



Division of Development Administration and Review
City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning
200 Ross Street, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of April 6, 2011
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>	<u>Others (cont.)</u>
Noor Ismail	Makenzie Diehl	Pat Martin	Pat Gilbert
Ernie Hogan		George Shelly	Peter Margittai
Linda McClellan		Michael Carr	John Rudiak
Arthur Sheffield		Jim Bach	Carol Anthony
Joe Serrao		Jennifer Bach	Larry Tavlarides
John Jennings		Phil Johnson	Anne Nelson
		James Eash	Evelyn Jones
		Keith Cochran	Matt Galluzzo

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the March 2011 minutes, Ms. McClellan moved to approve. Mr. Jennings seconded the motion.

Mr. Hogan stated he would like to make a clarification in regards to the minutes. He says in the minutes on page 8, item 10 Mr. Serrao says “he thinks the question we looked at just talking earlier today is are we preserving a building or a roof?” Mr. Hogan says he wants to clarify that that was a discussion that the two of them had, on the telephone. He says there was no other discussion of any other case with any other board members. He says he would like the minutes to reflect this.

Mr. Hogan asks if there are any other clarifications or corrections, all members voted in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the March 2011 Certificates of Appropriateness, Ms. McClellan moved to approve, Mr. Jennings seconded, all members voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Correspondence: Mr. Hogan says he would like to acknowledge the receipt of two letters. He says the first is concerning the historic nomination of 1425 Brownsville Road, and the second is the engineering report in regards to Iron City Brewery. He says he would like to defer these letters to discussion at the time of the agenda items. Ms. Ismail says she wants to point out that the public hearing for the Wigman House is closed. Mr. Hogan concurs.

Upcoming Demolitions: None

Other: Mr. Hogan asks if for an update on the project at 947 Western Avenue. Ms. Diehl states that the Streetface grant was approved, and the project should be underway. Mr. Hogan asks for an update on the enforcement issue at 856 N. Lincoln Avenue. Ms. Diehl states that staff is not in receipt of any correspondence from the property owner, and suggests establishing a deadline for application. The Commission asks staff to send a letter to the property owner establishing a (90) day deadline for formal application.

Adjourn: Ms. McClellan moved to adjourn, Mr. Jennings seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Iron City Brewery

OWNER: Iron City Brewery, LLC 3340 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15201	WARD: 6 th LOT & BLOCK: 26-A-300 INSPECTOR: JIM KING COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	APPLICATION RECEIVED:12/15/2010 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Iron City Brewery, LLC 3340 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15201	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Changes:

Proposed removal of stock tanks from Buildings D & E.

Discussion:

1. Tim Hickman, CEO of Iron City Brewing Company, introduces himself. Mr. Hickman says they are calling this project the tank abatement. He says they found photographs from 1951 when they installed the tanks, and they brought in an engineer who said they can get the tanks out the same way they went in. He says this would require removing portions of the façade to extract the tanks through the openings. He says they would reopen these holes as seen in the 1951 picture, then replace the walls with concrete or brick. He says everyone who has seen the buildings says nothing can be done with them until the tanks are removed so Master Planning is irrelevant until the tanks come out.
2. Mr. Hogan says the photographs are somewhat misleading because there are a lot more than the five tanks you see in the holes. He asks for clarification on how many tanks there are total. Mr. Hogan asks if the engineer who prepared the letter is here and if he can talk about the process of extraction. Mr. Hickman says the engineer who prepared the letter is on another project, but he can answer the questions. Mr. Hickman says there are 102 total tanks in the building that would be removed. He says there are 5 stories of tanks. He says the building is a hollow, and as they built an interior support structure they slid the tanks into place.
3. Mr. Hogan says something that was previously brought up for discussion was removing the roof for the process, and asks if that is still in the game plan. Mr. Hickman says that is no longer an option because it is a 2 ½' thick asbestos roof. Mr. Jennings says the roof is probably also offering support the structure.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if there has been any exploratory work done with regards to removing the plaster coating/adherence to the brick to determine what the infill was to that building. Mr. Hickman says it is cinderblock. Mr. Hogan asks if the engineer has verified if the steel lintel which was evidently installed as part of the process is still structurally sound. Mr. Hickman says yes, if the building didn't fall down in 1951 there is a high probability it won't fall down in 2011.
5. Mr. Hogan says he walked around the site three weeks ago and didn't see any security guards. He says there is a significant amount of weight being pushed against this building from the demolition of Building "F". He says there is a significant hole in the side of Building "E" and there hasn't been anything done to make sure that building is stable. He says you are proposing to further compromise this building by punching almost an entire length across three stories in the air to be able to start an extraction process which is going to be

Iron City Brewery

- challenging because they will be demolishing the structure which was put around the tanks. Mr. Hickman says that is not correct, they would be sliding the tanks out on rails. Mr. Hickman says there is no pressure from the debris that is leaning against the building, so it should not be a concern with how the tanks are removed. Mr. Jennings says the pile is acting as a retaining wall. Mr. Hogan asks how many layers deep the tanks are. Mr. Hickman says three.
6. Mr. Hogan says the tanks were probably slid in and then an entire catwalk system was installed. Mr. Hickman says that is not correct. Mr. Hickman says he thinks the Commission's concern is with the façade of the building and they will be very careful not to damage it, and if it is damaged it will be replaced. Mr. Hogan says his other concern is that he doesn't know if the roof has been leaking or that wall has had water compromising it. He says he does not know how extensive the engineer's evaluation was. Mr. Hogan says you can have an engineer assess a historic building but then as you start working you uncover many more issues that were unnoted to the eye. He says because this is part of the original assemblage of buildings, the Commission needs to take all necessary steps to ensure that as the extractions happens it is done with all efforts to ensure the building is not compromised.
 7. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Jennings if he is asking the right questions, because he is concerned. Mr. Jennings says he agrees with Mr. Hogan 100%, that we don't know what type of water damage has been done over the years. He says he also thinks the condition of the lintel needs to be evaluated, and when a hole is created in the side of the building how will the walls be supported. Mr. Jennings says he would like to see an engineer's report with a more thorough investigation explaining that the building will be able to withstand the work that's being done on it. Mr. Jennings also says that for a building permit they will require an engineer with a Pennsylvania seal. He says he is also concerned with the removal of the lower tanks, that lifting and sliding them would cause vibration to the building. Mr. Hogan asks if the is engineer is affiliated with the extraction company. Mr. Jennings says he appreciated the engineering report that was given but would like to see a report that evaluates the current condition of the structure, and if it is going to withstand this operation.
 8. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
 9. George Shelly, former Superintendent of Engineering for Pittsburgh Brewing Company, introduces himself. He says he thinks this is a bad idea. He refers to pictures of the building's existing conditions, and says the debris from the previous demolition was never removed, and a large hole which was put in the building. He says he would suggest that the owner be held to cleaning up the site and repairing the hole to its original state before any other work is approved. He says these buildings also have internal walls and he wonders where that debris is going to go.
 10. Mr. Jennings says this debris was reported as left there to fill in future repairs.
 11. Mr. Shelly says he understands there was a permit issued to demolish the Pipe Shop building, but to date nothing has been done.
 12. Mr. Hogan asks how familiar Mr. Shelly is with the interior of this building. Mr. Shelly says it has been quite some time, but he was responsible for repairing all the piping in that building. Mr. Hogan asks if the characterization that there is a tank farm in this building –independent of the structure – is correct. Mr. Shelly says yes, but there are also masonry walls which separate the tanks, but he doesn't know if they support the building.
 13. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Shelly to describe the condition of this building when he left (1998). Mr. Shelly says the building was in fair condition. He says over the years there has been significant damage done to the exterior

Iron City Brewery

- walls due to cleaning solutions, etc. and if the building is shaken the back wall is going to fall down. He says the Commission needs to tour the site and he would be happy to act as their guide.
14. Keith Cochran, of Lawrenceville Stakeholders, introduces himself. He says he is concerned with the debris and the large hole, which he believes is compromising the entire brick façade. He says they have been clear on their position on demolitions, and they were hoping the Master Plan would go through. He says based on what they have seen on the site so far, leads him to worry that work will be done in the proper way and he is concerned about the structural integrity of this building. He says he thinks the engineer's report should be focused on whether or not this tank extraction will jeopardize the structural integrity of these buildings.
 15. Anne Nelson of Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation. She says the mirror these concerns of the structural integrity of the building and how the partial demolition will impact it. She says they are concerned with any demolitions and the effect they may have on the reuse of the site. She says they also hope that if any demolitions are approved, they are contingent upon the proper removal of debris from previous demolitions, and a detailed plan for the repair of the removed masonry wall is presented.
 16. Matthew Galluzzo, Executive Director of the Lawrenceville Corporation, introduces himself. He says they are opposed to the removal of the stock tanks. He says the Brewery is an important architectural landmark for Lawrenceville and surrounding neighborhoods and they support a community backed redevelopment plan for the reuse of the site. He says it is their contention that the removal of the stock tanks from Buildings D & E by this ownership group will cause irreparable damage to the existing historic fabric and integrity of these structures and the complex as a whole. He says they cannot support any site modifications until a plan is developed and articulated. He says on numerous occasions the HRC has shared this perspective, indicating a strong interest in showing a substantial, community supported long-term plan for the redevelopment and reuse of the site prior to any application for demolition. He says the application today for demolition of buildings D & E is a clear and deliberate disregard for those stated priorities. He submits a letter from the Lawrenceville Planning Forum.
 17. Mr. Hogan says for clarification that the application today is for the removal of the tanks not the demolition of the buildings. Mr. Galluzzo says they believe those terms are synonymous.
 18. James Eash, of the Lawrenceville Corporation, introduces himself and states that he and the organization he represents are opposed to this application. He says it is their position that the Brewery site is only as valuable as the buildings on it, and that continued alterations or demolitions jeopardizes the historical and architectural integrity of the entire complex. He says in July of last year the HRC voted to deny ICB's request to demolish these buildings, until the applicant could provide a more substantial plan for the redevelopment and reuse of the site. He says their organization then became involved with ICB in working on a community supported Master Plan for the entire Brewery site, and worked on developing the project for a number of months which they believed would help guide the HRC in their decisions. He says it was then made clear to them by the ICB owners that their intent was to move forward with the demolition strategy regardless of community input or a broader reuse plan, the Corporation elected to put this project on hold. He says this site also has implications for regional transportation and development issues that stretch beyond the site. HE says the Allegheny Riverfront Vision Plan identified this corridor as a high priority target area.
 19. Patricia Gilbert, Lawrenceville resident, thanks the Commission for deny permission to demolish these buildings. She says she supports any further denials to demolish buildings, and it concerns her that the Pipe Shop demolition was approved. She says she is concerned that allowing the owner to remove anything from the building would send a message to future developers who think they can come in and remove natural

Iron City Brewery

- resources from a community. She says she doesn't want people to think this area is ripe for the picking for salvage of old buildings.
20. Mr. Cochran submits a letter on behalf of James Guidarcic, a Lawrenceville resident and historian, who is also opposed to this application.
 21. Mr. Jennings says he is not opposed to removing the tanks to make the building available for further development, but he would like to see that the work will not be done in such a way that the building will be defaced or compromised structurally. He says he would propose to continue this to a future date when a PA licensed structural engineer can review the building and come to the HRC hearing and answer the Commission's questions as to whether this building is structurally sound for this operation.
 22. Mr. Hogan says he agrees. He says he thinks there also needs to be further work done to remove some of the plaster that has been adhered to the brick walls to determine the materials that are in question, and what the real damage to the building has been, in addition to an assessment of the entire envelope of the building by an engineer, and an assessment reviewing the interior steel superstructure that supports the walls and the roof is intact and there isn't any bearing of the tank system. Mr. Jennings says also the condition of the brick itself.
 23. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a desire of the Commission for any members to be there when the engineer investigates. Mr. Jennings says after the engineer does his initial investigation he and the demolition supervisor could go to the site so the engineer could explain his findings and concerns. Mr. Jennings says he also wants to make sure that there is a plan to reconstruct the wall to at least match what was there if not to put the building back to its original configuration. Mr. Hogan says as you look at some of the photos it appears that brick was actually the initial infill. He says part of his concern is that if they move forward with the removal of the masonry can the bricks be recreated with a like material brick of that age and patina.
 24. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Hickman if they are opposed to engaging a local engineer. Mr. Hickman says no because they would have to anyway in order to obtain a permit. He says they are not demolishing the building, they have made that loud and clear. He says they will do whatever it takes to get permission to remove the tanks. He says to tell him what he needs and he will get it.
 25. Mr. Hogan lists the requirements: if there has been any water damage to roof and exterior walls, the structural condition of the masonry walls and if they are sound enough to take on the vibrations that would be created by the dismantling and removal of the tanks from the building, a detailed extraction plan that identifies how the material will be removed from the building.
 26. Mr. Hogan says it looks very clear from the photographs was actually put back in, so he is inclined to visit the site. Mr. Hickman asks if there is brick there what is the concern. Mr. Hogan says the concern is if it can be matched. Mr. Hickman asks what if it can't. Mr. Hogan says then they have more problems.
 27. Mr. Serrao says it is doable. He says Mr. Hickman could very well be right that it is concrete block, and if it is, it would be acceptable as a replacement.
 28. Mr. Jennings says if the engineer does find structural deficiencies the Commission would like to see recommendations on how those deficiencies would be reinforced or repaired prior to the work being done.
 29. Mr. Hogan says once the engineers report is prepared he would be happy to walk around the site and review it.
 30. Mr. Hogan asks Mr. Hickman if the building is now officially listed for sale. Mr. Hickman says yes.

Iron City Brewery

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Motions to table the application until the owner submits a more detailed plan and methodology to achieve the proposal.

Ms. McClellan Seconds the motion.

31. Mr. Hogan says he would like to clarify that the plan incorporates a PA registered structural engineer, a methodology for extraction and the removal of all existing demolition materials and how they will be removed or stored on site so as not to damage or impede on any of the future buildings.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

OWNER: Gregg 21 st Street, LP 825 East Pittsburgh Plaza East Pittsburgh, PA 15112	WARD: 17 th LOT & BLOCK: 3-H-99 INSPECTOR: PAT BROWN	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 3/23/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Peter Margittai Architects, LLC 2110 Sarah Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE

Proposed Changes:
Proposed building rehabilitation.

Discussion:

1. Peter Margittai, architect, introduces himself. He refers to contextual photos which show the surrounding buildings. He says they do not believe the building in question is a contributing structure to the district. He says the building will be divided into four townhomes. He refers to floor plans and explains the building’s interior.
2. He says the building was constructed in two parts, and their reason for this assumption is that half of the building’s masonry is covered in a brick-veneer. He says the face of the two brick types are quite different – he presents a photo to the Commission identifying the separation of the two masonry materials. He says almost the entire parapet which faces 15th Street will have to be removed and rebuilt because the steel lintels above the windows have become damaged over time, and the expansion of the lintel has pushed the brick outwards.
3. He says the existing sash windows are in very poor shape. He says they did get a quote for replacing the windows with a similar steel window, but they are proposing to install aluminum windows. He presents photos of similar replacement windows in other buildings.
4. He says the third floor addition will be clad in a light, reflective metal such that it doesn’t detract from the building and actually blends into the sky. He says to contrast the addition they will be painting the brick a dark, red color. He says the garage door will be a paneled design similar to the existing. He says there will be a metal security gate at the primary building entrance.
5. Mr. Hogan asks any of this has been evaluated by Building Inspection. Mr. Margattai says yes, especially because the courtyard is a curious space. He says it is an internal stair that is open – almost like a courtyard. He says Michael from BBI did advise that it may need to be covered from the elements.
6. Mr. Hogan asks if any of this building has been previously painted. Mr. Margattai says no, and they are not crazy about doing it. He says the existing brick on the corner section was built at a different time then the brick on the interior section, and it is failing. He says ideally we want to remove that brick veneer layer, and they are assuming what is behind it is in lousy shape.
7. Mr. Hogan says the guidelines state that if brick is unpainted, it is supposed to stay unpainted. Mr. Margattai says they felt that the building was non-contributing. Mr. Hogan says even non-contributing buildings need to be held to some standard, which is why he is also not crazy about the 3rd floor addition which are also not usually allowed in the District.

1500 Bingham Street

8. Mr. Margattai says he looked for other industrial type structures within the district, and there are almost none. He says the only one he could think of is the building the Pittsburgh Business Times currently occupies.
9. Mr. Hogan asks if Mr. Margattai has been to the LRC. He says yes, and they also had trouble with the brick painting but they couldn't formulate a better option.
10. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment, there is none.
11. Mr. Sheffield asks if they have looked at stucco brick. Mr. Margattai asks if that is allowed in the district. Mr. Sheffield says, possibly on a case-by-case basis when the masonry has been damaged.
12. Mr. Serrao asks what is underneath the brick veneer. Mr. Margattai says they believe its brick but they think it is in bad condition and was covered for a reason.
13. The Commission looks at close-up photographs of the building with Mr. Margattai and discuss the possible building material behind the brick veneer.
14. The Commission agrees upon approval of the 3rd floor addition, window and door replacement, and all other work items aside from the masonry painting.
15. Mr. Serrao suggests Mr. Margattai investigate the material underneath the brick veneer.
16. Mr. Margattai said part of their strategy in painting the masonry was to contrast the color with the light color of the 3rd story addition, so it blended into the sky. Mr. Hogan says he is not sure if that is true. He says if the colors matched it may actually disguise the addition more.
17. Mr. Margattai says they are happy to remove some of the veneer.
18. Mr. Hogan asks what the timeline on this project is. Mr. Margattai says the owner is not in a rush.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao..... Motions to table the application for an exploration of the existing masonry conditions.

Mr. Jennings Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

Wigman House – HRC Final Vote

WIGMAN HOUSE - HISTORIC NOMINATION STAFF REPORT

Name of Property Wigman House
Address of Property 1425 Brownsville Road
Property Owner Grace McClory
Nominated by: Carrick-Overbrook Historical Society
Date Received: 30 December 2010
Parcel No.: 60-G-168
Ward: 29th
Zoning Classification:..... R2-L
Neighborhood..... Carrick
Bldg. Inspector: Ken Seisek
Council District: 3- Kraus

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION:

1. Act on the Preliminary Determination of Eligibility for Historic Designation (2 February 2011)
2. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation (2 March 2011)
3. Review the Report prepared by staff for the property in question, and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation (6 April 2011)

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

4. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
5. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:

6. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
7. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and the City Planning Commission and take action on the Historic Designation

TIMELINE:

Nomination:	<i>Civic Arena</i>	Notes	Occurred	Must Occur Before
Nomination Submitted			30-Dec-10	
			<i>With Check</i>	
Date of Notice sent to Property Owner			3-Jan-11	<i>4-Jan-11</i>
Date of Notice Sent to each Owner of Record			N/A	<i>9-Jan-11</i>
Date of Preliminary Determination Hearing			2-Feb-11	<i>13-Feb-11</i>
Date of Public Hearing			2-Mar-11	
Date of HRC's Recommendation			6-Apr-11	
Date of PC Briefing				
Date of PC's Recommendation				
Date Recommendations sent to CC			30-May-11	<i>30-May-11</i>
Date of City Council Hearing				
Date of Adoption by City Council				<i>27-Sep-11</i>
Mayor Signs				
Effective Date				

Wigman House – HRC Final Vote

Discussion:

1. Mr. Hogan says the Commission held a public hearing on this nomination last month and they recently received a letter of correspondence which was acknowledged in the internal business at the beginning of today's meeting.
2. A member of the audience asks to address the Commission. Mr. Hogan denies this request.
3. Mr. Hogan asks for the desire of the Commission in regards to this letter, and if they wish to entertain testimony.
4. Mr. Jennings says he believes they have had enough notification with two prior meetings to make their objections noted. He says if they wanted to make a presentation it should have been done at the public meeting where members of the audience could react to their presentation.

MOTION:

Ms. McClellan Motions to enter the correspondence into the record but not acknowledge them as part of evidence in today's decision

Mr. Jennings Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

5. Mr. Hogan says he thinks the public presented an interesting case – this being one of the only houses still standing of its significance in this Carrick – and knowing that Carrick is a neighborhood of significance to the City and its growth during that time.
6. He says he would argue that the house does meet several of the criteria. Mr. Hogan says it was argued that it met criteria 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10. He says he feels that it does meet criteria 3. He says he feels criteria 7 might be a stretch. He says in terms of criteria 8, he believes it originally exemplified a pattern of neighborhood development but the context has been disrupted. He says he also believes it meets criteria 10, as it is a significant piece of the neighborhood and people identify with it.
7. Mr. Serrao says he believes it most closely meets criteria 3 and 10.
8. A member of the audience asks if the family is permitted to speak.
9. Mr. Hogan says he apologizes but the time for the family to comment would have been at the initial nomination or the public hearing. He says there was numerous correspondences sent to the property owner, and being that no members of the family presented themselves, the time of comment has passed. He says what is in front of them now is the testimony that was provided during those comment periods and that is what they have to base their decision on today. He says the Commission allowing additional testimony would be going against policy and the Commission's processes of gathering information.

Wigman House – HRC Final Vote

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao..... Motions to recommend designation of the Wigman House at 1425 Brownsville Road to City Council.

Ms. McClellan Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

..... **Motion passes.**

10. Mr. Hogan clarifies the next steps in the process. He says he understands the families' belief that the value of the property will go down, but he would argue against this. He says this property is quite significant and the Historic Preservation Code does provide for Economic Hardship cases, if the building were to be nominated.