



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 October 5, 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	Sarah Quinn	Mike Bazala	Scott Bofinger
Erik Harless		Ryan Dedes	Canard Grigsby
Carol Peterson		Tommie Thomas	Jeffrey Davis
Ernie Hogan		Zachary DuBois	Dina Klavon
Matthew Falcone		Bob Russ	Jerry Morosco
Ray Gastil		Ben Boggio	Rebecca Lowe

Old Business-None.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the September 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.

Other Business:

1. Ms. Quinn presents the finding of fact for the recent nomination. She also states that it is time again for revisions to the statewide preservation plan, so PHMC is hosting a meeting the Tuesday after Thanksgiving at the Heinz History Center. She talks about the National Register nomination for Lawrenceville and where the process is in hiring a consultant. She also mentions that they may be receiving a nomination for a small historic district on the North Side and are in the process of scheduling a pre-nomination meeting. She mentions that there will be filming in the Hunt armory and she recently walked the filming crew **through what they are and aren't allowed to change.**
2. Mr. Falcone states that they just signed the MOA for redevelopment of the arsenal site in Lawrenceville, and as part of the agreement, the developer will be giving the city some funds to restore the fountain in the park among other things.

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. Scott Bofinger steps to the podium; he is with the architect for the project. He states that last time, they introduced their new plans and sketches for the project. He has brought more detailed drawings today of the same plans including the two entrances. He talks about the Lockhart entrance, stating that it is the primary entrance from a historic point of view, and it has two doors which they believe are original as well as a storm door with a vision panel that was added later. All they are proposing is to remove the storm door and header above to expose the wooden doors. They would like the doors to remain inward-swinging as they are since they are providing an accessible entrance on Avery Street. He talks about the light fixture on the Lockhart side and states that if they find the original fixture in the building, they plan to restore and replace it, and if not they will come back with a plan for new fixtures.
 2. Mr. Falcone asks about the railing.
 3. Mr. Bofinger states that he would like to remove the railing and do something more decorative, but they will submit that at a future date.
 4. Mr. Serrao state that the drawings call for restoration or replacement in-kind of the stained glass.
 5. Mr. Bofinger states that they had the windows looked at and were told that they were in good condition, so they will not need to replace them. He talks about the plans for the accessible entrance on Avery Street and shows the drawings. He states that they are proposing to remove the stairs and the doors and to install new recessed doors at sidewalk level. He talks about the proposed new doors, stating that they are open to aluminum-clad or wood doors.
 6. The Commission discusses the recession of the entrance; it is determined that the recession of the door will be retained.
-
-

-
-
7. The Commission discusses the doors and lites on the Avery entrance.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alterations to the main and ADA entrances as submitted with the condition that the ADA entrance on Avery be a solid-core wood door as articulated in the drawings.
 2. Mr. Falcone amends the motion stating that the lites on the door should mirror the articulation in the current doors and have twelve lites on each.
 3. Mr. Serrao accepts the amendment.
 4. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

19 Bedford Square

East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:
Shawn O Mara
360 Carlton Road
Bethel Park, Pa 15102

Ward: 17th

Lot and Block: 3-H-198

Applicant:
Shawn O Mara
360 Carlton Road
Bethel Park, Pa 15102

Inspector:

Council District: 3rd

Application Received: 8/30/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of lighting.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jeffery Davis steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project and is representing the owner. He states that the owner purchased the property to renovate it for office use. He states that some facade work was approved already and that today they are requesting approval of new light fixtures to be installed on the exterior of the building. He provides the elevation and spec sheets and talks about the fixtures.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony. **He acknowledges for the record the LRC's** emailed comments.
 3. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. He states that they **reviewed the application and don't have an issue with it.**
-
-

Motion:

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

1006 E. Carson Street East Carson Street Historic District

Owner:
Terry Dubois
122 Woodside Drive
Canonsburg, Pa 15317

Ward: 17th
Lot and Block: 3-G-18

Applicant:
Terry Dubois
122 Woodside Drive
Canonsburg, Pa 15317

Inspector:
Council District: 3rd
Application Received: 9/6/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact installation of LED signage.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jerry Morosco steps to the podium representing the applicant. He also introduces Mr. Zachary Dubois, who is the owner along with his father. He explains that the owner applied through zoning last year and were not made aware that the building was in the historic district. They were then granted a variance through zoning to allow the LED illumination of the signboard. He states that the gas station across the street did recently come to HRC for approval of their LED sign, and this sign was brought up during that meeting which brought it to the attention of HRC staff. He shows side-by-side pictures of the old and new signs as well as the drawings for the new sign. He states that the ordinance is silent on this type of sign as it pre-dates the technology.
 2. Mr. Hogan states that there are precedents in this and other districts.
 3. Mr. Harless asks if they got a permit as well as the zoning variance.
 4. Mr. Dubois states that they thought the variance was all they needed until they received notification that they did not have a permit and needed to come to HRC as the next step.
 5. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony. **He acknowledges for the record the LRC's** emailed comments.
 6. Mr. Bob Russ steps to the podium representing the LRC. He states that the building is non-contributing in the district and that the sign itself does predate the **district and is grandfathered in. He states that if the LED letters don't exceed what** is allowed per the guidelines they are fine with it being allowed as it was allowed across the street.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the after-the-fact installation of an LED sign based on the conditions that the building and site are non-contributing and that the sign
-
-

is required under state law to post the price of the item at the site. He states that this would only apply to gas stations in the district for posting of gas pricing.

2. Mr. Harless seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan clarifies that the motion is for approval of a static digital display sign for a non-contributing building in the district that is not to exceed current size and dimensions. The change is a change in technology only.
 4. 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

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

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

National Register Status: Listed: Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Building renovations.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Jason Roth steps to the podium; he is the architect for the project. He states that the first item of his proposal was just added, which is the basement sash that was previously discussed. They had originally put this item on the schedule for next summer but they owners have decided to move it up. He reiterates that the proposal was to slide the glass block deeper into the walls, which are two feet thick, and install wood and glass sashes towards the outside of the windows, probably recessed an inch or two. He states that since these are basement windows and the existing first floor windows have no profile and are just flat with glazing putty, they are proposing just a simple piece of one-by to be custom-milled for the frame, with a fixed piece of glass inside. The color will be white or red to match the colors on the building. He talks about the next item, stating that last month they were proposing a deck and wheelchair lift in the northwest corner, which the Commission needed more detail on. They have now revamped the entire egress situation and have a solution which will allow them to use the existing doors and insert a lift in the interstitial building between the church and the house, which will require interior changes only. The only work then required for egress will be modification of the front steps, where there is a step down and no landing at all, **the steps don't have even tread or height, and there is no railing.** They would like to make the stairs safe, even if it is possible that they are not required for egress. They are proposing to repair and not replace the front doors, and they are proposing to possibly replace the side door and have brought a new door design. They are not proposing any changes to the interstitial accessible door other than painting. He goes over the proposal for the front steps and the proposed railing, which they are designing to include elements of the existing fence. He talks about the proposal for the doors; for the side door they are looking at going with a wider door with new trim around it. The door itself will match the layout of the front door without a glazed panel.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the material of the existing front steps.
-
-

-
-
3. Mr. Roth states that they are stone above what he believes to be concrete.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that they are most likely sandstone.
 5. Mr. Roth **states that they are not very worn, so he doesn't know if they are sandstone.**
 6. Mr. Hogan asks if there are primary doors behind the doors in question.
 7. Mr. Roth states that there are primary doors behind them; the inner doors are set back about six inches.
 8. Mr. Hogan states that they are proposing to remove the stone stairs and replace them with concrete stairs, therefore changing materials.
 9. Mr. Falcone asks if the change in the stairs is for ADA.
 10. Mr. Roth states that it has to do with the Certificate of Occupancy.
 11. The Commission discusses the issue.
 12. Mr. Roth states that a main concern is that the stairs are unsafe due to the difference in the treads and risers.
 13. Mr. Hogan states that if the stairs need to be replaced, he would want to see retention of the material.
 14. Mr. Serrao agrees and states that the change of materials would set a precedent.
 15. Mr. Hogan states that he is fine with repair of the front door and suggests an alternate for the side door, with panels more in keeping with the structure. He asks for public testimony; there is none. He states that he is uncomfortable with the change in materials of the front steps.
 16. Mr. Roth states that if PLI will approve existing stairs with a railing they would keep them.
 17. Mr. Hogan states that they would like to give some guidance on stair replacement **so they don't have to come back. He states that his preference would be to move the stairs out, create the landing behind them, and reset them so that the tread heights are all somewhat consistent. He states that they may allow the top landing to be concrete.**
 18. The other Commissioners agree.
 19. Mr. Falcone asks about the doors.
 20. Mr. Hogan states that the side door is fine with the change in orientation of the panels, and they have allowed fiberglass before. He states that they are also looking for approval of the railing.

Motion:

1. Mr. Hogan motions to approve modifications to reflect the alteration of the front stairs by moving the existing stair away from the building and constructing a landing to be stained to match the stair, as well as installation of a pipe hand rail, alteration of the side entrance to replace the existing door with a new fiberglass door with reoriented one over three panels to match the front doors, and trim and paint color to match front doors, and alteration of the basement window with new
-
-

sash design to be installed over recessed glass block.

2. Mr. Falcone seconds.

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

1236-1238 Liverpool Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:
Phylissa & Tommie Thomas
1238 Liverpool Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Ward: 21st
Lot and Block: 22-L-258,259

Applicant:
Phylissa & Tommie Thomas
1238 Liverpool Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15233

Inspector:
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 9/13/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: After-the-fact installation of vinyl windows.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Tommie Thomas steps to the podium; he is the co-owner of the property. He states that he and his wife inherited the property recently and started to make repairs to the paint and porch, which they did get approval for. They also replaced the windows with vinyl windows, which they thought was allowed as several neighboring properties have them. He states that his mother-in-law, the previous owner of the property, had looked into wooden window replacements, but they were priced at \$2000-\$3000 per window because of the size. The original windows were wood.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if the top windows were arched-top windows that were retrofitted with storm windows and infill above.
 3. Mr. Thomas says yes.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if all the windows were then replaced with square vinyl windows.
 5. Mr. Thomas says yes.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that some of the examples he provided on the street are aluminum as they were new construction, but some are also unpermitted vinyl. He states that these cases are difficult, as Manchester has been a historic district for a long time and the guidelines are clear about window treatments, but unfortunately not everyone follows the rules. He states that they have inherited a significant piece of architecture that is diminished because of the alterations. He suggests that there might be financial resources available through the façade renovation program in Manchester and to contact Manchester Citizens Corporation for assistance. He states that the guidelines are clear about what they can and cannot accept, so they may not like the decision, but there are other options that they can explore.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to deny the after-the-fact installation of vinyl windows.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

1121 Sheffield Street

Manchester Historic District

Owner:
BHI Capital
302 E. Main Street
Carnegie, Pa 15106

Ward: 21st
Lot and Block: 22-R-209

Applicant:
Ryan Dedes
302 E. Main Street
Carnegie, Pa 15106

Inspector:
Council District: 6th
Application Received: 9/15/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Construction of rear and rooftop decks.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Ryan Dedes steps to the podium; he is the project manager for BHI Capital, the owner of the property. He states that they are proposing a two-story deck at the rear of the house as well as a rooftop deck on the roof of the rear of the house. He states that the rooftop deck will be visible looking up from Sheffield St.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks about the materials.
 3. Mr. Dedes states that they will use pressure-treated wood and a board-on-board privacy fence on the rooftop deck. He states that there are other two-story decks along the alleyway.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks if the handrails are 1x1 square bannisters with a 2x4 on top.
 5. Mr. Dedes says yes.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that two-story decks were not uncommon in the district on these larger houses. He asks if the openings are still there.
 7. Mr. Dedes states that they will be using the existing openings and installing doors, but he does not have the specs.
 8. Mr. Hogan states that usually for handrails they would require something more in keeping with the guidelines. He states that 1x1 pickets may be fine, but he would want to see something more Victorian for the railing. He states that for the roof **deck, if it can be seen from the street, they can't approve it. He asks if the rear deck will be used for egress.**
 9. Mr. Dedes says no, they had originally proposed a stair but have eliminated it.
 10. Mr. Hogan asks if the deck will be the full width of the building.
 11. Mr. Dedes says yes, and they are scheduled for ZBA in January to apply for a variance for the setbacks.
 12. Mr. Falcone states that getting a better idea of what it will look like will be
-
-

important.

13. Mr. Hogan states that they would like to see additional drawings including the handrails and better photos of the rear of the building so that they can see the openings.
14. Mr. Serrao would also like to see a side section.

Motion:

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

4200 Fifth Avenue

Oakland Civic Center Historic District

Owner:
University of Pittsburgh
3400 Forbes Avenue, Suite 3
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 4th
Lot and Block: 27-S-125

Applicant:
Dina Klavon
48 S. 15th Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15203

Inspector:
Council District: 8th
Application Received: 9/16/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Installation of a formal garden.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Canard Grigsby steps to the podium; he is the interim architect for the University of Pittsburgh. He states that the consultant for the project is Klavon Design Associates and he introduces the owner and principle, Dina Klavon. He states that they are seeking approval for a very formal garden adjacent to the very historic Heinz Chapel. He states that the building is very symmetric, although a few years ago an elevator tower was added. He states that the chapel is heavily utilized for weddings especially, and the university thought that it would be beneficial for photo opportunities and the flow of people to establish a more formal space.
 2. Ms. Dina Klavon steps to the podium. She shows an overview of the site and some photographs. She talks about the proposal, stating that one of the main objectives was to not have any trees so as not to obstruct the building. She states that the shape of the garden is meant to reflect the shape of the chapel. She talks about the proposed sandstone walkway, plantings, and benches, as well as how they are proposing to close the garden during events. The other big element is the proposed fountain. She shows drawings and talks about how they came up with the design.
 3. Mr. Hogan states that the only part he has issues with is the fountain, specifically its placement next to the chapel, which could distract from the architecture.
 4. Ms. Klavon states that they did have that thought too, although the wall of the chapel where it is located is more open and no architectural features would be blocked.
 5. Mr. Grigsby talks about the architectural features of the chapel that they were playing off of. He states that he hears what Mr. Hogan is saying, that a fountain is usually a centerpiece, but states that they are trying to create a backdrop for photo opportunities that includes the character of the chapel.
 6. Mr. Hogan states that his issue is that the windows above the fountain are massive and the fountain is competing with them, He thinks a more simplified fountain
-
-

may be more appropriate, something more like what the base of the proposed fountain is. He feels that a formal garden is appropriate and that water is an appropriate feature within the garden, but he feels the placement is inappropriate.

7. Ms. Klavon states that without the back piece the fountain looks tiny.
8. Mr. Falcone states that it is because it is overshadowed by the building, which is the issue. He states that the large water feature is devaluing the building, and a smaller water feature or one located more in the center would be more appropriate.
9. Mr. Hogan states that there is already a central point in the garden.
10. Ms. Klavon states that there are already utilities located in that area.
11. Mr. Harless states that he does not have an issue so much with the location of the fountain, as the garden does not seem symmetrical within the site, but he would be more comfortable with a simpler water feature.
12. Mr. Hogan agrees.
13. Mr. Serrao also agrees. He states that the wall is making it seem like part of a building, which does not fit with the site.
14. Mr. Falcone suggests that they approve the garden and have them come back with an alternate design for the fountain.
15. Ms. Klavon states that they could just remove the wall and keep the reflecting pool.
16. Mr. Grigsby states that they could also come up with an alternate design to still serve as a backdrop.

Motion:

1. Mr. Falcone motions to approve the schematic site plan with the exception of the water feature, with the applicant to return with a revised fountain design in 30 days.
 2. Mr. Serrao seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

943 Liberty Avenue

Penn-Liberty Historic District

Owner:
Pittsburgh Cultural Trust
803 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa 15222

Ward: 2nd

Lot and Block: 9-N-43

Applicant:
Desmone Architects
3400 Butler Street
Pittsburgh, Pa 15201

Inspector:

Council District: 6th

Application Received: 9/16/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Alterations to rear elevation.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Rebecca Lowe steps to the podium; she is the architect on the project. She states that they are doing an interior renovation of the property and they have also decided to address the rear façade. She states that all the windows have been removed and there is plywood over the openings. They are proposing to fill seven of the existing openings; three will be infilled with brick to match. The new windows will be aluminum single-hung windows. The exit door will be recessed back and a concrete stair will be added. She states that the pictured air conditioners have been removed.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks if they will be doing a flush insert or recessed insert for the windows.
 3. Ms. Lowe says they will have a little bit of a recess to give it a little bit of a profile.
 4. Mr. Hogan asks about the color of the windows.
 5. Ms. Lowe states that they will probably be painted black.
 6. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the alterations to the rear elevations with the condition that the brick insets be recessed to allow for a profile and that the windows have a dark trim.
 2. Ms. Peterson seconds.
 3. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-

4339 Schenley Farms Terrace Schenley Farms Historic District

Owner:
Doug Swanson
4339 Schenley Farms Terrace
Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Ward: 5th
Lot and Block: 27-G-40

Applicant:
Renewal by Andersen
1640 Golden Mile Highway
Monroeville, Pa 15146

Inspector:
Council District:
Application Received: 8/23/16

National Register Status: Listed: X Eligible:

Proposed Changes: Window replacement.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Karie Boyer from Renewal by Andersen Windows steps to the podium; she also introduces her coworker Mr. Mike Bazala and the homeowner Mr. Doug Swanson. She states that they are seeking approval to replace 17 double-hung windows. She states that they will be using the existing window openings and brick molds, and they will not be changing the style of the windows; they will be true divided-lites. They will be changing the color of the windows as shown.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony; there is none.
-
-

Motion:

1. Mr. Serrao motions to approve the window replacement as submitted.
 2. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 3. 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 summarizes her staff report on the property. She states that the property is significant under two main criteria, the first of which is Criterion 3, exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship. At the last meeting, she stated that more **research needed to be done on this criterion; the building's footprint and height** are somewhat unusual for a school and is very much an urban design and unique in the city. The other criterion is 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 the rapid growth of a neighborhood like this one required the construction of several school buildings like this one. She also restates that the building has the integrity required for historic designation. She states that there was talk about development at the last meeting, and she states that there are lots of things that can be done to further increase the integrity of the building. She recommends that the Commission make a positive recommendation to City Council. She talks about the dates for Planning Commission.
 2. Mr. Hogan asks for public testimony.
 3. Mr. Rick Belloli from Q Development steps to the podium. He states that they do have a closing date for the property, and their development plans continue to advance. They have been meeting with the community as well as the SHPO. They would still appreciate consideration of designation at the end of the project.
 4. Mr. Hogan states that the issue is that if the nominator does not withdraw the nomination, they do have to act today, and since they made a preliminary determination that the building does meet at least one of the criteria, they will
-
-

have to provide a positive recommendation.

5. Ms. Quinn states that the process is not meant to slow them down at all. The process does need to move forward, and they will just have to submit an application for any work they need to do.
6. The Commission discusses the national standards versus the local.

Motion:

7. Mr. Serrao motions to recommend the 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.
 8. Mr. Falcone seconds.
 9. Mr. Hogan asks for a vote; all are in favor and motion carries.
-
-