

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting of June 14, 2011
Beginning at 2:20 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Chairwoman Wrenna Watson,
Rabner, Reidbord, Thomas, Myers,
Valentine, Costello

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Ismail, Tymoczko, Layman, Hanna, Rakus

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

<i>Item</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
1. ELD, Inc. Subdivision Plan #2 (North Euclid between Hays Street and Livery Way), 11 th Ward	2
2. Fingal Street Plan of Lots (Fingal Street south of Greenleaf Street), 19 th Ward	2
3. Lincoln Subdivision Plan of Lots (North of Grace Street), 19 th Ward	3
4. Cleancare Lot Consolidation (51 st Street and AVRR), 9 th Ward	3
5. ZCP #753, File CC-747, Map Pittsburgh, Marshall-Shadeland	4
6. Project Development Plan #11-24, 3454 Forbes Avenue, Hilton Garden	6
7. Project Development Plan #11-25, 34 Boulevard of the Allies, Post Gazette High Wall Sign	8
8. Final Land Development Plan, Oakhill Housing Plan	9

Ms. Watson chaired today’s meeting and called the meeting to order.

A. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

Minutes not available.

B. CORRESPONDENCE (See Attachment A)

Ms. Watson stated that the Commission was in receipt of correspondence from: Kevin McKeegan representing Giant Eagle requesting that Zone Change Petition Action on ZCP #750, 3150 E. Carson Street be delayed until June 28, 2011.

C. PLAN OF LOTS (See Attachment B.)

1. ELD, Inc. Subdivision Plan #2 (North Euclid Avenue between Hays Street and Livery Way), 11th Ward

Ms. Tymoczko made a presentation in accord with the attached staff report. Director Ismail stated that the subdivision committee had met and recommends approval of the plan. The subdivision will provide a greater setback. The Chairwoman called for a motion.

MOTION: That the ELD, Inc. Subdivision Plan #2, 11th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, prepared for East Liberty Development, Inc. by KAG Engineering, Inc., dated April 26, 2011 and received by the Planning Commission June 14, 2011 be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY Mr. Thomas; SECONDED BY Mr. Valentine

IN FAVOR: Watson, Reidbord, Rabner, Thomas, Czuczman, Valentine, Costello

RECUSED: Myers

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

2. Fingal Street Plan of Lots (Fingal Street south of Greeleaf Street), 19th Ward

Ms. Tymoczko made a presentation in accord with the attached staff report. Director Ismail stated that the subdivision committee had met and recommends approval of the plan. This is converting three lots with two dwellings into two lots, one property for all of the lots. The Chairwoman called for a motion.

MOTION: That the Fingal Street Plan of Lots, 19th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, prepared for Chester Kownacki & Sandra by Converse Surveying, dated April 19, 2011 and received by the Planning Commission June 14, 2011 be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY Mr. Valentine; SECONDED BY Mr. Rabner.

IN FAVOR: Watson, Reidbord, Rabner, Thomas, Myers, Valentine, Costello

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

D. DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS (See **Attachment C** for staff reports.)

Public Hearing and Action: ZCP No. 753, File #C-747, Map Pittsburgh, Marshall Shadeland

This is a request by City of Pittsburgh, Planning Department staff to rezone portions of the Marshall-Shadeland area under Map Pittsburgh, Zoning for your neighborhood. Mr. Dash presented the proposed changes.

Mr. Dash said this process started in November of 2010 and we met with the community group on three different occasions. We had a community meeting just before the briefing on May 24 with roughly 25 people in attendance. To date we have received 28 response forms: 16 in favor, 8 opposed, 4 no opinion. Out of the 8 opposed there were no reasons given other than being opposed to some of the down zoning. Mr. Dash said one of the changes was the introduction of hillside zoning.

Mr. Valentine asked if the community group was ok with it and Mr. Dash said they met with them three separate times and feel that we came to an agreement.

The Chairwoman called for comments from the Public.

Ed Brandt, volunteer Brightwood Civic Group, 3127 Brighton Road, Ed Lewis is also present. We did have the community meetings; the changes reflect the actual current zoning use. The one question that they have is the area zoned industrial along Woods Run Avenue, that is zoned UI and there is a GI area. There is a third zone called NDI and he wondered if the area along Woods Run and McClure shouldn't be called that instead. We have a couple of concerns and one is the possibility of a strip club in the industrial area. Mr. Dash assured us with the dimensions required it wouldn't be permitted but Council does have some changes proposed. We thought the NDI may be a better use to give us additional protections. The UI at its widest point is 350 feet wide, and with the spacing requirements, it is surrounded by residential areas and there are residential units along that street also, so the 350 spacing will prevent that use being permitted.

Mr. Brandt asked about Councilwoman Smith's legislation but staff has not seen the proposal as yet.

There being no more comments from the Public, the Chairwoman called for questions and comments from the Commission members.

Ms. Watson asked if the area Mr. Brandt was asking about is where the Young Brothers bar is located and Mr. Brandt said yes. Mr. Reidbord asked Mr. Dash to respond to Mr. Brandt's questions.

Mr. Dash said this was discussed at one of the meetings with the civic group and I did some research. There are a number of properties currently along that area that would not be compatible with the NDI zoning. In addition, the neighborhood plan for Brightwood talks about doing flex spaces along that corridor.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Commission, Ms. Watson called for a motion.

MOTION: That staff be directed to prepare an ordinance for submission to City Council with the City Planning Commission approval, changing various zoning line boundaries and zoning district designations in the Marshall-Shadeland neighborhood, according to the attached map as part of MAP PITTSBURGH: Zoning for your neighborhood.

MOVED BY Mr. Valentine;

SECONDED BY Mr. Thomas.

IN FAVOR: Watson, Reidbord, Rabner, Thomas, Myers, Valentine, Costello

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

7. For Hearing and Action: Project Development Plan #11-24, 3454 Forbes Avenue, Hilton Gardens Hotel, RLJ Development, OPR-C

Mr. Layman made a presentation in accord with the attached staff report. Mr. Layman said this is an existing hotel with exterior renovations consistent with a brand change. The project was reviewed by Design Review. Mr. Layman turned the presentation over to the application.

Rolf Biggers presented a Power Point presentation on the project. Mr. Biggers detailed the changes that they would like to make to the entrance, windows, and base area. Mr. Biggers said during the review process there were questions concerning the size of the louvers and they have some options that they would like to present to the Commission. Mr. Biggers said they are comfortable with any range of louver size and will defer to the desires of the Commission.

Mr. Layman recommended approval of the proposal.

The Chairwoman called for comments from the Public, there being none, the Chairwoman called for questions or comments from the Commission.

Mr. Thomas asked what the staff recommendation was regarding the projection of the louver section. Ms. Rakus said they looked at all three but doesn't remember a strong reaction to any in particular. Ms. Rakus said they would defer to the Commission.

Ms. Watson said she was noticed in this presentation there is a lower cornice and it would match the one on top, Mr. Biggers said it would probably be smaller because of portions by distance. Ms. Watson said she likes the larger size one.

Mr. Costello said the sign isn't part of the application being reviewed and Mr. Bigger said that is correct but he wanted to show it to provide the Commission with as much information as possible. Mr. Costello asked how it would be lighted and Mr. Bigger said he believes it will be internally illuminated but he isn't certain what the final decisions on those will be.

Mr. Thomas asked if the louver sections are illuminated and Mr. Bigger said that right not the outside of the building is illuminated but we are not intending to light up the louvers themselves.

Mr. Thomas said he would make a motion to approval and Mr. Reidbord seconded and Mr. Thomas stated that with the condition that the louvers stay in the 45 to 63 range. Ms. Watson said that would be the medium to the large sizes, giving the applicant the option. Mr. Layman said that we could amend that to say including final plans and elevations including the largest of louver options. Changed to maximum.

8. Hearing & Action: Project Development Plan #11-25, 34 Boulevard of the Allies, Block Communications, GT-D

Mr. Layman made a presentation in accord with the attached staff report. Mr. Layman said the project has been thru the Design Review Process. This is a proposed replacement of the existing high wall sign that is on the mechanical penthouse on top of the building. The proposal is to replace a painted externally illuminated sign with an internally illuminated LED sign with slightly smaller dimensions. The project went before the Zoning Board of Adjustment on May 12th for approval of a sign above the roof parapet and it was approved. The project also went before Design Review and they felt that it was better on that facade. Mr. Layman turned the presentation over to Mr. Kolano and Mr. Sittig to make a presentation.

Mr. Sittig presented representing the Post Gazette. Mr. Sittig said the green background isn't changing but the lettering will be reduced to 341 square feet of signage.

Mr. Kolano presented a Power Point presentation showing the proposed signage and the area the signage will be visible from and an explanation of how the letters become more visible with added spacing.

Mr. Layman recommended approval of the proposal.

The Chairwoman called for comments from the Public, there being none, the Chairwoman called for questions or comments from the Commission members.

Mr. Costello asked if it would be only on one face and Mr. Kolano said yes. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be a brighter green and Mr. Kolano said it would be the same green.

There being no more questions or comments from the Commission, the Chairwoman called for the motion.

MOTION: That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves Project Development Plan No. 11-25, for approval of the erection of one new high wall building identification sign on the west facade of the existing office building located at 34 Boulevard of the Allies, and based on the application and drawings filed by Kolano Design, Inc. on behalf of Block Communications, Inc., property owner.

MOVED BY Mr. Reidbord;

SECONDED BY Mr. Rabner

IN FAVOR: Watson, Reidbord, Rabner, Thomas, Myers, Valentine, Costello

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

9. Hearing & Action: Revised Preliminary Development Plan and Final Land Development Plan #11-16 (Oak Hill Commons Sub-Phase)

Mr. Layman made a presentation in accord with the attached staff report. Mr. Layman said this is a portion of Oak Hill Phase II and it is also re-subdivision of Phase 2. The Phase 2 portion of the Oak Hill proposal is for 450 dwelling units. This sub-phase is 2 structures, community retail, and office space. There will be 77 on site parking stalls and two loading spaces. Future sub-phases will come back to the Planning Commission. The project was reviewed by Design Review and they did respond to concerns. Mr. Layman turned the presentation over to Miles Byrnes.

Miles Byrnes, we are currently completing one phase of the development on July 28th, there will be 725 units at that time. Mr. Byrnes showed a Power Point presentation of the completed project and the proposed project. The commercial space will be leased by the University of Pittsburgh for twenty years. Mr. Byrnes said they are working toward having a grocer in area. Mr. Byrnes introduced Mark Major.

Mark Major, VMY Architects, provided more information on the proposed development. Mr. Major said there are two floors of office use and there will be a convenience store/grocer, and twelve units of residential housing. There will be four two bedroom and eight three bedroom units. The exterior will match buildings currently on the site.

Mr. Byrnes said Oak Hill is 50% owners and resident council and three members of the council are present today and have been involved in every step of the process.

The Chairwoman called for comments from the Public.

Elijah Hughes, 5621 Forbes Avenue. Mr. Hughes asked what provisions are being made for the hearing and visually impaired for the complex.

Ms. Watson said she would ask the developer to respond.

Mr. Major said the office portion and the retail portion are completely in compliance with all ADA regulations. Of the residential units, the first floor will be designed as ADA units; there is not an elevator in the residential portion. Just the first floor will be all accessible units.

James Williams, Director of Intergovernmental Relations with the University of Pittsburgh, excited about the completion of this phase of the project and we are in full support.

There being no comments from the Public, the Chairwoman called for questions or comments from the Commission members.

Ms. Watson asked about the retail area, will that be operated by the tenant council. Mr. Brynes said they have an arrangement that the council will be able

to reap the proceeds from the rent. They will not be operating. They are currently meeting with IGA. Ms. Watson said so this would be a larger store. Mr. Brynes said IGA is thinking of using this as a satellite store. None of the plans have been signed or confirmed.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve and Ms. Myers seconded the motion. Mr. Layman read the recommended motion by staff and the condition.

Mr. Costello asked if there is any consideration for flashing doorbells for anyone with sensory problems. Mr. Major said that all door bells will ring and light. Mr. Costello said that none of the units have garages or parking, Mr. Major said it is all general parking. Mr. Costello questioned the number of parking spaces and Mr. Layman advised that it meets any requirements. Discussion with Mr. Costello and some of the residents concerning the accessibility of units. Mr. Costello asked if everyone will be able to make changes to their unit if required and Mr. Major said that no one has ever been denied.

Ms. Watson asked if HUD money will be used and Mr. Major said no. Ms. Watson said the tenant council will receive the rental money from the store has any consideration been given to having them run the store. Mr. Bryne said that the resident partners are very involved. Ms. Watson asked if they had ever considered a resident partnership where some of the residents learn how to learn how to be owner/operators of convenience stores. Mr. Bryne said they have discussed that and the resident council has taken the lead on the store and they want a professional grocer that knows how to service people. Ms. Watson said she appreciates the opportunities that are being provided.

There being no more questions or comments from the Commission, the Chairwoman called for the vote on the motion.

MOTION: That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves the following for RP District No. 96:

- (1) The Allequippa Terrace – Oakhill Phase II – Oak Hill Commons Sub-Phase Subdivision Plan, 5th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, prepared for the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh by Liadis Engineering & Surveying, Inc. dated January 1, 2011 and received by the Planning Commission on June 14, 2011 with the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission to be affixed thereto; and
- (2) The Revised Preliminary Land Development Plan for RP District No. 96 and the Final Land Development Plan for the construction of the Oak Hill Commons Sub-Phase with a total of 12 dwelling units within 2 and 3 story mixed use structure with 77 parking stalls; based on the application and drawings filed by BCJ Partners II LLC, dated March 25, 2011, subject to the following condition:

Final construction plans be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuance of a building permit.

