



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 July 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>
Noor Ismail	Sarah Quinn	Avery Abrams
Ernie Hogan	Makenzie Diehl	Sergei Matveiv
Linda McClellan		Pastor Yvonne Burns
Arthur Sheffield		Evelyn Jones
		Sarah Hoover
		Tobie Nepo
		Ahmed Martine
		Ric Criscella
		Bill Hashinger
		Anne Nelson
		Russ Blauch
		Dan McSwiggen
		Stanley Lowe

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the June 2011 minutes, Ms. McClellan moved to approve. Ms. Ismail seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

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

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Upcoming Demolitions: Ms. Quinn indicated that the following addresses would be considered for demolition at the August 2011 HRC meeting:

- 1321 N. Franklin Street

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

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

OWNER: Rich Perallo 420 Fort Duquesne Boulevard Suite 625 Pittsburgh, Pa 15222	WARD: 2 nd LOT & BLOCK: 1-D-268 INSPECTOR: BOB MOLYNEAUX COUNCIL DISTRICT: 6th	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 4/18/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Sarah Hoover One Gateway Center, 17 th Floor Pittsburgh, Pa 15222	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE

Proposed Changes:

Installation of a halo illuminated “Y” logo sign on the façade of the building

Discussion:

- Ms. Quinn states that this is an extension of a project which was previously approved by the Commission. She says there is a discussion regarding the method of illumination for the sign, as it does not appear to be addressed within the guidelines.
- Sarah Hoover, of DRS Architects, introduces herself. She says the Y has been in this location for a year, and since that time they have re-branded themselves, therefore they have a new sign design. She says the entry façade is approximately 40’ wide, and the Y occupies three of the floors in this complex known as Market Square Place. She says they are proposing to install a sign on the 5th Avenue façade which includes their entry. She says the façade currently has FRP metal panels, and they are proposing to install a metal panel in the inset between the horizontal and vertical mullions. She says a painted white aluminum panel would then be attached with a halo illuminated “Y”. She says the depth of the “Y” is 5”.
- Mr. Hogan confirms that only the back of the “Y” will be illuminated, and not any other letters. Ms. Hoover says yes, and the lights will be shielded, creating a “halo” effect.
- Ms. Hoover explains the proposed replacement banners. She explains that these were previously approved and the locations will remain unchanged.
- Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.

MOTION:

Ms. McClellan Motions to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Ismail Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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

OWNER: Avery Abrams 706 Devonshire Street Pittsburgh, Pa 15213	WARD: 16TH LOT & BLOCK:12-L-9 INSPECTOR: PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... 3rd ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 6/17/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Avery Abrams 706 Devonshire Street Pittsburgh, Pa 15213		

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

Proposed Changes:
Modify storefront window and install ATM

Discussion:

1. Avery Abrams, property owner, and Sergei Matveiv introduce themselves.
2. Ms. Quinn explains that the applicant seeks approval for an ATM in the façade of the building.
3. Mr. Matveiv says what is driving the ATM location is accessibility guidelines. He says in preparing the design they tried to maintain the existing lines of the façade and take queues from the masonry molding. He says they propose to outline the ATM with a raised molding to match the wainscoting.
4. Mr. Hogan asks where the nearest ATM is to this location. Mr. Matveiv says he believes around 17th Street. Mr. Hogan asks what the business in this building is. Mr. Abrams says it is a tavern.
5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.
6. Mr. Hogan says he would like to introduce an e-mail into the record from the South Side LRC. He says they do not endorse an ATM in a non-banking institution in the district.
7. Mr. Hogan says the Commission has denied the installation of several ATMs both Downtown and East Carson Street; and because banking is not the primary business it is his position not to approve the ATM. He says he feels it deteriorates and distorts the façade of a very elegant building and does not enhance the building at all.
8. Mr. Matveiv says this is a significant building in terms of the masonry, however the lower portion of the building is not original. Mr. Hogan agrees that it is not original, but the façade is not moving to a better place, and instead will be deteriorated.
9. Mr. Hogan asks if there is a vestibule or other place in this building that the ATM can be installed. Mr. Matveiv says there is not a vestibule.
10. Mr. Abrams says this particular model ATM is the smallest possible. Mr. Abrams says there is nothing in the Zoning or Building Codes that precludes non-banking institutions from having ATMs. Mr. Hogan says there is not, but the Historic Preservation Code is specific about façade alterations.
11. Daniel McSwiggen, property owner in South Side, says his business placed an ATM inside because on cold days the machines fail.

- 12. Mr. Hogan says he is happy to table the application to allow for the applicant to meet with the LRC to come to a better solution.

MOTION:

Mr. Sheffield..... Motions to table the application for further consultation with the South Side LRC.

Ms. McClellan Seconds the motion.

- 13. Mr. Hogan asks if the option is OK with the property owners.
- 14. Mr. Abrams says he is not sure because of the LRC’s position on ATMs in non-banking institutions. Mr. Hogan says even banks need to meet the standard of the district. He says a good example is the PNC Bank ATM which was installed on the side of the building instead of interrupting the primary façade.
- 15. Mr. Abrams asks if there is an appeal process if the Commission votes to deny the application. Mr. Hogan says they could file an Application for Economic Hardship, and would have to make an argument as to why an ATM is needed on the exterior of the building.
- 16. Mr. Matveiv asks if the Commission would feel more sympathetic to a move where some of the façade was improved and restored. Mr. Hogan says by installing an ATM the window openings are altered, and the character of the building is taken away from.

All members Voted in favor

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

OWNER: Tim Husini P.O. Box 42323 Pittsburgh, Pa 15203	WARD: 17 th LOT & BLOCK: 12-K-18 INSPECTOR: PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....3rd	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 6/20/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Rick Criscella 225 Butler Street Pittsburgh, Pa 15223	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE

Proposed Changes:

Installation of rectangular windows into arched window openings, repointing and cleaning of brick

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn gives an overview of the application.
2. Rick Criscella, applicant, introduces himself. He says they are requesting to install rectangular windows and place an arched transom window above.
3. Mr. Hogan says he is having a problem with the introduction of an additional mullion.
4. Mr. Criscella says this addition does not really take away from the building. He says they will keep all the existing exterior wooden trim. He says they will clean and paint it, but it is in good condition.
5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
6. Daniel McSwiggen says he does not understand what he is proposing.
7. Mr. Hogan says the current windows have arched upper sashes and they are proposing to install a squattier double hung window with an arched glass transom above.
8. Mr. Criscella says this type of design exists on several buildings in the South Side.
9. Anne Nelson asks if the current windows are original to the building. Mr. Criscella says they are, but they are falling apart and do not meet current energy codes.
10. Mr. Hogan says the Commission received comment from the LRC pointing out that work has already begun on the building and that window sashes have already been removed. He says the LRC would request that the original sashes be maintained and new wood windows be installed as per the guidelines. They are not in support of installing rectangular window in arched openings, and if the sashes have already been discarded new wooden sashes should be fabricated to mach the originals. They do support the cleaning and repointing of the masonry if done to standards.
11. Mr. Hogan says he agrees with the LRC comments, and would entertain a motion to deny the proposed window replacement and suggest the applicant looks for a replacement more appropriate to historic standards. He says he would recommend approval of the cleaning and repointing of brick.

MOTION:

Ms. Ismail..... Motions to deny the replacement windows and approve the cleaning of the brick.

Ms. McClellan Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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

OWNER: Daniel McSwiggen 1741 Arlington Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15210	WARD: 17 th LOT & BLOCK: 12-E-304 INSPECTOR: PAT BROWN COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....3rd	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 6/22/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Daniel McSwiggen 1741 Arlington Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15210	ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE

Proposed Changes:

Façade alterations after-the-fact and additional repairs to the façade and the dormer.

Discussion:

1. Dan McSwiggen, property owner, introduces himself. Mr. Hogan asks the applicant to give an overview of the proposed work and work that has already begun.
2. Mr. McSwiggen says currently above the upper portion of the storefront is stucco. He says there was Carrera glass attached to the stucco and an aluminum sign on top of the glass; but he removed the sign and the glass started crumbling, creating a safety hazard, so they removed it as well. He says the stucco is not original; the next door building has glass on this portion of the storefront and his building probably had the same at one time.
3. He says he cleaned the second floor windows and painted the frames in the approved color scheme. He says they are currently repointing bricks on other parts of the building. He says the face of the fourth floor dormer has insulbrick which he would like to remove. He says the sides of the dormer have slate, and he would like to use composite slate to replace the insulbrick. He says they are replacing the windows on the rear addition because they are so deteriorated. He says they will be installing a new roof on the rear addition. He says he is doing in-kind repairs to the slate roof and the box gutters.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if it is Mr. McSwiggen’s intent to alter the storefront. Mr. McSwiggen says they will be mounting signage to the stucco. He says the sign is made of MDO and has cedar letters. He says they will also install gooseneck lights.
5. Mr. Hogan asks if he is familiar with the Mayor’s Streetface program. Mr. McSwiggen says he is, but they have been doing this in bits and pieces. He says it seems that there are more hoops to jump through than he is willing to go through. Mr. Hogan briefly explains how the program works.
6. Mr. Hogan reads comments from the LRC into the record. The e-mail states that they would like to see detailed drawings further explaining the owner’s intentions.
7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.
8. Mr. Hogan says he would recommend a motion to give conditional approval pending submittal of all materials and details to staff.

- 9. Ms. Ismail says she would like to reiterate the comments of the LRC, that the more information received the better. She says they would like to see an overall plan which pulls in everything together cohesively.

- 10. Mr. Hogan reiterates that they are asking for annotated drawings and scope of work.

MOTION:

Ms. McClellan Motions to approve pending the submission of further information including drawings, materials, and details.

Ms. Ismail Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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

OWNER: Park Rankin c/o University of Pittsburgh 3400 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15260	WARD:4 th LOT & BLOCK: 27-R-28 INSPECTOR: JIM KING COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... 8th ZONING CLASSIFICATION: ARCH. RATING:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 6/28/11 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Bill Hashinger 33 Terminal Way, Suite 317 Pittsburgh, Pa 15219		

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE

Proposed Changes:

Replacement of portions of slate roof with asphalt shingles and installation of several aluminum windows.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn says the applicant is proposing to remove the existing slate roof and install asphalt shingles, as well as replacement aluminum windows. She says there have been aluminum windows approved and installed throughout the building.
2. Park Rankin and Bill Hashinger introduce themselves. Mr. Hashinger says the slate on this four-story addition of the building is failing. He says the later addition has the same style roof, but the slate is in good shape. He says when one is standing at the base of the building they cannot see the roof. He says they found a nine-layer asphalt product which has the same dimensions and color as the slate.
3. Mr. Rankin says it is an unusual slate with a heavy texture and there is no real replacement.
4. Mr. Hogan confirms that they did find a product which they mixed in when doing repairs. Mr. Rankin says yes, that was a real slate.
5. Ms. McClellan says she is concerned that they would be setting a precedent for what they could do on the upper roof.
6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment. There is none.
7. Mr. Hashinger says the taller building has two openings in which the windows were not replaced. Therefore they are proposing to remove the plywood and install matching aluminum windows with spandrel glass.

MOTION:

Ms. McClellan Motions to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Ismail Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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

1. 1810 Chateau Street
2. 1451 Warner Avenue
3. 1816 Chateau Street
4. 1818 Chateau Street
5. 1820 Chateau Street
6. 1900 Chateau Street
7. 1446 Columbus Avenue

Discussion:

1. Ms. Quinn provides the Commission with GIS maps indicating the properties up for demolition review. She gives an overview of the properties' locations.
2. Russell Blaich, Senior Demolition Inspector, says the roof on 1810 Chateau Street is collapsed as indicated in a picture. He also provides Commission with pictures of the interior which is rotted.
3. He says 1451 Warner is owned by the URA who supports the demolition. He says the building has been condemned since 1978.
4. He says 1816 Chateau Street is also owned by the URA and has been condemned since 1978. Mr. Hogan asks if this entire row is abandoned. Mr. Blaich says 1814 is secure but it is not occupied. He says the woman who owns it contacted BBI and asked them to take it down as well. Mr. Blaich says 1818 is also owned by the URA, condemned since 1999. He says the back is rotted and open. He says 1820 is the end unit which is owned by the City.
5. Mr. Blaich says 1900 Chateau is a corner building which has been condemned since 2005. He says the left wall is bowed out approximately 1'. Mr. Blaich said he spoke with a neighbor who notified him that the owner of 1900 typically visits the property every 2-3 months, but he has not seen him in the last 6 months.
6. Mr. Blaich says 1446 Columbus has been condemned since 2002. Mr. Blaich says the owner is Joyce Coleman, who he has not heard from.
7. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
8. Pastor Yvonne Burns of the North Side Church of God located at 1822 Chateau Street says she supports the demolition, as the Church is interested in obtaining some of that land. She says they have noticed inappropriate activity surrounding the empty buildings, and it has become a safety and security hazard. She says they are also in need of additional church parking as all of their parking is on the street.
9. Evelyn Jones and Carol Wooley of the Manchester LRC introduce themselves. Ms. Jones says the LRC is familiar with these buildings and discussed their demolition at their last meeting She says they support the demolition of 1810 Chateau Street, and 1816-1820 Chateau Street. She says they would like 1451 Warner and 1446 Columbus to be tabled, and defers comments on 1900 Chateau Street to Ms. Wooley.

10. Ms. Wooley says the LRC has no problem considering demolition of 1451 Warner and 1900 Chateau, but wants these to be brought to them. She says the other Chateau Street properties were presented to the LRC but not these. She says they would like to see the interior of 1446 Columbus before it is demolished. Mr. Blaich says because this is not a City-owned property they are not able to allow them inside. Ms. Wooley says however possible they would still like more information and time for discussion.
11. Stanley Lowe, President of Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development and consultant to MCC, says this list was brought before the LRC. He says the list was also brought in front of PHLF, minister of local churches, and Manchester Strategic Planning Committee. He says they have gone through an extensive planning process to determine what is doable, and they are looking at restoration as well as infill new construction. He says they also met with the Casino because it is a corridor entrance along Chateau Street. He says they support the demolition of all these properties. He says they have had a year and half to look at what resources are available and they have to be extremely careful with what they save. He says the reason these building are still there is because the community has felt for a long time that the more that is torn down along Chateau Street, the more it intrudes into the neighborhood. He says it is very difficult to get insurance on homes along Chateau Street because of the highway and the HUD regulations make it very cost prohibitive. He says at a future time they would like to come in front of the Commission with the Land Management Strategy they are putting in place.
12. Anne Nelson of PHLF says they have been working with Mr. Lowe and MCC and they only differ in opinion on 1446 Columbus. She says their recommendation is it should be kept but it is not a priority. She provides the Commission with a list of the properties which Mr. Lowe showed PHLF. Mr. Hogan asks if it is fair to say this list of properties is one MCC is putting forward and not Mr. Lowe personally.
13. Mr. Lowe says they will be returning with a Land Management Strategy which incorporates these buildings. Ms. Nelson says these are properties PHLF toured with Mr. Lowe and they have the Manchester Neighborhood Transformation Initiative recommendation from 2005. She says PHLF and MCC did another survey in 2009, and some of these properties were included, and the final recommendations were produced after the June 2011 tour.
14. She says they have greater concerns that all these demolitions in the historic district are going to have a cumulative adverse impact on both the City District and National Register District. She says while these buildings are in bad condition they still count towards the fabric, and the fabric is what can be used to revitalize the district. She says if the National Register status is lost the 20% tax credit is as well. She also says if CDBG monies are being used Section 106 will need to be complied with.
15. Ahmed Martin, Executive Director of the Manchester Citizens Corporation and member of the LRC, introduces himself. He says MCC is also focused on the larger picture and a comprehensive neighborhood strategy and they have to take into account what is happening with the derelict buildings and how to repurpose the vacant lots for short and long term periods. He says they support these demolitions because it is a part of their proposed Elm Street District which includes the Chateau Street corridor. He says in terms of perception, this area contributes negatively to the image of Manchester. He says he thinks there is an opportunity to create a new face of Manchester with a green buffer zone to encourage community engagement, etc. He says he would like to seek guidance from the Committee in regards to federal designation and the quantitative analysis that comes into play in negatively contributing to the integrity of the district.
16. Mr. Hogan says the properties under review are not in the National Register District so he does not believe Section 106 would even apply. Ms. Quinn says if there is money involved from federal funds it would require Section 106 to be completed, which she has initiated.

17. Mr. Martin asks what are some of the components involved in that assessment? Ms. Quinn says the building's integrity is examined which includes a number of components such as architectural integrity, building association, etc. She
18. Ms. Wooley says on May 28th the Chateau Street properties and 1446 Columbus, as Mr. Lowe stated, were brought to the LRC, but they did not have a chance to discuss them as a committee on that date or make a recommendation.
19. Mr. Hogan confirms that the LRC is asking for more time on 1451 Warner, 1900 Chateau, and 1446 Columbus. Ms. Wooley says yes and that there was no one from MCC at their June 28th meeting, so that is how they came to this conclusion.0
20. Mr. Lowe says there have been three meetings as he mentioned. He says they have been in front of the LRC twice regarding the Manchester Strategic Plan. He says their last meeting was held on June 1st, and it was a community meeting at the request of the LRC. He says they will be coming back with a strategic initiative which says they cannot wait for all these buildings. He says it was the Commission who asked them to get a comprehensive plan in place. He says also very soon all of the City will be fighting for very scarce resources.
21. Mr. Hogan asks what the timetable is for demolition. Mr. Blaich says they will be doing asbestos abatement as soon as possible, and demolition immediately (approximately 2 months).
22. Mr. Hogan asks if it is still the desire of the LRC to have more time to review these properties. They answer yes. Mr. Hogan says he would like to commend Manchester and all of the parties working together to get to a much better place than they were at last year.
23. Mr. Hogan asks for a motion from the Commission approving demolition of 1810 Chateau Street, 1816 Chateau Street, 1818 Chateau Street, 1820 Chateau Street and tabling 1451 Warner Avenue, 1900 Chateau Street, and 1446 Chateau Street.

MOTION #1:

Ms. McClellan Motions to approve the demolition of 1810 Chateau Street, 1816 Chateau Street, 1818 Chateau Street, 1820 Chateau Street.

Ms. Ismail Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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

MOTION #2:

Ms. Ismail Motions to table 1451 Warner Avenue, 1900 Chateau Street, and 1446 Chateau Street.

Ms. McClellan Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor

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