



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 September 7, 2016
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>	
Joe Serrao	Sharon Spooner	Richard C Worl	Bill West
Erik Harless	Sarah Quinn	Susan Brandt	Joe Edelstein
Carol Peterson		James Rizzo	Stephen Connell
Ernie Hogan		Gary Cirrincione	Scott Bofinger
Matthew Falcone		Jason Roth	Tom Pierce
		Mac Grant	Heather Stone Fletcher
		Tom Bates	Mary Bates

Old Business-None.

New Business

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

Other Business:

1. Ms. Quinn talks about developments with the Iron City Brewery.
2. Mr. Hogan talks about the history of the property with the HRC.
3. Mr. Harless states that he will follow up with Ms. Quinn on some of the pending issues.

Adjourn:

Mr. Serrao motions to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Hogan asks for objections; hearing none, he adjourns the meeting.

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

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

Inspector:
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 8/19/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alterations to entrance for ADA access.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Bill West steps to the podium; he is representing the developer. He talks about the history of the project and parking issues and some of the solutions they are coming up with. He states that what they are asking for today is an accessible entrance on Avery Street.
 2. Mr. Scott Bofinger steps to the podium; he is with the architect for the project. He shows the site and photos of the building. He shows the floor plans and talks about some of the changes that have been made to the proposal. He shows the Lockhart elevation and talks about possible plans for door replacement if possible. He shows the plans for the Avery Street accessible entrance and states that they are proposing to alter the doors to include clear glass.
 3. Mr. Hogan summarizes that they will be eliminating the stairs and bringing the entrance to grade. He states that they should look at how the entrance is articulated and relates to the street. He states that he does think that it is a good solution and a minor alteration to a historic building compared to what they were looking at before. He states that they would need more information on the Lockhart Street doors, although it may be to their advantage to leave the Lockhart façade as-is depending on code requirements.
 4. Mr. Serrao agrees that the concept is good, and that they will just need to provide more detailed drawings.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks if there will be a door to the trash room shown on the plans.
 6. Mr. West states that there is a man-door in that area, and they are working on finding where the property line is and what their options are on that side of the building. They also have an area under the sidewalk that they may be able to use. He states that they have engaged the community group and believe that they have their support.
 7. Ms. Quinn states that she would be happy to come to their zoning board hearing and explain the challenges that they faced as far as developing the historic
-
-

building.

8. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none. He states that they can table the application until they come back with drawings.

Motion:

1. No motion.
-
-

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:
Jason M. Roth
233 Amber Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/19/16

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of new entrance and ramp for ADA access.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jason Roth steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He explains the proposal, stating that they are looking to add an accessible entrance at the rear of the building. They would be creating an opening in the wall and have a landing, set of stairs, and wheelchair lift for egress. He states that there is currently a fence and condensers in this area; they will have to relocate the units and possibly rebuild the fence. He asks if a fence would be required for screening.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that they would need more photographs to be able to determine that. He states that he did walk the site and states that the area in question is visible from the alley. He asks if they will be doing any greening or landscaping.
 3. Mr. Roth states that there is no room because of the required paving and pedestrian access. He states that the owners are looking to have this entrance be a primary entrance rather than just an emergency/accessible entrance, so they would prefer a lower screening fence if one is necessary. He talks about the design for the wheelchair lift. He shows the options for the guardrail design.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if the condensers will go to the roof.
 5. Mr. Roth says no, they would remain on the ground as there are already units on the roof.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that they may require screening by code.
 7. Mr. Serrao asks about the property lines.
 8. Mr. Roth states that the property line shown runs straight between the two buildings. He states that the owner does own both properties, but they will need to do research to determine exactly where the property line is and if the condensers are able to be on the other property.
 9. Mr. Hogan states that since the air conditioners are not shown, he is inclined not to give approval. He states that they would usually require them to be screened
-
-

with evergreens.

10. Mr. Roth states that they should be able to provide screening with landscaping.
11. Mr. Falcone states that they need more information and that this may be another case that they can only give preliminary approval.
12. Mr. Roth states that without the air conditioners, he believes they have provided enough information for the accessible entrance.
13. Mr. Hogan **and Mr. Harless state that they don't believe there is enough information.**
14. Mr. Hogan states that there are a lot of questions about how all the elements will **interact. They don't know exactly where the property line is, and the deck/porch** itself needs some work; he states that they would need more information about the materials.
15. **Mr. Falcone states that he feels that they don't have the ability** to make a decision because of the property line questions.
16. Mr. Hogan states that the code issues are out of their privy. He states that his issue is what is visible from the public right-of-way, which is all of it because they are adjacent to a parking lot. Going back to materials, he states that he is not inclined to approve the galvanized wire screenings, as they have not been approved on other properties. He states that the code is clear about porch structures, so they should follow standards for side and rear porches such as a tongue-and-groove floor decking and a picket with a top rail and newel. He states that the lift can be installed as is. He states that they would also need information about how the band board and newels would be treated; the side-mounted approach shown is generally not acceptable.
17. Mr. Roth states that they are saying that the porch should look like a front porch in the Mexican War Streets.
18. Mr. Hogan says basically, yes. He states that they also need to figure out the issues with the property lines and the condensers.

Motion:

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

Taylor Ailderdice
2409 Shady Avenue

Individual Landmark

Owner:
Pittsburgh Public Schools
1305 Muriel Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Ward: 14th

Lot and Block: 87-H-250

Applicant:
Gary J. Cirrincione
5507 Hays Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Inspector:

Council District:

Application Received: 8/19/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alterations to smokestack.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Gary Cirrincione steps to the podium; he is the consulting architect for the Pittsburgh Public Schools. He shows the plan of the school and states that the smokestack is 128 feet high from grade. He shows views of the building, stating that the smokestack is visible from many angles. He states that the smokestack is a utilitarian Tuscan style while the building is a Beaux-Arts style. He states that the engineering report on the condition has been included in the packet. He talks about the proposal, stating that they are proposing to remove the upper 15 feet of the stack and rebuilt at a lower height. They are proposing to cast the existing features and replicate the profile of the smokestack. He shows side-by-side views of the stack before and after and states that the look will be the same. He states that a piece of the smokestack stack did fall in May, and the engineering company assessed the condition and recommended rebuilding of the upper portion of the stack, resealing of joints, and installation of supporting banding. They advised that maintenance will be ongoing and strongly advised reconstruction or lowering of the stack. He states that the height of the smokestack is no longer functionally needed, and they are just trying to maintain a historic feature of the building at this point.
 2. Mr. Falcone asks about the reasoning behind the removal of the 15 feet.
 3. Mr. Cirrincione states that this was the decorative terracotta section and has the loosest masonry and is most at risk. Lowering will also help with future maintenance, and as he stated previously the height is not functionally needed.
 4. **Mr. Hogan asks since why they don't restore it in-kind since they will be up there anyway.**
 5. Mr. Cirrincione states that in addition to the previously stated reasons, they also believe that the terracotta is more extensively damaged and that the banding is unstable.
-
-

-
-
6. Mr. Hogan states that they have seen several of these cases recently. He states that the smokestacks are an iconic image and do contribute to the historic nature of the buildings.
 7. Mr. Cirrincione states that he did review the thematic National Register nomination for schools, and the references to Taylor Allderdice reference the main building and its monumentality and style. He states that the smokestack was a later, utilitarian feature added at the back; he states that a lot of these smokestacks have unfortunately been removed as they are a liability to owners and an obsolete feature.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none. He comments that the engineering report does point out that the terracotta portion of the smokestack needs to be rebuilt.
 9. Mr. Falcone states that he understands the need for the proposal and the recommendations but would have a difficult time approving the proposal, including the reduction in height and the proposed materials being concrete and fiberglass.
 10. Ms. Peterson states that she tends to agree that the smokestack should be rebuilt in-kind.
 11. Mr. Harless states that there was a piece that already fell, and as it is a school, precautions need to be taken. He states that the maintenance is also an issue, and that it will be more manageable at the lower height.

Motion:

1. Mr. Harless moves to approve the reconstruction of the smokestack as submitted, to be 15 feet lower in height.
 2. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; Mr. Serrao, Mr. Harless, and Mr. Hogan are in favor and Mr. Falcone and Ms. Peterson are opposed. Motion carries.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that this is a diminimous change to the smokestack and that the school district is making an investment to reconstruct it. The alteration will also **help them to maintain the smokestack so they don't run into the issue again.** [Clarification: The lowering of the smokestack as an architectural feature is acceptable as presented because relative to the site and the overall building perspective the reduction will not be noticeable, and the cap will be reconstructed to match the existing historic cap details.]
 5. Ms. Quinn states that she has had several conversations with them about this and a lot of thought did go into the proposal.
-
-

219 Fourth Avenue

Market Square Historic District

Owner:
Kosar Enterprises LLC
309 Painters Drive
Pittsburgh, Pa 15228

Ward: 1st
Lot and Block: 1-H-180

Applicant:
The G Corp
5905 Elgin Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15206

Inspector:
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 7/22/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Replacement of storefront door system.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Mac Grant steps to the podium; he is the builder for the project. He states that they are proposing to replace the glass storefront in order to add a second door. He shows photos of the storefront and states that they are proposing to change the right hand side, which will almost match the configuration on the neighboring storefront. He shows additional photos and drawings. He states that the materials **will remain the same. He states that the building is a late '60s or early '70s** rendition of concrete and glass massing and is not particularly historic.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that part of the uniqueness of the architecture is the free-flowing glass. He states that the horizontal element would interrupt that rhythm; their proposal is more of a traditional storefront which is counter to the design of the building.
 3. Mr. Tom Pierce steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that he does appreciate the issue.
 4. The Commission discusses the design with the applicants.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none. He states that he is inclined to forego the retractable storefront in lieu of maintaining the historic proportions, but he understands their need to add the extra door and proposal to mimic the **neighboring storefront's doors.**
 6. Mr. Falcone and Ms. Peterson agree.
 7. Mr. Harless states that they would only need to modify the one bay.
 8. Mr. Hogan says yes, and that they should retain the break at the lower level and retain the upper.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the façade renovation with the condition that the center and left façade be maintained and the right panel of the tri-part façade be
-
-

modified to include a door.

2. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
 4. Mr. Hogan clarifies that if they need to replace the entire storefront, as long as the new storefront maintains its current configuration and they add the additional egress in the right bay to mimic the original articulation, they will be in compliance.
-
-

1224 Monterey Street Mexican War Streets Historic District

Owner:
Monterey Street Project LLC
1228 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Ward: 22nd

Lot and Block: 23-J-265

Inspector:

Applicant:
Monterey Street Project LLC
1228 Monterey Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15212

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 8/19/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of rear garage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Richard Craig Worl steps to the podium; he is the owner of the property. He states that they are proposing rear garages. He shows photos of other garages on the alley. He states that the garage will be block with Hardie siding all around, and he points out the door that they are proposing. He states that they are trying to mimic the look of a carriage house.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a rear garage, with final colors to be submitted to staff.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan specifies that the garage door is to be the closed Tuscan, and the siding is to be Hardie lap.
 4. 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

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

Inspector:

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 she was before the HRC a few months ago to present the construction of a deck on top of her garage. Since then, they did have an architect work on the project; she shows one of the elevations from the alley. She states that there are some carriage houses and a lot of garages on the alley. She shows the existing structure and shows where they are looking to construct the deck.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials.
 3. Ms. Fletcher states that they decided to use wrought iron decorative pieces reclaimed from an old school building along the top of the garage as a railing on the alley. The pieces are currently used on the lower deck. The privacy fence will be beadboard, which is also used on the existing deck. They are planning on using natural stained wood for the open pergola, similar to another pergola on the alley.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the type of wood, as it looks like the example pergola is cedar.
 5. Ms. Fletcher states that she is not sure what the type of wood will be. She states that if they are fine with the example pergola, they can match it.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the construction of a deck on the rear garage, with final colors and materials to be submitted to staff.
 2. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Catahecassa Spring
Howe Spring
Voegtly Spring

Historic Nomination

Owner:
Various – See Nomination

Ward: var.

Lot and Block: var.

Nominator:
Matthew Falcone
Preservation Pittsburgh
1501 Reedsdale Street, Suite 5003
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Inspector:

Council District: var.

Nomination Received: 7/15/16

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Nomination for historic designation.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn clarifies what their tasks are today as far as the nominations.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony on the springs.
 3. Mr. Hersh Merenstein steps to the podium; he is representing city councilman Dan Gilman. He states that the councilman did send a letter of support for Howe Spring, and he would like to reiterate his strong support.
 4. Mr. James Rizzo steps to the podium representing the Spring Hill Civic League; he **wants to register their organization and community's support for the nomination. He draws the Commission's attention to the historic petition included in the nomination packet** and states that the spring has been important to the community since over 100 years ago.
 5. Ms. Susan Brandt steps to the podium; she is the vice president of Preservation Pittsburgh and states that they are thrilled with the nomination and hope that it sets a precedent for everyone to look at historic landmarks in their communities.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for additional testimony; there is none.
 7. Mr. Hogan states that after review of the staff report and additional items, he finds **that the springs are clearly characteristics of the city's history and are worthy of preservation and designation.** He also states that they speak to how the city developed that it is clear from the earlier testimony that they were vital services for the health and welfare of neighborhoods.
 8. The other Commissioners agree.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion. He states that Criterion 7 speaks to the thematic nomination, and they had also discussed Criterion 8 as being applicable.
-
-

Motion:

10. Mr. Serrao motions to recommend to City Council the designation of the three springs based on Criteria 7 and 8.
 11. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 12. Mr. Hogan clarifies that it meets Criterion 7, association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States, and Criterion 8, exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

Bayard School
4830 Hatfield Street

Historic Nomination

Owner:
Wylie Holdings LP
5170 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Ward: 9th
Lot and Block: 80-F-160

Nominator:
Carol Peterson
Lawrenceville Stakeholders
PO Box 40151
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Inspector:
Council District: 7th
Nomination Received: 7/29/16

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Nomination for historic designation.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn gives a brief staff report on the nomination. She talks about the history of the property and its historic nomination status. She states that the property was nominated for the National Register with many other schools all at the same time. There was also a local designation for schools done about 15 years ago, but this building was denied designation as it had some additions that affected its integrity. She states that the additions have since been removed, so this is a case where a property has regained integrity. She talks about the architecture and history of the building. She states that she found that the property meets at least two of the criteria for designation, which are Criterion 3, exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship, and Criterion 8, exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction. She states that other criteria mentioned in the nomination may apply with additional research. She talks about the integrity of the building, stating that the building is in its original location and constructed of its original materials, and although it has some windows infilled it does maintain its original shape and fenestration. It also had all of its additions removed as she mentioned previously. She states that the building is worthy of historic designation and recommends a preliminary determination of positive nomination viability.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that since people are in attendance they can take public testimony.
 3. Mr. Joel Edelstein steps to the podium; he is a partner with Wylie Holdings, the owner of the property. He states that he would like to request that the nomination be placed on hold, not necessarily on the basis of merit, but because they have been conscientious stewards of this and other historic buildings already as well been the recipients of historic preservation awards for their efforts. They are the
-
-

party that was responsible for removal of the non-essential elements of the building. He states that the ultimate goal of designation appears to be to preserve the building, but they have already been taking steps to do that at some expense. He states that they are currently under agreement with a third party, Q Development, to acquire the building; their intention is to restore the building according to the Secretary of the **Interior's Standards as a historic tax credit** project. He states that they feel strongly that a historic designation would jeopardize the process by creating an impediment for development of the property.

4. Mr. Hogan states that what is in front of the Commission is to determine if the nomination meets the standards for historic nomination. He states that the nominator has prepared documentation and staff has given testimony about why they believe the building meets the criteria. He states that the fact that the building **would meet the Department of the Interior's Standards is compelling as the city's standards are similar, and unless there is real cause why it shouldn't be nominated, he doesn't see why this would be an impediment. He understands the nature of real estate deals and the difficulties, but he states that the goal is preservation and reuse of the building to support the community and remember its history. He states that the request to stay is not enough to stop the process, and economic concerns are not within their privy at this time. The owner does have the right to object to a nomination, but they need to understand the cause related to it not meeting the historic standards.**
 5. Mr. Edelstein states that he could present objections based on merit, but he **doesn't want to do anything that would be a detriment to the restoration plan. He** states that his issue is what the objective of the nomination is.
 6. Mr. Rick Belloli steps to the podium; he is with Q Development, the group that has an option to purchase the property. He talks about their option to purchase the property and states that they have invested time and money although it is preliminary. He states that they wholeheartedly believe in preservation and do intend to obtain tax credits. He states that an extra layer of review would add time, expense, and possible inconsistencies between the levels of review. He proposes that they pursue historic designation once the restoration project is complete, which he feels would be a win for all parties.
 7. Mr. Keith Cochran steps to the podium; he is the co-chair of Lawrenceville Stakeholders, who voted to nominate the property. He states that they feel that this building is an important historic landmark in the neighborhood, and the fact that it is already listed on the National Register speaks to that. He states that it has a tremendous presence and conveys its original character. They hope that any future development will be required to maintain the building on its site.
 8. Ms. Alina Del Pino steps to the podium; she is a neighbor and a member of Stakeholders as well. She states that she hopes that the building is designated. She has seen so many losses of these buildings that are anchors in the community, especially in Lawrenceville.
 9. Mr. Matthew Craig steps to the podium; he is the executive director of the Young Preservationists Association. He states that they are in support of the nomination, but he also wants to speak to the **quality of Q Development's work. He feels that their involvement may be the best opportunity to have the building redeveloped and that they should be given the chance to do so.**
-
-

-
-
10. Mr. Hogan states that the ordinance is pretty clear about nominations and the process. He states that the city is where it is today because of a proactive approach to **preserving its past. He does sympathize with the owner and developer's** challenges, but when a nomination comes before the Commission without **compelling issues why it doesn't meet the standards, it becomes difficult to delay** or not go forward with a recommendation. He does believe that the building meets at least the two criteria. He states that the Commission has a tendency to defer to the national standards in order to not jeopardize the financial incentives. He states that he hopes the owner and developer understand that the historic review process is not a hindrance and that they try to make it complementary and seamless, and he states that he respects their efforts and hopes they continue to invest in the city.
 11. Mr. Serrao states that the criteria they are looking at are 3 and 8.
 12. Mr. Falcone states that he would like to take the opportunity to point out the two **connections between the city's code and the National Register. Section 1101.03 (c) (2) states** "Listing (or eligibility for listing) in the National Register of Historic Places may be considered as evidence of the reasonable cause **as described above**" **for accepting a nomination, and Section 1101.02 (g) "GUIDELINES FOR THE ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION IN HISTORIC DISTRICTS"** states "The Commission shall use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation after a property is nominated for historic designation, until it develops guidelines specifically for a structure [or] district." **He states** that if the nomination is **accepted, the Commission is to use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards until** guidelines are established, so there would be no conflict between the two.
 13. Ms. Peterson asks if the Commission would defer to the tax credit reviewers.
 14. Mr. Hogan says yes, they have done so in several cases.
 15. Ms. Quinn states that the Commission tends to be less strict than the Park Service.
 16. Mr. Harless asks if their preliminary determination has to be made today or if it could be delayed.
 17. Ms. Quinn states that they need to make the determination today.
 18. Mr. Hogan further clarifies the process.
 19. Ms. Quinn clarifies the protections that will result.
 20. Mr. Wylie states his concern about the assumption that since the building is on the National Register it automatically qualifies for local designation.
 21. Mr. Hogan accepts the comment and outlines what the process will be. He asks for a motion.

Motion:

22. Mr. Serrao motions to accept the recommendation for nomination based on the two criteria listed, Criterion 3, exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship, and Criterion 8, exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the
-
-

City, whose components may lack individual distinction.

23. Mr. Falcone seconds.

24. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the application is complete and has at least met two of the criteria, so with that they are accepting the application and moving it forward for consideration.

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