. Mr. Russ also has concerns about the internal illumination.
 9. The Commission discusses whether the sign is internally lit. It is determined that it is currently externally lit and should keep the same illumination, as internally
-
-

illuminated signs are prohibited in the district.

10. Mr. Hogan states that they need to be careful about how they approve the LED and make sure to note that it should not flash or change. He asks for additional public testimony; there is none.
11. The Commission discusses the size requirements in the guidelines. They determine that the size of the sign box is permitted but that if they were to replace the sign pole, it would be considered a new sign rather than an existing and would have to conform to the height guidelines.
12. Mr. Hogan states that if they replace the sign on the existing pole and scale back the lighting, they will be fine. If they change the pole, it will be considered a new sign, and they will have to change the sign position, size, and height.

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of a new sign box with the following conditions: the existing pole should be maintained, the new sign should be 5 x 10 as submitted in the documents and is to have modified exterior lighting as current sign does, and it is permitted to have an LED portion to the sign to only show the dollar amount and is not to flash or show advertising. He notes that the building is a non-contributing building in the district.
 2. Mr. Harless seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1719 E. Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:

Gregg Carson LLC
PO Box 143
Allison Park, Pa 15101

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 12-E-313

Inspector:

Applicant:

Chad Melberg
Sign Innovation
50 Halstead Blvd, Suite 17
Zelienople, Pa 16063

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 5/13/16

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

Proposed Changes: Installation of awnings.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Chad Melberg of Sign Innovation steps to the podium.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony. He states that he was before the Commission in April for approval of metal awnings, which were not approved. They are now proposing canvas awnings as suggested, to have a black aluminum framing with black or charcoal canvas.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the installation of awnings as submitted.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

810 Tripoli Street

Individual Landmark

Owner:

Homestead Property Ventures
5889 Aylesboro Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Ward: 23rd

Lot and Block: 24-J-229

Inspector:

Applicant:

Homestead Property Ventures
5889 Aylesboro Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15217

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 6/5/16

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alterations to after-the-fact building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Angelique Bamberg steps to the podium; she states that she has been engaged by the owners to help with a variety of issues with adaptive reuse of their two buildings. She states that they understand that the basement windows are the present issue and what brought the property before the Commission, but what they are now looking to do is zoom back from that specific issue and try to look at the entire property. They are looking to create a historic structures report for the exterior of the building in order to document the history and significance of the building and evaluate its features, which will help them recommend work items and approaches. She states that she will go through their immediate proposed work items and also have the architect Jason Roth talk about them.

The first urgent item is the repair and restoration of the wood tracery on the rose window on the Madison Avenue façade. She states that the glass is in good condition but the wood is in very poor condition; the window is also partially covered by an inappropriate plastic cover that is deteriorating and needs to be removed. She states that the window is very vulnerable because of its location near the busy street. They are proposing a new covering for this window. She talks about the stained glass windows on the Tripoli Street side and states that they already have storm windows in aluminum frames which are divided along the height of the window. One panel is missing in each because of hopper vents, but as they will be air-conditioning the sanctuary the hopper vents will be sealed, and they are proposing to replace the missing panes in the existing frames. She states that the air conditioning will require HVAC units, which they are proposing to locate in a place which is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

She states that they are proposing to address the basement windows in the short-term after these immediate items are taken care of; they still need some time to find a historically appropriate solution that will meet their needs. She states that Mr. Roth will go through the work items in additional detail.

2. Mr. Jason Roth steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He

mentions an additional item, which is the organ enclosure at the rear of the church that is currently insulbrick that is in terrible condition. They are proposing to take the insulbrick off and replace it with siding, which will be either wood siding or fiber cement, to be painted a neutral and appropriate color.

3. Mr. Hogan states that he did walk up and down the alley and states that the enclosure is not a very prominent feature, but he did see that it is falling apart.
 4. Mr. Roth talks about the HVAC units. He states that there will most likely be three units which will be 3x3x2 and will be all but invisible from the public right-of-way. They plan to paint any drainage lines a brick color so they will disappear.
 5. The Commissioners discuss the HVAC units and possible issues with code and possible need for a guardrail or screening.
 6. Mr. Roth states that he will check into it and come back with some different options. He talks about the rose window and shows a picture of the poor condition. He shows a drawing showing the aluminum frame and states that they are looking at a bronze anodized material.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks about the mullion of the storm window.
 8. Mr. Roth states that it is one inch. He states that they are trying to respect the dimensions of the rose window and not obscure it. He talks about the addition of the side panes.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks about corrective work to the rose window itself.
 10. Mr. Roth states that the glass is in good shape, and the wood will need the standard scraping, patching, and painting. He talks about coverings for additional windows and states that he can submit final specs to staff for approval on those if the Commission agrees. He also talks about future plans for accessibility.
 11. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
 12. Mr. Hogan states that he does appreciate that the owner has engaged them to help them walk through the process. He states that what they are proposing seems rational, but he would like to see a full plan that articulates how and when the non-compliance work will be corrected before he can approve anything else. He states that the Commission's only leverage is to hold them accountable to fix the other work first, but he understands that there are health and safety issues to be considered.
 13. Mr. Serrao agrees, and states that they can look at getting them started with the understanding that they need a road map for the corrections.
 14. Ms. Bamberg states that she thinks they are all on the same page.
 15. Mr. Hogan states that a good example is Phipps Conservatory, who came before them with a multi-year plan with the understanding that they would be back for individual hearings as the project progressed.
 16. Mr. Gastil asks if they could be back as soon as 30 days.
 17. Ms. Bamberg states that the most immediate issue is the rose window, and the project is ready to go.
 18. Ms. Quinn states that they could possibly approve it at staff level as in-kind
-
-

replacement.

19. Ms. Bamberg states that the new cover is the only thing that isn't in-kind repair.
20. Mr. Hogan states that they can approve that portion with the understanding that everything else has to come back.
21. Mr. Roth states that they would like to come back for July with a comprehensive plan, but they would like to start work on the rose window immediately.
22. Ms. Bamberg adds that the addition of the missing panes would also be an in-kind replacement that they would like to get started on.

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the storm window for the rose window as submitted, as well as the installation of the missing pane on the side windows in the sanctuary as submitted.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds, and adds that he wants to thank them for taking on this project.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1115 Liverpool Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

Eric Contakos
1115 Liverpool Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 22-L-293

Inspector:

Applicant:

Eric Contakos
1115 Liverpool Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 4/21/16

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

Proposed Changes: Installation of fencing.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Eric Contakos steps to the podium; he is the new owner of the property. He states that there is an existing chain link fence, and he is proposing to replace it with a new fence. The fence will be a six foot high wooden fence supported by metal poles. He is proposing to use a dog-eared design rather than a straight-across design.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
 3. Mr. Serrao states that dog-eared would not be appropriate, but he can use either a flat-top or pointed design.
 4. Mr. Contakos states that they will go with the flat-top design.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the fencing.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1321 Sheffield Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:

Millard W. Landis
1321 Sheffield Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st

Lot and Block: 22-P-312

Inspector:

Applicant:

Geoffrey Radkoff
112 Dorseyville Road
Pittsburgh, Pa 15215

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/13/16

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

Proposed Changes: Change in openings on rear elevation.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Geoff Radkoff steps to the podium; he also introduces the property owners. He states that the project was initiated because the kitchen floor is starting to collapse. In redesigning the kitchen, they are trying to provide a rear entrance for ease of mobility. They are proposing a French door with a transom above it.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that there is a fence around the property, and the rear of the building is not very visible.
 3. Mr. Radkoff states that the masonry above the opening is failing and will need repair or replacement.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if the lintels are currently wood.
 5. Mr. Radkoff states that they are a mix of wood and concrete, and he is proposing to use stone.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the change in the rear elevation to allow for a new French door and window openings as well as repair and replacement of masonry.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1209 Palo Alto Street *Mexican War Streets Historic District*

Owner:

Rob & Heather Fletcher
1209 Palo Alto Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-K-104

Inspector:

Applicant:

Rob & Heather Fletcher
1209 Palo Alto Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 5/13/16

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

Proposed Changes: Construction of deck on rear garage.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Heather Fletcher steps to the podium; she is the owner of the property. She states that the building is a townhouse with a freestanding garage in the rear, but between the two there is a small deck which is about 10x10. They are proposing to extend it over the top of the garage.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks how they are proposing to screen it.
 3. Ms. Fletcher shows the drawings and talks about the plans for the deck. She states that the side of the deck facing the street will have either wrought iron or wood—whatever will go best with the wooden pergola that they will be constructing.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that most of the alley is one-story garages, although there are two or three two-story garages.
 5. Ms. Fletcher states that there are quite a few carriage houses on the alley also.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that they might be able to approve the deck itself with the wrought iron and just having it float within the parapet walls, but they wouldn't be able to approve a pergola structure because of its visibility. He states that if they are trying to get screening with the pergola, they could take the existing walls up and create false windows. He states that he doesn't know if other structures that may exist on the alley were approved or not.
 7. Mr. Harless states that they will need additional drawings, such as an elevation.
 8. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that they agree in principle, but measured drawings would be helpful, and they will need those for permits as well. They will also need cut sheets for all materials.
 9. Mr. Falcone suggests that they table the application.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

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

201 N. Bellefield Avenue *Oakland Civic Center Historic District*

Owner:

Western PA School for Blind Children
201 N Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Ward: 4th

Lot and Block: 27-G-287

Inspector:

Council District:

Application Received: 5/13/16

Applicant:

Lisa Carver
PWWG Architects
408 Boulevard of the Allies
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

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

Proposed Changes: Alterations to previously approved plans.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Lisa Carver steps to the podium; she is with the architect for the project. She states that they were before the Commission in December but are finding they need to make changes. She goes over the requested changes including a canopy.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials.
 3. Ms. Carver states that they are proposing a steel tube structure with corrugated stainless or aluminum finish. She states that they are also proposing LED lights underneath.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that he wishes the canopy was a little more “dressed up” as it will be there for a long time and is somewhat visible from the main streets. He is concerned about the underside of the canopy from the street and would like to see more information about how it will be treated and maintained. He thinks that the concept works but just needs to be more finished. He asks about the color.
 5. Ms. Carver states that it will match the bridge.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks the applicant to investigate other roofing materials that have an underlying finish and submit them to staff.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alterations to the previously approved plans including addition a bus canopy, with the condition that the applicant submit final designs and materials to staff.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Certificates of Appropriateness Report – June 2016

Staff Approval	C of A Number	Date Issued	Application Address	Historic District	Work Approved
C	16-071	2-Jun-16	1719 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Installation of awnings
C	16-072	2-Jun-16	1115 Liverpool Street	Manchester	Installation of fencing
C	16-073	2-Jun-16	1321 Sheffield Street	Manchester	Change in openings on rear elevation
C	16-074	2-Jun-16	925 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Installation of LED signage
S	16-075	3-Jun-16	1224 Buena Vista Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind replacement of window glass
S	16-076	3-Jun-16	218 Tennyson Avenue	Schenley Farms	In-kind replacement of sidewalk and driveway
S	16-077	6-Jun-16	2134 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	Signage

S	16-078	7-Jun-16	4200 Fifth Avenue	Individual	Door replacement
C	16-079	8-Jun-16	810 Tripoli Street	Individual	Restoration of rose window
S	16-080	10-Jun-16	1243 Liverpool Street	Manchester	Painting
S	16-081	17-Jun-16	1113 Liverpool Street	Manchester	In-kind repair and repointing
S	16-082	21-Jun-16	607 E Carson Street	East Carson Street	In-kind masonry repair
S	16-083	22-Jun-16	1319 Sheffield Street	Manchester	In-kind window replacement
S	16-084	22-Jun-16	4400 Forbes Avenue	Oakland Civic Center	In-kind façade renovations
S	16-085	22-Jun-16	710 Cedar Avenue	Deutschtown	In-kind repair and painting

S	16-086	23-Jun-16	53 S 10th Street	East Carson Street	Signage
S	16-087	24-Jun-16	19 Bedford Square	East Carson Street	In-kind repair and replacement of windows, roof, painting
S	16-088	28-Jun-16	1239 Monterey Street	Mexican War Streets	In-kind window repairs
S	16-089	29-Jun-16	845 Western Avenue	Allegheny West	Painting - Awning removal