



---

**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 June 1, 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>
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	David Marconi
Ernie Hogan	Makenzie Diehl	Andrew Bavas
Linda McClellan		Evelyn Jones
Arthur Sheffield		Peter Margattai
John Jennings		Geof Comings
		Adam DeSimone

**New Business**

**Approval of Minutes:** In regards to the May 2011 minutes, Ms. Ismail moved to approve. Mr. Jennings seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

**Certificates of Appropriateness:** In regards to the May 2011 Certificates of Appropriateness, Ms. Ismail moved to approve, Mr. Jennings seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

**Applications for Economic Hardship:** None

**Upcoming Demolitions:** None

**Other:** Ms. Diehl indicated that the following addresses would be considered for demolition at the July 2011 HRC meeting:

- 1446 Columbus Avenue
- 1451 Warner Street
- 1810 Chateau Street
- 1816 Chateau Street
- 1818 Chateau Street
- 1820 Chateau Street
- 1900 Chateau Street

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

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.



**1005-1007 Allegheny Avenue**

---

8. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification that the middle property (1005) is painted. Mr. Margittai says yes, so they are proposing to spruce up that paint but not do anything to the brick at either abutting properties. Mr. Hogan asks if there is still intent to mimic the work that was done nearby.
9. Mr. Margittai says this is the quality of work that the owners are aspiring to, with a few exceptions. He says the nearby porches have brick piers, while the properties in questions do not have any masonry at the base. He says the second exception is the replacement concrete slab porch at 1005, which will be left as is, aside from paint application.
10. Mr. Hogan says the precedent was set nearby with the standing seam roof, and this project will set the standard for the other homes in this row. He says he is concerned with the long-term connectivity of the project.
11. Ms. McClellan asks for clarification that two of these five buildings have painted facades. Mr. Bavas says yes, 1005 and 1009. Mr. Hogan says the Commission is only considering these two addresses (1005 and 1007) today. Mr. Bavas says yes, but they have e-mail consent from the owner at 1003, in hopes that all three addresses could be approved at the same time.
12. Mr. Hogan says the e-mail consent from Andy Martin, owner of 1003, is stating that Mr. Margittai and Mr. Bavas can represent him at the meeting, but the current application in front of the Commission is only for 1005 and 1007. Mr. Margittai says Mr. Martin has not yet applied for review. Mr. Hogan says they cannot take action on any proposal for this property.
13. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. Evelyn Jones of the Manchester LRC says they were hoping they would come back to their recent meeting but they did not. She says they still have a lot of questions.
14. Mr. Hogan asks if there was reason they did not return to the LRC. Mr. Bavas says they apologize, but since the last meeting they have been working with Mr. Margittai to prepare for today's meeting.
15. Mr. Hogan says he believes the applicants are responding well to comments and direction, but he does want them to circle back to the LRC a second time. He says in order to keep this moving he would like to make a recommendation today. He again states his request to see a continuity of the band board and sensitivity to the transition between the concrete and wood porches. He says his other concern would be the roofing material.
16. Mr. Bavas says if it suits the Commission he thinks they can compromise and use the standing seam roof.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Ismail..... Motions to approve the application, with work to include: replication of the original porch system (standing seam metal roof, 6" columns balustrade); re-painting of only previously painted masonry; relocation of electrical meters to basement; painting of windows, etc. Finals plans shall be submitted to LRC and staff.

Mr. Jennings ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted in favor

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

**20 Market Square – Original Oyster House**

---

OWNER: Jocar Inc. 20 Market Square Pittsburgh, PA 15222	WARD: ..... 2 <sup>nd</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 1-D-162 INSPECTOR: ..... BOB MOLYNEAUX COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 5/2/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Peter Margittai 2110 Sarah Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203		
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>

---

**Proposed Changes:**  
Proposed storefront rehabilitation.

---

**Discussion:**

1. Mr. Margittai, architect, introduces himself. Mr. Margittai explains the building’s two-part structure. He explains that they intend to visually tie the two building facades together. He says they will add awnings to the various windows to give the building depth. He says they intend to repair and extend the cornice and signboard across the buildings. He says the existing neon sign will remain, and another will be added on the other side. In addition, a projecting sign with neon lettering will be added to the center of the buildings. He says the upper two floors on the side façade are stucco, and the lower floor is brick and they will clean and repair both elements.
2. He says the center pier will be maintained but the storefront and bulkhead will be replaced. He says the storefront to the left of the pier will have an operable window and built-in counter. The awnings for the ground floor will be canvas and retractable and will extend approximately 10’.
3. Mr. Hogan asks what the material for the storefront will be. Mr. Margittai says it will be a bronze colored aluminum, the bulkhead pre-cast concrete, and the height of the bulkhead will match that of the original corner structure.
4. The Commissioners discuss the proposed use of neon for the sign lettering. Mr. Hogan points out that the neon sign at the Oyster House has been an institution for quite some time.
5. Mr. Hogan says he is concerned with the addition of the service window. Mr. Jennings says the service window is existing.
6. Mr. Margittai says there is currently an ATM next to the service window. He says they are proposing to re-install the ATM in a recessed vestibule, and it will face the neighboring property.
7. Geof Comings, of Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership says Paris to Pittsburgh has approved a grant for this project. He says they believe this project will open the business up to the Square with the addition of the larger, operable storefront windows.

***20 Market Square – Original Oyster House***

---

**MOTION:**

Mr. Jennings ..... Motions to approve the application as submitted, with all details and materials to be submitted to staff.

Ms. McClellan ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted in favor

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

**512 Avery Street**

OWNER:  
David J. Marconi  
512 Avery Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

WARD: ..... 23<sup>rd</sup>

APPLICATION RECEIVED: 4/18/11

LOT & BLOCK: ..... 23-S-90

SITE VISITS:

INSPECTOR: ..... MARK SANDERS

CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000

APPLICANT:  
David J. Marconi  
512 Avery Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: .....

ARCH. RATING: .....

NATIONAL REGISTER:

LISTED.....

ELIGIBLE .....

**Proposed Changes:**

Proposed modification to existing roofline and box gutter.

**Discussion:**

1. David Marconi, property owner, introduces himself. He says since 1995 the box gutter has caused over \$7,000 worth of damage to his home. He says he has made various repairs to the roof, but it is not functioning properly. He says he would like to extend the roofline and install an aluminum gutter.
2. Mr. Hogan asks if he has tried using heat tape. Mr. Marconi says he has. He says their box gutter is approximately 3-4” wide and as soon as it fills up and freezes. Mr. Hogan says the box gutter does seem smaller than normal.
3. Mr. Hogan says installing an aluminum gutter would not fix the freezing problem. Mr. Hogan asks if Mr. Marconi also put the heat tape in the downspout. He says, yes, last winter he lined the entire system with heat tape and has not had a problem so far, but his electric bill has gone up and he worries about a fire. He says he got a loan to put a new roof on but wanted to make sure this problem was fixed first.
4. Mr. Hogan says this is a very plain box gutter and extending it would be a significant visual change.
5. Mr. Jennings asks if the box gutter is in good enough condition that it could withstand the addition. Mr. Hogan says his fear is that it would pull off.
6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment, there is none.
7. Mr. Hogan says the problem is ice damming which is exaggerated by heat loss from the roof. Mr. Marconi says he recently installed insulation. Mr. Hogan says that will probably help a lot.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Jennings ..... Motions to approve the modification of the roofline and installation of aluminum gutter on box gutter face.

Ms. McClellan ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted against.

..... **Motion defeated.**

**Phipps Conservatory**

---

OWNER: Phipps Conservatory 1 Schenley Drive Pittsburgh, PA 15217	WARD: ..... 14 <sup>th</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 27-S-150 INSPECTOR: ..... PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 5/18/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: The Design Alliance Architects 535 Smithfield Street Pittsburgh, PA 15222	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .....	

---

NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE ..... <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	---	---

---

**Proposed Changes:**

Proposed installation of accessory structures on building site.

---

**Discussion:**

1. Chris Minnerly, architect, and Richard Piacentini, Executive Director of Phipps Conservatory, introduce themselves.
2. Mr. Minnerly says they are requesting to make changes to a project which was previously approved by the HRC. Mr. Minnerly shows photos and gives an overview of the site, context, and previously approved plans.
3. Mr. Minnerly says they are proposing to add accessory structures including a photovoltaic array to be mounted on the ground and roof, and a vertical axis wind turbine. He explains that they will propose two locations for the wind turbine, one of which would require a variance and they have scheduled a ZBA hearing. He says the third accessory will be a series of solar distillery dishes.
4. Mr. Minnerly says the building is meeting the Living Building Challenge which stipulates that they are a “net-zero” building (as much energy is produced as is used in a year). He says the water purification dishes allow them to purify sanitary water on the site, also a requirement of the challenge.
5. He says one series of arrays will be placed on the roof of the Special Events Hall, and another will be mounted on the ground at the rear of the property. He shows images displaying the visual impact these structures will have on the surrounding views. He says the arrays will not be visible from the front of the main historic building but displays viewpoints where they may be seen.
6. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a reason these arrays are not being mounted on the roof of the new administrative building. Mr. Minnerly says that roof is a green roof, which they encourage visitors to walk on and enjoy the view.
7. Mr. Minnerly shows image of the proposed wind turbine. He shows a site plan and points out the proposed location at the SW corner of the production greenhouses. He says this site was chosen after analysis which identified this area as the best location to gather wind.
8. Mr. Hogan asks if you can see the Special Events Hall as you come off the Panther Hollow Bridge. Mr. Minnerly says he believes it is blocked by Botany Hall.
9. Mr. Minnerly shows a cross-section of the buildings and their heights in relation to the proposed turbine. He shows images of the visual impact of the turbine, and says they have determined it is not visible from the main historic entrance on Schenley Drive.

***Phipps Conservatory***

---

10. He says in the event that the ZBA does not grant a variance, they would like to present an alternate location., which is next to the ground-mounted photovoltaic array. He further explains this location, showing images and plans.
11. He says the last piece is the solar water purification system. He explains that the discs collect sunlight and heat oil which runs through the system to power a machine which distills the water. He says these will be located on the Headhouse, and there will be 15 total (8' in diameter).
12. He says there is essentially only one location where this would be visible from a public right-of-way which is from Schenley Drive. He says the location one may be able to see these discs is from the sidewalk which enters into the outdoor garden on the west.
13. He says Phipps is a leader in demonstrating everything that is out there in terms of energy, stormwater, and sanitary management; and they think as a display it is not wrong to display these and they will be on the newer buildings as opposed to the original historic structures.
14. Mr. Hogan asks if it is safe to say from their studies they have gathered that there is very minimal site impact, other than Panther Hollow with the solar arrays. Mr. Minnerly says yes he feels comfortable with that statement.
15. Mr. Jennings says he does not see any impact on the site plans, but if they move any of these to other areas it may impact the drives behind the maintenacne building which were approved by another board for Fire Department access. Mr. Minnerly says they have shown the Fire Department the site plans and they are ok with it.
16. Mr. Hogan verifies that there are no other changes to pathways or structures. Mr. Minnerly says that is correct.
17. Mr. Hogan says he thinks this is an exciting project and he commends Phipps for their leadership in Pittsburgh in regards to the preservation of this site, as well as the innovation to take it to the next level.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Jennings ..... Motions to approve the application as submitted, along with the proposed alternate location for the vertical axis wind turbine.

Ms. Ismail ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted in favor

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

OWNER: William Petrucci 4739 Bayard Street Pittsburgh, PA 15213	WARD: ..... 17 <sup>th</sup> LOT & BLOCK: ..... 12-E-318-0001 INSPECTOR: ..... PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 5/18/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Adam DeSimone 1737 E. Carson Street Pittsburgh, PA 15203	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ..... ARCH. RATING: .....	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED.....  ELIGIBLE .....

**Proposed Changes:**  
Proposed installation of NANA wall system.

**Discussion:**

1. Adam DeSimone, property manager, introduces himself. He says they are opening a new coffee shop in the South Side. He says their proposal is to replace the single pane window, with an operable window system which will extend to the curb. He says the NANA windows will be 8’ in height, with a transom window above.
2. Mr. Hogan asks for clarification that the proposal is to remove the window and knee wall and replace it with a NANA wall. Mr. DeSimone says that is correct. Mr. Hogan asks what the material of the NANA wall would be. Mr. DeSimone says it would be aluminum.
3. Mr. Hogan says this is a significant piece of architecture on the South Side. Mr. DeSimone says he was told this was not an original storefront.
4. Ms. Diehl says their records indicate that this façade was re-done, but it was prior to the establishment of the local district.
5. Mr. Hogan says he is having an issue with the transoms, and asks if 8’ is the limit on the NANA wall. Mr. DeSimone says from his past experience ordering these windows, 8’ was the limit, but if he can go higher he will.
6. Mr. Hogan asks if the purpose of this is just for street connectivity. Mr. DeSimone says yes this is a very narrow storefront and it has housed 3 different businesses in the last 5 years, making it a tough space without the openness to the street. He says they got the NANA walls approved at their restaurant at 16<sup>th</sup> and Carson and it makes a world of difference in terms of business. Mr. Hogan says the building up the street is a much different type of architecture.
7. Mr. Hogan asks what the material of the knee wall is. Mr. DeSimone says it is wood.
8. Mr. Hogan says in most cases the NANA wall is a reasonable substitution, but this is a significant departure from the intended architecture of the building. He says if the existing glass was shattered you may never be able to get a piece of glass that big again. He says it is a very ornate building with perfect proportions and the interruption of that with this wall system would raise a question. He says he may not have such an issue with it if the separations weren’t there. He says even if they went to 9’ doors, the window would be cut into three.
9. Mr. Sheffield asks if he has met with the Local Review Committee. Mr. DeSimone says he has not, but he has consulted with Jerry Morosco but he can’t afford him for this project.

- 10. Mr. Hogan asks if staff has heard from the LRC. Ms. Diehl says they have not received a formal recommendation but they are generally not in support.
- 11. Mr. Hogan asks where they are proposing signage. Mr. DeSimone says they will propose wooden letters on the signboard and a blade sign.
- 12. Ms. Ismail says the proposal will look alien to the ornate exterior of the façade. Ms. Ismail asks how wide the sidewalk is here. Mr. DeSimone says this is a wider sidewalk, but their intention was not to have outdoor seating. He says the current zoning codes state that a seat cant be within 5’ of a door opening so they wouldn’t have room.
- 13. Mr. Hogan says he will also run into issues with the Health Department. He says he wonders if they just replace the window and not remove the knee wall. Mr. DeSimone says he would be okay with that, he just needs something to help the space breathe.
- 14. Mr. Hogan says he believes if they create the right environment they will be succesful. He says he is not feeling comfortable with this proposal, especially for this building.
- 15. Mr. DeSimone says what if they did a double sash window that opened up inside. Mr. Hogan says the problem is they are inserting a mullion where there is currently clear glass, and anything they do will disturb the architecture.
- 16. Mr. Hogan says without the LRC reviewing this, he does not believe this is the right move for this building.
- 17. Mr. DeSimone says he understands the Commission’s viewpoints, and probably will not pursue any changes.

**MOTION #1:**

Mr. Jennings ..... Motions to approve the window replacement.

Ms. McClellan ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted against.

..... **Motion defeated.**

**MOTION #2:**

Mr. Jennings ..... Motions to decline the previous motion, and table the application.

Ms. McClellan ..... Seconds the motion.

All members ..... Voted in favor.

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