



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Historic Review Commission

Meeting Minutes of September 3, 2025

In Attendance

Chair Lucia M Aguirre
Commissioner Karen Loysen

Commissioner Katie Reed
Commissioner Richard Snipe

Not Present

Commissioner Dave Green

Commissioner Matthew Falcone
Commissioner James Hill

City Staff Present

Spooner
Kunak
Quinn

Historic Review Commission

A. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 1:08 p.m. by Chair Aguirre

B. Approval of Commission Minutes

Date: August, 2025

Commissioners Questions: None

Motion: Approval as submitted

Moved by: Commissioner Loysen

Seconded by: Commissioner Snipe

In favor: Commissioner Reed, Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen, Commissioner Aguirre

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

Approval of Certificate of Appropriateness Report

Date: August, 2025

Commissioners Questions: None

Motion: Approval

Moved by: Commissioner Snipe

Seconded by: Commissioner Loysen

In favor: Commissioner Reed, Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen, Commissioner Aguirre

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

C. Correspondence

BDA-2024 06 27623 - Oakland Square

- None

DCP-CDR-2025002741250 - Liverpool Street – this item was removed from the agenda and will be held until it comes back for a hearing

- Ms Julie Cakeler
- Ms Melissa McSwigan

BDA-2025-06698 - 3438 Parkview Street

- Letter from the OPDC

DCP-HN 202400130 - Westinghouse Park, nomination

- None

Historic District Guidelines Adoption

- None

National Register Nominations

- None

D. Hearing & Action Certificates of Appropriateness

1. BDA-2024-06276 - 23 Oakland Square, Oakland Square Historic District, Central Oakland Neighborhood - Building renovations including window replacement

Staff: Ms Spooner staff report, recommended motion: that the HRC approves the application for building renovations, including window replacement in accordance with section D.3 of the guidelines with the following conditions: A. Approval of in-kind work on the front facade, including window replacement and repairs to dormers, gutter, trim, and porch. B. that the work on the east elevation is not visible from the public right-of-way and does not require further review. And C. that any additional information required, including specifications, cut sheets, and measurements, should be submitted to staff for final approval.

Applicant: Eugene Yu – presentation (10:02)

Public Comment: Mr Jeff Maurin, resident – comments that this is very visible from a public right-of-way from the Anderson Bridge and across at Anderson Playground. You can very clearly see the side of 23 Oakland Square. But that it doesn't look like so many of the other patchwork that has gone on in the district. Also, in-kind is a hard thing for the inspector to know what was really approved. There is a discrepancy from what was presented about the windows. Issues with the type of mortar and strength of the brick. (8:18) Ms Mary Shea, resident – comments to reemphasize Mr Maurin's comments, from the edge of the square, you can clearly see that eastern side of the building, and from Anderson Bridge (20:56)

Commissioners: Commissioner Aguirre – comments she went to the side, standing from the right-of-way from the front, she could not see the windows unless almost past the barrier. The view from Anderson Bridge and Panther Hollow Bridge is a far distance. The whole landscape between trees, houses, the ravines and the bridges are considered, not just the single home. (22:39) Commissioner Reed – agreed, that far away and removed you can't see a lot of granularity and the changes being made are not huge. (24:08) Commissioner Loysen – comments that there were no comments that the overall wooden character defining features of the building have been covered over. If that is okay, she doesn't see the point of making an issue out of the side elevation. Since taking the metal off and repairing the original structure is not proposed here. (24:47) Commissioner Snipe – comments that they cannot be required to do that since it is already in existence, adhering to the rules that have already been established. (25:44) Commissioner Aguirre – comments she would rather make sure that they have a good front facade which will definitely be seen than a side that would take an effort to see, or from the distance where the focus is on the landscape and environment. As per the conditions, it will be clear once we get the information by the applicant to staff about what items are in-kind replacement. (26:37)

Motion: Approve as presented with the caveat that the cut sheets and additional information for the renovations be reviewed by staff for final approval.

Moved by: Commissioner Snipe

Seconded by: Commissioner Loysen

In favor: Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen, Commissioner Aguirre

Abstained: Commissioner Reed

Opposed: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2025-00274 - 1250 Liverpool Street, Manchester Historic District, Manchester Neighborhood
- Demolition
Removed from agenda

3. BDA-2025-06698 – 3438 Parkman Avenue, Oakland Square District, Central Oakland neighborhood building renovations including roof replacement

Staff: Ms Spooner staff report, recommended motion is that the HRC approves the application for building renovations including roof replacement in accordance with section D.4 of the guidelines with the following conditions: Condition A - that approval of the in-kind work on the front façade includes replacement of the front concrete steps and walkway and parging of the foundation walls as submitted. Condition B - replacement of roofing and gutters on main house and front porch with asphalt shingles in similar style and color as submitted. And condition C - that any additional information required, including additional specifications or cut sheets, should be submitted to staff for final approval (30:55).

Applicant: Emanuel Lardas, owner – presentation (32:26)

Commissioner Aguirre noted for the record receipt of a letter from the Oakland Planning and Development Corporation that mentioned they have a DAM report, have shared the property with the subscribers and information, and they were in support of the work, asking to expedite this project to be on today's agenda (33:39).

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners: Commissioner Aguirre – comments about feeling uncomfortable not having a photograph to show the work, nor more information. The commission has asked for more visuals so an inspector or this commission are able to do their work. She would have liked that kind of information in front of them to provide approval. They have not approved something with just a written description. They always had some kind of graphics or marked photographs or even hand sketched details (34:33). Mr Lardas – response, they submitted the site plan on the original application to OneStop, showing the distance from the sidewalk to the steps with an arrow showing what was going to be replaced for the front steps (35:41). Commissioner Loysen – question, did Mr Lardas submit any samples or product information about the proposed new roofing (36:10)? Mr Lardas - response, a photograph of from Owen's Corning of the roof sample of the same color to show what it would look like on the house (35:15). Commissioner Aguirre – comments, we don't have in front of us a product name or product number (36:39). Commissioner Reed – question, was that information submitted through OneStopPGH as part of the BDA permit? Ms Spooner – response, she took over this project and would be happy to work with Mr Lardas to get whatever we need (40:13).

Commissioner Reed – question, if you have that information available, can you send it us right now and we can pull it up. I can give you an email (41:42). Mr Lardas sent an email of the product and identified which shingle would be used. Commissioner Reed recommended remanding the details to staff, taking it into account that this is not the norm (50:59). Commissioner Aguirre – comments, that the conditions A, B, and C provided by staff for the approval be taken into account before a certificate of appropriateness will be issued. If we could just have an additional markup of a drawing showing exactly what items are going to be taken care of, even if it's just a photograph with markups. So, when an inspector comes to check the work they can easily recognize the work with the with approval. If that is not provided then a certificate of appropriateness won't be issued by the next hearing and it will have to come back again for review. Staff can work with the applicant to also identify the previously supplied information (51:23). Mr Kunak – staff comments, for clarity the steps are not in front of the commission for review because that can be administratively reviewed. What is here for review is the roof. Per the commission comments, I can do that on the email right now. We do need a photo or an elevation with something circled showing the extent of the roof replacement, and the document spec sheet that we have up online with the correct color circled. Those need to be submitted to your OneStopPGH account. These will then get stamped, and this is what the building inspector will see when they're out on site. After this meeting allow you to upload the documents that the commission is requesting. Can do a Teams call if we need to screen share and follow the steps to update that material (53:31). Commissioner Aguirre – comments, I'm comfortable with this procedure in order to move this forward and all of us learning a lesson for next time trying to expedite a non-contributing property (55:14).

Motion: To have follow-up documentation of the roofing materials and the scope of the roofing work submitted to staff, and for the step repair to continue absent further review, and the in-kind replacement to be covered via a photo of an elevation.

Moved by: Commissioner Loysen

Seconded by: Commissioner Snipe

In favor: Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen, Commissioner Aguirre

Abstained: Commissioner Reed
Opposed: None
CARRIED

E. Hearing & Action : Historic Nominations

1. DCP-HN-2024-00130 - Westinghouse Park, 320 North Murtland Street, Point Breeze North Neighborhood - **Recommendation to City Council**

Staff: Ms Spooner – Additional information since the commission last discussed this park, including criteria for nomination – 2 and 6. (58:24) The recommended motion would be that the HRC votes to provide a positive recommendation to city council regarding the historic designation of Westinghouse Park based on criteria 2 and six. (1:01:37)

Applicant: Ms Isabella Gross, Principal Environmental Planner, Dept of City Planning - background and overview of the Westinghouse Plan Master Plan. (1:00:15)

Public Comment: Mr David Behr, Westinghouse Legacy – comments - the development of an archaeology program with the University of Pittsburgh that has already done geomorphic surveying of sections of the park and will continue this fall in November with another section of the park. In addition, there is a pending field study course, Anthropology 1535 full semester course 5 days per week, is being considered for next September with a possible fieldwork study program taking place in the park. (1:02:39)

Commissioners: Commissioner Aguirre – comments, the commission is meeting to consider criteria 2 and 6, one of the rare criteria to have a qualified location. (1:05:34)

Motion: Motion to move it forward with the positive recommendation to City Council.

Moved by: Commissioner Snipe

Seconded by: Commissioner Loysen

In favor: Commissioner Reed, Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen, Commissioner Aguirre

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

F. Hearing & Action : Adoption of Guidelines

Historic District Guidelines - Mexican War Streets Expansion, Roslyn Place, and Schenley Farms Historic Districts, Central Northside, Shadyside, and North Oakland Neighborhoods, **Adoption of guidelines documents for three historic districts**

Staff: Ms Spooner – recommended motion is that the HRC adopts the discussed historic district guidelines with the following conditions: Number one, that the implementation is delayed for 60 days from the adoption date for both the Roslyn Place and Schenley Farms districts per the following conditions: that city planning staff develops a hierarchy of facades mapping for review by the commission to be discussed in this meeting's briefing. And, that the hierarchy of facades mapping is then adopted by the commission. Number two, that implementation is delayed for the Mexican War Streets expansion district until the Mexican War Streets original district guidelines are adopted, which is in the early stages of planning right now. (1:08:38)

Commissioners: Commissioner Aguirre emphasized there has been either neighborhood buy in for all of the different communities, with or without a local LRC, and they will be able to observe the guidelines and provide comments. (1:09:46) Discussion among commissioners and staff about editing the language, format, and content of the guidelines, coordination of guidelines and processes with other city documents, what the follow-up process would be to work with the commission to refine the guidelines. (1:10:23)

Further discussion about more editing that needs to be done so that the language, the format, and the content in terms of meeting the goals to be concise and easy to use; the hierarchy and the process is not as clear and concise as they hoped it to be. (1:12:41)

Commissioner Aguirre – comments - ultimately the people who are going to be using them are the LRC's and community members of the public. Having people actually working with the guidelines and putting them into motion can identify the issues. It has taken years before we had an update on the guidelines (1:15:46). Mr Kunak – comments that staff return to the commission with a usability or implementation assessment 6, 9 or even 12 months later to see what potential updates should be made is a great idea. If the recommendation is that historic district guidelines should be updated every 10 years, this is our first attempt at beginning to meet that timeline, but also having intermediate check-in points for how things are working, what needs to be tweaked based on feedback. Staff recommended having two documents in a

way so the front half will include the chapter 2 procedures while each district will have its own documents guideline as an appendix. While the specific historic district guidelines may not change comprehensively on a 10-year time schedule, this front half of procedures most likely will change more frequently per feedback (1:17:41). Commissioner Loysen - the general guidelines are a more live document than the district specific recommendations. The neighborhood specific ones are more static (1:19:26).

Commissioner Aguirre - sometimes you try to make something as perfectly worded as possible. Then you put it out to the users and they come out with something like, this will make more sense to us, or through the process of using the new guidelines, what we can edit out. (1:21:56) Commissioner Reed - the technical bulletins well be a helpful thing to people who can get information about things like why they shouldn't paint brick and things like that (1:27:29). They are trying to integrate the processes better and will make sure to look specifically at how things are handled within the design guidelines concerning the full development review process (1:28:42).

Motion: That the Historic Review Commission adopts the discussed historic district guidelines with the following conditions: Implementation is to be delayed for 60 days for the adoption date for Roslyn Place and Schenley Farms per the following conditions: A. City planning staff develops hierarchy of facades mapping for the review by the commission; B. the hierarchy of the facades mapping is adopted by the commission; implementation is to be delayed for the MWS expansion district until the Mexican War Street district guidelines are adopted. In addition, the general guidelines would come back to the Historic Review Commission's meeting for October.

Moved by: Commissioner Snipe

Seconded by: Commissioner Loysen

In favor: Commissioner Snipe, Commissioner Loysen

Abstained: Commissioner Reed, Commissioner Aguirre

Opposed: None

CARRIED

G. For Public Comment Only: National Register Nominations

1. Arlington Apartments - 515 S. Aiken Avenue, Shadyside

Public Comment: None

2. Demmler Bros. Co. Warehouse - 100 Ross Street, Downtown

Public Comment: None

3. IBM Building - 4 Allegheny Center, Allegheny Center

Public Comment: None

H. Director's Report

None

I. Adjournment

The Historic Review Commission moved to adjourn at 3:42 PM.