

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

January 10, 2023 at 2:25 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Christine Mondor

In Attendance

Acting Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell
 Sabina Deitrick

Rachel O'Neill
 Becky Mingo
 Jennifer Askey

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor

Fred Brown

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-10883 – 100 Art Rooney Avenue Public Destination Facility signs North Shore Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2021-02885 – Manilla Street DCP-ZDR-2021-02914 – Manilla Street DCP-ZDR-2021-02944 – Corner of Webster Avenue and Robert Street New construction of 3 single-family detached homes Crawford-Roberts Neighborhood 3. DCP-ZDR-2022-00442 – Grandview Avenue (between Augusta Street and Republic Street) New construction of 23 townhomes in the Grandview Public Realm District B Duquesne Heights Neighborhood 4. DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments Preliminary Land Development Amendment for SP-11 Lower Hill Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood 5. DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill Block E New construction of parking structure, public safety station, and entertainment venue Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood	2
5. Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Major Subdivision 1, Hays 2. DCP-LOT-2022-01593, Reed Roberts, Major Subdivision 2, Crawford Roberts 3. DCP-LOT-2022-01670, Watson Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff 4. DCP-LOT-2022-01677, Middletown Road, Minor Consolidation, Windgap 5. DCP-LOT-2022-01637, Penn Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Lower Lawrenceville 6. DCP-LOT-2022-01649, Rickenbach Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Northside	4

A. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To approve Planning Commission Minutes for 11/15/2022
 MOVED BY: Ms Dick
 SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED BY: Ms Mingo
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED.

MOTION: To approve Planning Commission Minutes for 11/29/2022
 MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill
 SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 ABSTAINED BY: Ms Askey, Ms Deitrick
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED.

MOTION: To approve Planning Commission Minutes for 12/13/2022
 MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill
 SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 ABSTAINED BY: Ms Askey
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2021-15753 – Brickworks Project

- Strip District Neighbors

DCP-ZDR-2022-00442 Grandview Townhomes

- William Conroy
- Jaye Newsom

DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments and/or

DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill Block E

- Chavaysha Chaney, Policy and Programs Associate, Hill CDC
- Executive Management Committee of the Lower Hill CCIP
- Natan Diacon-Furtado
- Marlana Adele Vassar
- Deavron Dailey
- Brandon Jennings
- Dr. Kimberly Ellis
- James Simon
- CCIP attachment

DCP-ZDR-2021-02885 – Manilla Street

DCP-ZDR-2021-02914 – Manilla Street

DCP-ZDR-2021-02944 – Corner of Webster Avenue and Robert Street

- Becky Davis

Lawrenceville in need of a walkable grocery store

- Lauren Doyle

C. Hearing and Action (See Attachment C for staff reports)

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-10883 – 100 Art Rooney Avenue Public Destination Facility signs North Shore Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City staff. The project is two internally illuminated high wall public destination signs. Both signs are approx. 187 sq ft. The signs will be located on the easterly and westerly facades at a height of 79 ft 6 in from grade. The maximum of four high wall signs was previously approved Oct 4, 2022, by Planning Commission. ZBA Case 225 of 2022 approved two additional high wall signs, totaling 6 with the condition that no additional

high wall signage will be permitted for any façade of the stadium. A staff design review took place for the proposed signs, and there were no comments from the review. Since there is no Registered Community Organization in this location a Development Activities Meeting was not required. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the Project Development Plan as presented for the 6 high wall signs.

Mr Kolano stated the total façade allows 2,253 sq ft of signage. Only about 200 sq ft per sign is being used. The two additional signs are located on architectural towers situated in view corridors corresponding to roads and streets. The white lettering is internally illuminated with a nonilluminated black background.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions, comments, or motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Project Development Plan as presented for the 6 high wall signs.

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2021-02885 – Manilla Street
DCP-ZDR-2021-02914 – Manilla Street
DCP-ZDR-2021-02944 – Corner of Webster Avenue and Robert Street New construction of 3 single-family detached homes Crawford-Roberts Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City staff. The project is Final Land Development plans for new construction of three single-family detached homes located in an RP zoning district. Public notices of the project were mailed to property owners as required because 10 or more years had elapsed since the approval date of the most recently amended PLDP for the district. A Development Activities Meeting was held October 31, 2022, with the Hill Community Development Corporation, the Registered Community Organization for this location. A staff design review found the elevations in compliance with the Bedford and Hill District Pattern Book. A CDAP meeting was not recommended. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the FLDPs as presented with a condition that the final construction document shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Mr Ohmori stated the three proposed homes are the last remaining of the Crawford Square Development. Three other parcels are being developed but are not part of this hearing and action. The homes are intended to be owner occupied. More detailed photos were requested at a previous briefing and were presented for context and reference. Most of the homes have front access garages with some having drive-in access off a secondary street or alley. Elevations and site plans presented showed contextual setbacks and exterior materials used.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Becky Davis.

Ms Davis read a submission to the Planning Commission concerning the upkeep and maintenance by her and other neighbors. She contacted the URA to express interest in obtaining the parcel, but received no response. She stated concerns about the rear porch and windows of the new structure in relation to her home. She stated that she wished the neighborhood could have included more inclusive housing with single-story homes, citing the amount of stairs, and accommodations for older or disabled potential neighbors.

Mr Fraker recognized Patrick Gray.

Mr Gray stated that they were told when they moved into their home that the final development would not include low income housing. The homes would be market value, which is what they paid for their home. He expressed concerns about the look and scale of

the new houses. He also expressed concerns about traffic, noting drivers violate the law frequently driving the wrong way on the one-way street because it is nearly impossible to see oncoming traffic. He also cited issues with parking on the street blocking the street. He said registered a complaint but nothing was done.

Mr Ohmori commented that there were multiple presentations with the HOA. The designs and proposals result from working with the HOA, including the proportions and locations of the houses on their sites. There are large setbacks that set the houses back on the sites, but they are the same as the existing houses, complying with contextual setbacks. The homes fall in line with the Pattern Book. He stated they have taken great care in selecting responsible and committed homeowners and hope they are welcomed into the neighborhood. Also, they have tried to make high quality homes to share with families that might not otherwise be able to afford homes.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions, comments or motion.

Ms O'Neill moved to approve as presented.

Ms Mingo asked to speak and commented that the request for photos of the conditions was to understand the impact on the neighbors. She stated she was concerned that the two neighbors' concerns haven't been addressed.

Mr Ohmori stated there were two presentations with the HOA and two meetings with the community group with good attendance at all four meetings.

Mr Tillman stated they received support letters from both organizations and Council.

Ms Mingo asked if there is a way to address the specific concerns of Ms Davis or Mr Gray about ensuring windows don't line up with each other, or to look at the other houses to make sure they don't have light shed or are not peering window to window.

Mr Ohmori stated they can pay close attention to window alignment, but the site constraints and large setbacks push the home to the back of the site. Also, the site is fairly steep and the deck is the only way to provide some useable outdoor space for the home.

Ms Mingo stated she was not convinced that all the concerns have been met at this point. She said that no site plans had been presented that show how the site works or that show the porch on the site.

Mr Ohmori asked to go back to the site plan for the home which shows the context in relation to the neighboring homes, including the rear porch and setbacks that comply with the Zoning Code.

Ms Mingo asked how this new house compares to the original plan from years ago.

Mr Ohmori stated in general the sizes of the homes are about the same. Both the existing homes are much wider. The new home is consistent with the existing homes.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if any other commissioners had questions or comments, or if they could go back to the motion from Ms O'Neill.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the FLDPs as presented with a condition that the final construction document shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2022-00442 – Grandview Avenue (between Augusta Street and Republic Street)
New construction of 23 townhomes in the Grandview Public Realm District B Duquesne Heights Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City staff. The project is new construction of 23 single-family attached units in the GPR-B zone. Three units in the R1A-H zone are shown for reference and are under another review. A Development Activities Meeting with the Mt Wash Community Assn RCO occurred July 28, 2022. A storm water management plan has received approval. This is an undermined area, and a Geotechnical report is under review. The proposed application was reviewed by CDAP Nov 8, 2022. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the PDP with conditions, 1. DOMI shall review the

final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuing the ROZA; 2. the storm water management plan be approved prior to issuing the ROZA; and 3. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

Mr Geoff Campbell stated the site is on the western edge of Grandview Ave in Duquesne Heights on Mt Washington. The geotechnical exploration involved drilling down to bedrock which ranged from just a few feet to 33 feet below ground. Test pits were also dug to understand storm water infiltration. A number of plans were shared relating to Grandview Avenue and defining the Grandview Public Realm, ending in 1995. A ten-year housing strategy was issued 13 years ago which was also reviewed. The project complies with all zoning dimensions for height, setbacks, and single-family uses. A public realm district requires a review of the project. The project proposes 26 rear-entry units, minimizing curb cuts to only three. Two-car garages per unit are provided. Landscaping and screening is provided at the rear of the garages and the adjacent parcels. The architectural context is varied in scale, time period, designs, and heights. Each unit is 3 stories high with a below grade garage with an extra room and a roof deck. As requested from a previous briefing, the exterior materials in a black and white pallet of brick, fibercement siding, precast concrete/stone panels, windows, roofing, wood elements, and retaining walls were presented. Also presented was a 3D front landscape with light wells and retaining walls, along with a front yard planting page. Concerns about utilities on poles were expressed to Duquesne Light, but the utility has no plans to put them underground at this time.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Jordan Davidson, Executive Director of Mt Washington Community Development Corporation.

Mr Davidson read a letter from the MWDCDC submitted for the record December 10, 2022.

Mr Fraker recognized Patrick Gianella, elected Democratic Committeeman for this area.

Mr Gianella stated that Mr Davidson and the secretary resigned from the MWDCDC and do not represent the residents. There was no well-published attendance of the CDC. He said they asked on several occasions that the CDC meet with the community and take the recommendation of the residents into account when preparing their approval of this construction. He also stated they asked that letters be sent to voters in this district so everyone could have input but were refused. The developer quoted \$3M to underground utilities. The cost the developer submitted was questioned by civil engineers and a representative from Public Works, citing a cost of \$3M to underground 15 blocks in the South Side. Also, a pedestrian experience was promised to the community and the City. To allow construction without underground utilities would be a big mistake by the Planning Commission. He also stated that there will be insufficient parking for this project.

Mr Fraker recognized William Conroy.

Mr Conroy owns a house next door to the development. He commented on the cost and ability to underground the utilities and asked that the Commission make it part of the project.

Mr Fraker recognized Jay Gennuso.

Ms Gennuso owns property behind the proposed project. She stated that most of their back yard has been washed away by the property, and that they lost a magnolia tree. She also stated that a church has also had water issues and had to have construction done as a result. She commented that there have been 3 sink holes after the West End landslide right behind their home. On the first boring, the bore began to sink, and 3 men had to try to hold it up. They discontinued boring and trenched the site. As trees were eliminated, a natural spring running under the ground washed away more ground. She stated concerns about traffic and parking since there are already parking concerns in the area. Requests for meetings through letters, calls to councilpersons, CDC have gone unanswered. The developer has torn down trees, resulting in lost sound barrier and privacy. This development will bring down property values in the area.

Mr Fraker recognized Jim Settembrino.

Mr Sttembrino owns an adjacent house since 1950. He is also concerned about water runoff and parking, citing many church and other activities in the community that this project will

restrict. The project will change the landscape and water issues will eliminate the enjoyment of his back yard.

Mr Fraker recognized Daria Newsom.

Ms Newsom lives behind the development. They built an addition to their home. At the time they were advised that there were voids in the area and needed to increase the stability on the addition. It had something to do with a void adjacent to their property. Also, when a bath was installed in the basement the local plumber showed them that there was a spring running under their home from the Grandview Ave property. He stressed it was fresh water. Ms Newsom emailed after the last meeting asking if the developer had addressed those issues and hasn't heard anything about that.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions, comments or a motion.

Ms O'Neill asked that the applicant respond to undergrounding the utilities. Also, how the geotechnical work has been evaluated and steps moving forward that would not contribute to storm water runoff or other issues on the street.

Mr Magrino stated that storm water management has been developed to capture, meter, and slowly release storm water from the site to the municipal storm system through rooftops, gutter systems, online collections systems, curbs, gutters, and inlets. This will actually reduce runoff to the various homes downgrade to the property. The underground systems have been lined so that water will not leach or perch into the ground. Less water will be released after construction to the storm system and discharge to the homes will be less.

The geotechnical engineer confirmed with their driller that there were no issues. They conducted a full sequence of borings and an infiltration test. The infiltration test involved a backhoe which could have been misconstrued as trenching. The exploration resulted in recommendations for site designs and foundation designs of the proposed buildings. They have been incorporated into the overall site design and submitted for review by the City.

Ms O'Neill confirmed that they have received the NPDES permit relating to storm water, and asked about the status of the storm water and geotechnical reviews with the City. She also confirmed that the geotechnical review incorporates a review of undermined or void areas that would be addressing any stability related to them.

Mr Magrino confirmed they received the permit the afternoon of this hearing and action.

Also, there is one comment they must respond to about the storm water review around easements onsite. The geotechnical review will address the undermined or voids and is still under review in PLI.

Mr Kamin addressed the utilities issue. His understanding is that it is a far more complex and larger project than has been described here. He stated that they are willing to work with Duquesne Light as is feasible. He stated they didn't think it is appropriate that underground utilities be placed as a condition of approval, not that it is within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. He said they have had discussions with Duquesne Light, making it seem it was a 7-figure number and unfeasible to do. It is their understanding that the utility lines are serving other units not just this new development.

Ms O'Neill asked staff if there are regulations or requirements that relate to underground utilities.

Mr Layman commented that in a detailed review of the GPR zone and subdivision regulations they can take a look.

Ms O'Neill proposed a condition that Planning Commission encourage assessing underground utilities to the extent feasible and working with staff to evaluate that.

Mr Kamin said they can definitely work with staff but just can't have it mandated.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions, comments or a motion

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve with conditions as stated in the staff report and with the additional condition that the applicant work with staff to evaluate the feasibility of underground utilities.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

4. DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments Preliminary Land Development Amendment for SP-11 Lower Hill Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk read in the agenda item, asked Mr Kunak to present the PLDP. Ms O'Neill recused herself for this hearing and action item.

Mr Kunak

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated they are in receipt of a 101 document submitted by the applicants after the start of today's briefing. As a result, neither staff nor the Commission have had a chance to review. She asked if the applicants want the Commission to review that submission as a part of the record. If so, it would be understood that it may necessitate a continuance because Commission has had no time to review.

Ms Kirk stated that most of what is in the document has already been seen by the Commission and just the first five pages are new.

Mr Sittig commented that the document primarily addresses the dashboard that was a condition of the FNB Financial Center approval. It represents the up-to-date detail that is summarized in the presentation. There is nothing that the Commission can't consider today. If there is a question on the dashboard and extent of efforts made in compliance of the FNB condition, the Commission can decide. It doesn't have to do with the amendment itself or Block E. It is an update that the Commissioners wanted up-to-the-minute progress with the neighbors.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated it sounds as if they want the Commission to consider it as part of the record. The Commission will continue with the presentation and figure it out as the hearing progresses.

Ms Kirk asked that they receive the additional correspondence that the Commission has received.

Mr Layman interjected that staff works hard to make sure there are clear deadlines for submissions, and if something comes in after the deadline, it is not to be considered for a hearing. Ms Kirk is asking the Commission to make an exception on this, and he just wants to be clear it works for both sides. The intent is not to open up a process where staff have to manage correspondence up to the minute of or during a Commission meeting. Staff does not have the ability to do that.

Mr Sittig stated it is not an amendment and does not have anything new with the application itself. It is an update on community process and not part of the application itself.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk said it is noted and to proceed.

Mr Kunak present the project for the City. It is new construction of a mixed-use office tower approved by Planning Commission May 4, 2021, that included a condition that an amendment to the PLDP address the removal of Wylie Ave, and that any other post changes to the Master Plan shall be approved prior to, or at the same time as, the next FLDP for SP-11. He stated that it is required within 2 years for commencement of open space on Block F. A DAM meeting was held Oct 17, 2022. Staff reviewed and made comments on the proposed PLDP. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve amendments to the PLDP as presented in this item.

Ms Kirk stated they are here in response to conditions of approval that the Lower Hill to Downtown should be pedestrian friendly and accessible. The site included topography, drainage, pedestrian safety, accessibility, and connectivity challenges. We are here to look at removing some streets and installing alleyways and pedestrian easements in Block A & B, and also to vacate Wylie Ave at the lower part of the site. Approval is really important to complete projects on A & B, and F as urban open space and the permitting on G4 that was required. A street vacation application was submitted to the City and is in the final stages of review by DOMI. An updated and approved 2021 transportation report was submitted to reflect the changes to these streets.

Mr Craig summarized the application submitted is for the lower portions of Wylie Ave and 2 streets, a dogleg on the A & B block and a cul-de-sac on the C Block, and three street vacations being processed by DOMI. The site is organized around three central principals,

Wylie Ave as the historic corridor, making the connection between Downtown and the greater Hill District, centering pedestrian activity, retail, and primary focus for buildings; Logan Street, focusing the major destination facility, the Arena, and mixed-use entertainment venue, and activity and retail on a “festival street” allowing closure; and Centre Ave as the main corridor connection between Downtown, the Hill, and Oakland.

Ms Spanza presented slides that compared the original FLDP with the amendments. The streets and connections have been revised to alleyways in Blocks A, B and C, providing better continuity through the development. The urban open space is being increased to a total of 3.83 acres. Modifications to frontage locations are in response to the revised parcel configurations. Parking and servicing have been adjusted to address block configurations, adjusting the quantity and location of curb cuts. A prohibition has been added on surface parking adjacent to urban open space.

Mr Bonce addressed achieving full universal accessibility throughout the site due to the slope transitions citing even able bodied people would have difficulty maneuvering through the corridor. The revised plan achieves 5% universal accessibility throughout the entire site. Buildings articulate with the grade. All accessible routes arrive at various plazas or various door elevations to enter the buildings. They also go through park activities, seating, gardens, artwork, & amphitheaters for accessibility.

Mr Craig stated they are following the guidelines in the Zoning Code that create open space being publicly accessible, open at regular business hours within the district, and maintained for passive recreation by the public. The Lower Hill District Conservancy was established which will maintain, program, operate, and provide supplemental security for the urban open space. A community advisory committee will be formed to help with programming and operations of the spaces.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Merma Milliones, Pres & CEO of The Hill Community Development Corporation.

Ms Milliones asked for extra consideration, given that the Hill CDC is the RCO for the Hill District neighborhood, to have extra time to get through the extensive comments. The Penns refused to agree to attach the community collaboration and implementation plan or to strengthen the language in the PLDP to ensure community protections for the Hill District. In order for Pittsburgh to achieve an equitable and just city, our city must move beyond the normal facilitation of processes and policies that will only perpetuate structural inequities. Without formally attaching the CCIP, there is no requirement for the Penns and private developers to follow the Community Collaboration and Implementation Plan. Therefore, there is nothing like inclusionary affordable housing or zoning for commercial space. The socioeconomic impact has to be assured by having some type of guideline.

Mr Fraker recognized Renee Wilson.

Ms Wilson stated that this item needs to go to the community so they can know about this. Many people in this area are senior citizens who are voters and need more information to be able to vote on what just came over today. She stated that some things seem to be done before they are brought to the Planning Commission, citing Wylie Ave already looks like it has been cut off at the FNB Building. The community should definitely be included and be given more time.

Mr Fraker recognized Chavaysha Chaney, Policy & Program Associate at the Hill CDC.

Ms, Chaney spoke about the Lower Hill development status and the Hill District Unified Community Review process. The Hill utilizes the Development Review Panel as an orderly and democratic process per the City RCO ordinance. The DRP is comprised of 9 Hill District organizations working together to ensure equitable Hill district redevelopment. The DRP is a two-step process. Step 1 is a focused review and scoring at the committee level if a plan is aligned with the master plan and CCIP, scoring 80% or above. Step two is to advance the plan to the residents for review and vote. The developers must secure a letter of support of 80% or better. The Penns have complained that this process is too lengthy. The duty of the RCO is to ensure that the developers are heard in the order they are received. Ms Chaney asked that the Planning Commission support the Hill District community and send them back to complete the RCO process.

Mr Fraker recognized Phyllis Gaffar.

Ms Gaffar is a retired planning professional. She testified that she went through the SEA and City processes before the Civic Arena was demolished. She stated she is glad the City is working with Macedonia Church and Bethel AME Church to ensure their historical and land use needs are met. Ms Gaffar stated two concerns. First, there is a need that the community and DRP group receive clarity and respect from the developer concerning the changes that will occur, and that the developer does not subvert the process, causing it to take such a long time. Second, she stated that there is a greater need in the overall Hill to have the common goals of the community and the Penguins Development Group communicated. She stated she is more concerned about the lack of affordable housing throughout the community and not to get hung up on minutia and attitudes. She noted the interaction between the BCP and the CDC intermingles with the facts and stops progress. She would like to see the 100 page document presented at this hearing.

Mr Fraker recognized Martin Rafanan.

Mr Rafanan agreed with Ms Gaffar and stated that the community has a right to look at the documentation. Although the developers have moved forward on a number of points of concern, it is important that they take a close look at the documentation and understand what is being recommended. He did not like the document being submitted a couple of hours before this hearing, and that commissioners are asked to vote on it before the community has a chance to take a look at it. He praised the commissioners' efforts listening to complex material. As the community is going to be impacted by this development, it is important that they have the opportunity to carefully look at and discuss this issue. He echoed concerns about affordable housing and asked the Commission to continue this hearing until the community has had a chance to look at the new things put on the table by the developers.

Mr Fraker recognized Kevin McNair.

Mr McNair stated the same concerns of previous public testimony that a vote should happen without transparency to the community. He believed that to be fair and equitable, conversations have to be more than just words and promises. He would like to have an opportunity to look at the document. It would only be equitable that the community know what was going on because it impacts them in this area.

Mr Fraker recognized Rev Dale Snyder.

Rev Snyder stated that Bethel is the oldest African-American owned entity west of the Alleghenies and would like to offer an opportunity for them to come together as a community. He noted that finances are hard to come by when doing major developments like this. It sometimes causes last minute changes. He encouraged everyone to examine the proposed plans posted on the City Website and do their homework, and for the community to come together to move in the right direction. He believed they all want the same thing in different ways and must find a way to communicate that to get the best that they can from the monies that are available. This land has been vacant long enough and he hoped that the community, developers, City, and Commission can find ways to work together to create a win-win. He thanked everyone for their commitment to allow Bethel to tell their story.

Mr Fraker recognized Cn Daniel Lavelle.

Mr Kunak said the Councilman dropped off.

Mr Fraker recognized Charlotte Ka.

Ms Ka stated that she and Eric Reynolds of Mocha Art Gallery would like to commend Dr Kim Ellis for all the information she provided concerning this project and would like to augment Frankie Place with a mosaic in her honor to let the citizens of the Hill District know that she was a pioneering woman who worked tirelessly to honor the citizens of the Hill District. She stated that she is happy to see that Bethel Church is getting some reparations for their past work and the beautiful church that was torn down.

Mr Fraker recognized Cn Daniel Lavelle.

Cn Lavelle had 3 quick notes on the PLDP. 1. When the original request was made to attach the CCIP as a supporting document, he submitted a letter of support and formally asked the Commission to consider doing it. He stated his support at having the CCIP attached. 2. There is now discussion to remove public streets and eventual privatization of public land. Once it is privatized, how do you ensure it still remains public especially for those who are native to this

community? If the Commission approves this, Cn Lavelle asked that they do so with consideration to ensure the privatized public land remain public at all times. And 3. Curtain Call was mentioned earlier. There was an exhaustive process to select its current place. The applicant has suggested there could be a better location. If the Commission approves this, they should know that they would be approving something that has not been vetted with the community. He asked that the Commission approve it with conditions ensuring they still have to go through a community process.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk thanked everyone for the presentation and public testimony due to the length of the hearing, but staying the course is testimony of a level of commitment. She then asked for questions or comments from commissioners.

Ms Askey stated that the CCIP was established in 2014, and she would like staff to refresh everyone on what the City and legal department feel the role of the CCIP should be.

Mr Layman stated that there is no statement ready from the Law Department. Staff did consult with the solicitor at the time. Mr Layman felt that none of the conditions of the document or the Planning Commission's purview have changed. The position is that the CCIP stands on its own. It is considered an informational and supplemental document. The Commission's role regarding approving land development plans is narrow and focused on the development review and plan review. Mr Layman asked Mr Dash for comment.

Mr Dash stated the CCIP has no legal authority other than it is Planning Commission's criteria for decisions.

Ms Kirk said she was there in 2014 when the CCIP was established, and it is a reference document and thought that is what the Planning Commission and Court of Common Pleas decided. This is a very small PLDP with minor revisions. It is here because it is required to come back before further development. The urban open space will be the same as all other UOS in the City. The Lower Hill Conservancy plans to have security through that site. It is intended to be open to all. That is why there is pedestrian accessibility in the easements. This needs to move forward so that the money for parking tax diversion can help the Lower and Middle Hill.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk said she understands that what we are reviewing today is strictly land use related and that the CCIP and PLDP stand independently from one another. She wants the applicant to understand the gravity as it relates to the CCIP and how the community perceived that to be a win at the time. We are hopeful that the EMC is holding feet to the fire and basic reciprocity is occurring. She thinks it boils down to communication, and the community is feeling excluded of information. Ms Burton-Faulk stated she would not be comfortable moving forward because there are 101 pages that say something, and the community and commissioners haven't had time to review them. She would be comfortable closing record today and giving everyone a chance to go through it before taking a vote.

Ms Askey agreed that the Commission and the community should have a chance to confirm that all information was previously presented in other ways and would not affect the decision.

Mr Sittig noted that these documents have to do with the compliance of the condition on another project that is not directly related to this approval. They understood that even if a vote to approve was taken, there is a dashboard that would establish compliance for a staff determination to be made. It is a 100 page document, but it is a 5 page summary of attachments that are in the record elsewhere. It is a convenience document to allow whoever is going to make the determination of compliance with condition 6. He stated that they are in compliance with the CCIP and are willing to have this as an ongoing condition. Whether the determination is from the Planning Commission or the Zoning Administrator, we need a determination where our dashboard complies.

Ms Kirk agreed and stated this is a condition from the approval for G1 and doesn't relate to the PLDP, but it must be presented for the next approval and we can't get to Block E approval without going through this approval.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated their intention was to submit it in time for today, but it didn't make it in terms of the clock. This issue is that we have a last minute document that has not been communicated to the entire community, causing a trust issue.

Ms Dick agreed with what Ms Burton-Faulk stated. She stated she believed it has been proven that ignorance leads to fear. If people have not read, they fear what it may mean. The general public in the Hill need to read this first, and we need to have a continuance. Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated that there has to be communication, and they have to give an extension of trust. She put a motion on the table to continue. She would like Cn Lavelle to organize a virtual meeting instead of people having to read on their own.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh continue the hearing.

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick

CARRIED

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked to please set something up between now and the next meeting.

Mr Sittig asked for clarification if the continued hearing will be focusing on the summary of the dashboard they submitted.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk said they were asking for more communication, and that the community understands where we are. The Planning Commission understands this is land use. This was intended to be a part of what commissioners were to consider today.

Mr Sittig stated he wanted to be sure they will be ready for everything and will focus on this submittal at the continued hearing.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated they should probably table the next item as well.

Mr Sittig asked that they go ahead with the next item. They would be able to come back with what they need for both items.

Ms Askey said that they hear the presentation but won't vote until the next meeting.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a 5 minute recess.

Ms Kirk clarified that the record on the PLDP is closed.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk had stated that on record earlier.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated that because the Commission lost quorum for this last hearing and action, the vote for the continuance will need to be voted on again.

MOTION:

A motion to continue the PLDP amendment until the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOVED BY: Acting Chair Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

ABSTAINED: Chair Mondor

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick

CARRIED

5. DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill Block E New construction of parking structure, public safety station, and entertainment venue Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated that in an effort to maintain quorum for this last hearing and action, they should hold on Item 5.

Mr Sittig asked if that means to move it to the next meeting

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk said yes. They do not have a quorum. She also stated that because there was no vote on the PLDP, it makes sense to hold here. Part of the break was to make sure they had quorum.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to continue Item 5 until the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

CARRIED

Mr Sittig asked if the schedule in two weeks is full.

Mr Kunak stated that schedule will allow the two continued items.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Major Subdivision 1, Hays
2. DCP-LOT-2022-01593, Reed Roberts, Major Subdivision 2, Crawford Roberts
3. DCP-LOT-2022-01670, Watson Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01677, Middletown Road, Minor Consolidation, Windgap
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01637, Penn Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Lower Lawrenceville
6. DCP-LOT-2022-01649, Rickenbach Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Northside

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if the plans of lots will be taken separately.

Mr Scheppke stated that Item 1 will need to be taken separately.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk confirmed Item 1 is separate, and Items 2 through 6 will be batched together. Acting Chair Burton-Faulk read in Item 1.

Mr Scheppke presented Item 1 plan of lots. The recommended motion is to preliminarily approve the subdivision with final review scheduled Jan 24, 2023.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. There being none she asked for a motion from Commissioners.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh preliminarily approve the subdivision with final review scheduled Jan 24, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 2 through 6.

Mr Scheppke presented Items 2 through 6 plan of lots. The recommended motion was to approve all items.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. There being none she asked for a motion from Commissioners.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve plan of lots Items 2 through 6.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

E. Director's Report

None.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

January 24, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Christine Mondor

In Attendance

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 Acting Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Dina Blackwell
 Rachel O'Neill
 Sabina Deitrick

Not Present

Jennifer Askey
 Becky Mingo

Fred Brown

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-13482– 418 1st Avenue Demolition in the GT-C zoning district Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-05365 – 3610 Fifth Avenue Exterior alterations in the Oakland Public Realm zoning district Central Oakland Neighborhood 3. DCP-ZDR-2021-15753 – 2121 Smallman Street New construction of multi-unit residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood 4. DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments Preliminary Land Development Amendment for SP-11 Lower Hill Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood, continued 5. DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill FLDP for Block E New construction of parking structure, public safety station, and entertainment venue Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood, continued	2
5. Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00030, Liberty Avenue, Major Subdivision 1, Strip District 2. DCP-LOT-2023-00014, High Street, Minor Consolidation, Spring Garden 3. DCP-LOT-2023-00023, 11th Street, Minor Subdivision, South Side Flats 4. DCP-LOT-2022-01681, Chartiers Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Crafton Heights 5. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Minor Subdivision, Hays 6. DCP-LOT-2022-01623, Shady Avenue, Lot Line Revision, Squirrel Hill North	4

A. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To approve Planning Commission Minutes for 01/10/2023
 MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick
 SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 ABSTAINED BY: Chair Mondor
 IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick
 CARRIED.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2022-00442 Grandview Townhomes

- Pat Gianella

DCP-ZDR-2021-15753 - 2121 Smallman Street - Brickworks

- David Vatz, Pro-Housing Pittsburgh

DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments and/or

DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill Block E

- The Hill District Collaborative
- Hill District Consensus Group
- E.Holdings, Inc
- Cameron Real Estate Services
- Cosmos Technologies
- Allegheny County Labor Council
- Builder's Guild of Western PA
- Pittsburgh Regional Building Trades Council
- Live Nation
- Elizabeth "Lisa" Dugan
- Charlotte Ka
- Brian Peters
- Renee Wilson
- Phyllis Ghafoor

C. Hearing and Action (See Attachment C for staff reports)

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-13482– 418 1st Avenue Demolition in the GT-C zoning district Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City. The proposed demolition is a two-story and single-story rear addition. A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership Registered Community Organization on 10/13/22. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the PDP with the condition: the final document shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Mr Ohmori presented the project. The addition is a painted, over-sized concrete block addition with a concrete block office above. The demolition is to expose the original 6-story and 4-story building behind it, which will undergo interior renovations, adding a set of egress stairs.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions, comments. Hearing none, Chair Mondor asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the PDP with the condition: the final document shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-05365 – 3610 Fifth Avenue Exterior alterations in the Oakland Public Realm zoning district Central Oakland Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City staff. This will include street-level exterior alterations to a two and three-story structure for continued use as a restaurant (general). A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Oakland Planning & Development Corporation and Oakland Business Improvement District Registered Community Organizations on 09/12/22. The application was reviewed at Staff Design Review, a Contextual Design Advisory Panel, and a follow-up Staff Design Review. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission

approve the PDP with conditions; 1. DOMI shall review the final site plans and issue the necessary DOMI approval prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA), and 2. the final document shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Ms Noonan presented the project which is a conversion from the former Thirsty Scholar restaurant tenant space to a Raising Cane's Chicken Fingers restaurant. There is existing covered parking at 5th Ave & Atwood St, totaling 6 parking spaces with some interior improvements. The scope of work only includes the tenant space. No work is planned to the apartments above. There will be no public access to basement. The presentation included the exterior design and materials to the tenant space. The scheduled opening is 08/2023. Chair Mondor asked for public testimony. See none Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions or comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion to approve.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the PDP with conditions; 1. DOMI shall review the final site plans and issue the necessary DOMI approval prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA), and 2. The final document shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2021-15753 – 2121 Smallman Street New construction of multi-unit residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for City staff. The proposed development is new construction of 228 multi-unit residential dwelling units. It includes 8 structures, two 6-story structures as multi-unit residential with first-floor structured parking, Buildings A & B, facing Smallman St. Four 4-story structures will be used as multi-unit townhouse style residential with integral parking, Building C, facing 23rd St; Buildings D & G, facing interior court yards; and Building H, facing 21st St; also, two 6-story multi-unit structures used as multi-unit residential with first-floor structured parking, Buildings E & F, facing interior court yards. There are no Registered Community Organizations for this location, and no Development Activities Meeting was required. The application was reviewed at Staff Design Review and by Contextual Design Advisory Panel. The application is requesting one performance point. The base height is 60ft and max hgt is 90 ft. The proposed building hgt is approx. 70 ft for Buildings A, B, E, & F. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the PDP with conditions: 1. DOMI shall approve all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROZA; 2. The Storm Water Management Plan shall be approved prior to issuing the ROZA; and 3. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

Mr Spagnolli summarized the project as the Brick Works at 21st and Smallman Sts between 23rd & Railroad Sts. The project was presented to Strip District Neighbors community group even though they are not a Registered Community Organization. There are a total of 228 units, 20 townhouses for purchase, 40 stacked townhomes for purchase, 186 parking spaces, 166 bike spaces, 86 are protected, and fully accessible sites.

Mr Jantunovich summarized the makeup of the site plan. 22nd Street is vacated in the middle of the site, with Spruce St as a private drive, for parking access, service, and deliveries. A 10 ft wide pedestrian strip is extended to the river consistent with the 21st Street Vision Plan. He also summarized the makeup of the landscaping, street trees, and storm water management. Mr Campbell Presented the flats and townhomes for purchase. There is 1 parking space per unit; 1 unit in each building will be Type A accessible; and 19 accessible units Type B; the townhomes have 2 cars per unit accessed from the rear.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony. Hearing none, Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions, comments

Ms Dick asked if any sites in this plan fall within the flood plain, and if so, how they would be treated.

Mr Jantunovich stated that the property does not fall within the flood plain. The NE corner is being raised to be above base flood elevation. The property will be upgraded to have no drainage or storm water accommodation needed to be fully compliant.

Ms Deitrick asked if there were any affordable units, if there is any public money in the development, the price of a townhome, and the price of a rental unit. She also asked if they could provide a whole view of the buildings from 21st to 22nd St.

Mr Welch stated the development is market rate, there is no plan to use public money in the project. He stated the rental units will be \$2,000/month.

Mr Gillespie stated the price of the townhomes will be \$900,000 to \$1.5-1.6M, and the stacked flats will be \$800,000 to \$1.5M.

Chair Mondor asked if Ms Deitrick had a concern over length of building and continuity of the view with only the 22nd St break and the lack of additional breaks in the buildings. Hearing no more questions or comments from commissioners, she asked for a motion to approve as stated in the report.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the PDP with conditions: 1. DOMI shall approve all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROZA; 2. The Storm Water Management Plan shall be approved prior to issuing the ROZA; and 3. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Daulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

NAYS: Ms Deitrick

CARRIED

Mondor asked for a 5 minute break to reconvene at 3:00 pm.

Continued Hearing and Action

4. DCP-MPZC-2022-01041 – SP-11 Lower Hill PLDP Amendments Preliminary Land Development Amendment for SP-11 Lower Hill Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Mr Kunak read in the continued hearing and action. DCP-ZDR-2021-00265 is new construction of a mixed-use office tower approved by Planning Commission 05/04/2021, including the condition that an amendment to the PLDP that addresses the removal of Wylie Ave and any other proposed changes to the Master Plan shall be approved prior to, or at the same time as, the next FLDP for SP-11 as required within 2 years for the commencement of open space for Block F. A Development Activities Meeting was held 10/17/2022. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the amendment to the PLDP.

Chair Mondor recognized Ms O'Neill joined the meeting.

Ms O'Neill stated she is recusing from this hearing item.

Chair Mondor summarized that a new document was received at the last meeting, needing additional time for review. There were conversations concerning the relationship of the CCIP document. She stated as an independent document it stands on its own. The Commission does not need to adopt it for it to have legal affect. She questioned if there was someone from the Mayor's Office present who could refresh the commissioners on what the process is with the CCIP and what happens with this application after it leaves the Planning Commission.

Mr Chintalapalli summarized the process.

Chair Mondor confirmed that there are other specific processes that administered and monitored the CCIP. She then stated the Commission has been clear in the need to show progress on the CCIP items. The Planning Commission is not the arbiter of the CCIP but asked for commissioners' thoughts about reopening public testimony because of the new document submitted at the last hearing.

Ms Burton-Faulk stated that, having read through, there were less than half a dozen documents that are newer material. She preferred the testimony would be left to the addition of the document. Her opinion was that it is an update built on some significantly older material and meant to be an update to the Commission.

Ms Deitrick agreed to open testimony since there was no time to get to the document and the public should have a say.

Ms Kirk asked for clarification that opening the is record of limited purpose on smaller points on two pages of the document. She also clarified that the CCIP is a reference document already decided in 2015, for the record.

Chair Mondor reopened public testimony, limiting comments to the new materials and not to repeat testimony from the previous meeting or from others' testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Glenn Grayson Jr, EMC member.

Mr Grayson stated he was asked to provide reports for the PLDP and Block E. He listed the 4 principles of the EMC. He raised concerns about the overall content of reports from developers, the progress on important provisions, and achievement of envisioned collective outcomes. A \$2 surcharge only applies to Live Nation events and tickets for 10 years, and other items are still incomplete.

Chair Mondor asked if other EMC members were present to have them comment on Mr Grayson's testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Phyllis Ghafoor.

Ms Ghafoor stated that her objection from the last hearing was not being able to look over the document. A memo of report was addressed to EMC and Planning Commission relating comments to the public is a problem to entities in the Hill District. The document is a report on sub entities working with PAR and BPG. Her understanding was that Bethel Church would work with PAR and BPG to find an appropriate location, probably with a legal memorandum of understanding. After looking at past enabling legislation, she stated that the State legislator had to approve the original purpose and the update. It doesn't appear to her that the CCIP does not belong in the Planning Dept but with the URA or the SEA. The structures and social conditions from Dinwiddie through the Upper Hill to Herron Ave are deplorable. They are drowning in their poverty above Crawford St, and the EMC has not recognized that.

Mr Fraker recognized Marimba Milliones, Pres. and CEO of the Hill CDC.

Ms Milliones stated that this plan did not complete their development review panel. She wanted to ensure that the Commission received this in writing and verbally in December and Jan. 10. She expressed concerns on how the Planning Commission and Planning Staff will ensure the Mayor's commitment to a city for all. Without inclusionary zoning the current demographics of the site will be extremely racially segregated with very few units for working class and poor people. She also expressed concerns about the private security working alongside City police when patrolling the urban open space.

Mr Fraker recognized Rep Latasha D Mays

Rep Mays stated that she looks forward to deeply engaging with stakeholders. She also stated the 101 page document is very difficult to read through. She wondered what community engagement has been up to this point and what still needs to happen to ensure equitable development, and that those directly impacted truly understand what is happening in their communities.

Ms Kirk stated she wanted to put on the record that last Thursday there was a 1 ½ hours long public community meeting regarding the 101 page document. Many people attended and were able to speak and ask questions of the development team.

Mr Fraker recognized Dr Bonnie Young on behalf of the Hill District Consensus Group and the Hill District Collaborative.

Dr Young stated for the record that there was extensive community engagement about this project, reflected in the letters of support from these two organizations.

Mr Fraker recognized Renee Wilson

Ms Wilson stated she sent letters to the Planning Commission, Mayor, and others involved that there needs to be a meeting for the community that is accessible to the elder stakeholders of this community. There was a petition signed by 121 people to date to have this community meeting. This project could push people out of the community and cause another situation of homelessness and displaced people.

Chair Mondor closed public testimony and asked for questions and comments from commissioners, or from the applicant first.

Mr Dunam responded to public testimony with clarification about the 101 page document.

There was a condition in the original approval of the PLDP that the EMC would provide a report with each FLDP. Also, the approval of FNB Tower had a condition that each FLDP would be

provided a developers' dashboard report updating the status of compliance with the CCIP and other community agreements. This resulted in a letter in December to the Planning Commission constituting the EMC's report. The late document received in January is the developer's response to the comments by the EMC as well as an updated dashboard. A community meeting was immediately convened through Cn Lavelle's office and other networks 01/19/2023 in response to Acting Chair Burton-Faulk's comments, public testimony, and commissioners comments at that time. A paper copy of the document was provided to the Hill District library 01/23/2023, and will be continually updated in paper form. Also, the applicant will be committing to more regular community events online or in person on a quarterly basis to continue the exchange of information, along with biweekly dialog with EMC. A meeting with the DRP is scheduled for February 2023. The Curtain Call will be a separate FLDP and will be presented when funding and project plans allow. The application for street vacations was initiated in 2021. It was finalized in October 2022 and presented before City Council this morning 01/24/2023. The urban open space established by the vacations will be for the benefit of public mobility through the site. The operation of the open space will be consistent with UOS guidelines in the Zoning Code.

Chair Mondor asked for questions or comments from commissioners. She noted 4 different concerns already heard about performance under the CCIP, concerns about the role and position of CCIP, concerns about specifics related to the PLDP, and concerns about engagement.

Ms Burton-Faulk acknowledged the participation of public and individual testimony and the applicant immediately engaging with the residents from the last meeting and today. She also put it on record acknowledgement of the accuracy of the statement that the whole 101 page document was not new and only a small portion of it was new as an update. Another point is that, with continued engagement and quarterly meetings, concerns about participation may potentially get better.

Chair Mondor added to Ms Burton-Faulk's comments that there has been very strong efforts by staff, community, and others to create a process of engagement, but there can always be more and better engagement. The conversation today is to check in on the metrics and performance on the CCIP. She called upon colleagues in the EMC, SEA, and URA to ensure the applicants increase performance addressing these issues because the Planning Commission does not have all the tools to make it happen. At this time it is not in the PC's purview to enforce or push those things as they are being asked for. Chair Mondor stated she still has concerns about the shape and programming of the reconfigured open space of Block A. The PLDP clearly states that there is no asked for change to Block A and that it shall be a gathering place open to the public that takes into consideration the residential nature of sub-district 1 and does not see evidence that the reconfiguration can provide a wide range of amenities such as play zones, courts, and community gardens. She asked the applicant to show those types of programming baked into this reconfigured open space.

Mr Dunam stated the reconfiguration prioritizes access pathways and centralizes Wylie Ave rather than isolates spaces. Figure 7.16 uses switchback pathways to create a series of terraces programmed with age appropriate play areas by zone. More organized plazas with flexibility for different types of gatherings further down the site. If the concept of a reconfigured Curtain Call on Block A1 is not desired by the community, then further expansion of passive play and recreation areas will be considered. Using the hillsides and slopes following Wylie to create smaller, more intimate spaces increases the overall area with the larger gathering spaces benefiting from the expanded areas on Blocks F & G with even larger areas for gathering in Frankie Pace Park. This creates a set of different scaled spaces to use along Wylie Ave.

Ms Kirk stated that this prioritizes pedestrian access over cars, increases tree canopy, creates a variety of ecosystems and amenities, using the topography to take one through the site.

Chair Mondor explained that regardless of the shape, the team remains beholden to the PLDP Parcel A requirements. A series of pathways does not fulfill that requirement. The square shape allows for different types of activity. The challenge is how to make a space that is challenged topographically and dimensionally into a space that fulfills the Parcel A requirements.

Chair Mondor had no opinion on Mr Hood's piece of the presentation. She stated it is for the community to decide, along with the programming of the space. She had concerns about the

intention to keep the UOS open during business hours and sometime after, and how it will be maintained. She said they will look at other public spaces to see how they are administered. The public space on the lower part of the site expresses its Downtown character. The space on the upper part of the Hill will need to address the residential character of that area. Chair Mondor, noting many unresolved concerns that may need to be resolved outside of Planning Commission, asked for a motion to approve as stated in the report.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the amendments to the Preliminary Land Development Plan as presented in DCP-MPZC-2022-01041.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

NAYS: Ms Deitrick

CARRIED

Continued Hearing and Action

5. DCP-ZDR-2022-06099 – SP-11 Lower Hill Block E New construction of parking structure, public safety station, and entertainment venue Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented for the City staff. This FLDP is for a 910 space parking garage, a public safety station, and an approx. 95,000 sq ft entertainment venue. The storm water management is under review and must retain 1.2 inches of rainfall. Urban open space is not required on the parcel. Block F's urban open space must commence within 2 years of the 05/04/2021 approval of DCP-ZDR-2021-00265. There was a Staff Design Review and CDAP review 01/25/2022. A LEED ND checklist and documentation has been submitted.

Consideration of publicly available art must be integrated into the SP-11 Lower Hill Plan. A DAM meeting was held Oct 17 2022. A report on the projected outcome of development on jobs and tax generation must be submitted. The recommended motion is to approve the FLDP with conditions: 1. DOMI will approve all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROZA; 2. the storm water management plan will be approved prior to issuing the ROZA; and 3. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to Aissuing the ROZA.

Mr Sittig covered some items related to the hearing just completed. A statement of compliance with FLDP criteria has been filed. The focus of the Dashboard will be more for Block E. Comments from a previous briefing will be noted where appropriate as the hearing progresses.

Mr Buccini began the presentation. This is a \$110M mixed-use with a 910 space parking garage and 4,500 person Live Nation music venue, a modest retail space, and a new public safety facility in Block E with half an acre of open space. Some changes have been made per Commission and community feedback. The height has been reduced by 10 ft, and the outdoor component has been removed to eliminate any noise pollution. An additional economic incentive has been proposed for the Hill District in the form of a \$2 surcharge per ticket on all Live Nation events.

Dr Kimberly Ellis presented a historic view of the Hill District, beginning with 10 to 12 families in 1827 comprised of educators, business people, doctors, abolitionists operating in the Underground Railroad. They helped to create the first interracial, anti-slavery society during the antebellum period. This is never talked about in Pittsburgh. The African-American community advocated for themselves and enslaved brethren in Colored Conventions especially in places like Pittsburgh. There is a through line in progressive history and engaged activism involving the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church. She also summarized what the Lower Hill Cultural District housing the Civic Arena for the Civic Light Opera was supposed to be, and the result of Pittsburgh's first urban renewal opportunity, being a failure for the entire City of Pittsburgh. This new project is only the second opportunity in the Lower Hill. She noted the protests resulting in hiring of African-Americans to demolish the neighborhood but not hired to build new buildings. She emphasized that the story about their history must be matched with the new vision for our future.

The First Source Center is for business support as well as job seekers and those looking into construction. She also summarized the training programs supported by the Center, noting that none of them have reached capacity and need recruitment.

She also summarized the vacation of Wylie Ave, G4 engagement, and that after a call for artists, finalists have been chosen with most of them being from Pittsburgh. She presented a video to show what opportunities in this project look like, highlighting the WMBE fulfillment. Mr Bomani Mwambaciami Howze stated that the 101-page document will be made available at the First Source Center where people can also seek jobs and get assistance with contracting. The document will also be at the Hill District Library, subscribing to the CCIP that asks for coordinated community development. They have an engagement campaign and are willing to work on a monthly basis, or more often, to engage with a broad network of stewards for this project. Meetings have been arranged with Hill District Consensus Grp, Hill District Collaborative, government agencies, organizations, RCO's, and community groups. The contracts, developers report, workforce hours, contract values, company names, black-owned businesses, etc. in the Lower Hill CCIP monthly reports are given to the EMC, Mayor's Office, SEA, URA, and anyone else who would want to see them. There is a commitment to ensure the green space will be consistent from Frankie Pace Park to Wylie Ave and Crawford St. Mr Buccini summarized the LERTA, noting the Live Nation and parking garage is projected to generate \$3.8M to \$4.3M. Twenty-five percent of the projected parking tax will go into the community over the next 20 years, estimated to be \$8.5M to \$10M.

Mr Booth summarized the site plans for Block E. There is a change in grade of 40 ft. The block is subdivided in two, E1 is the parking garage with a portion as the public safety station, and E2 is the music venue. The garage has 3 vehicular entries for parking, with two other entries for loading and the public safety facility. There is a narrow landscape strip along Bedford Ave. The ground floor has a main vehicle entry, bike parking, 3 commercial spaces, and lobbies for the garage and main entrance to the venue. The loading area for the venue is off the 2nd level, the secondary vehicular entrance is off the 3rd level, the safety facility is on the 4th and 5th levels, along with terraces for the venue. There are 19 EV charging stations on the 2nd and 3rd levels. As a way of differentiating the public safety facility and giving it its own identity, a public art installation of etchings on the building is proposed to incorporate public art at Fullerton St and Bedford Ave. At Wylie Ave and Fullerton St, as a way to speak to the historical music legacy of this area, the architecture will incorporate the suggestion of piano keys along with art work in the façade. Another artistic installation will incorporate legacy elements to experience some of the history within all the lobbies of the garage.

Chair Mondor interjected that they were about to lose quorum and asked them to address the specific issues brought up by the Commission and to also get through public testimony. There was still a chance commissioners would not be able to vote today.

Mr Booth pointed out that all entrances are accessible, street trees were included as much as possible at any place where one could be included. Safety regarding ingress and egress was addressed with signage, mirrors, etc. to alert pedestrians crossing those areas. Also, DOMI standards and guidelines to address public safety in the public ways will be incorporated with features on the building around the entrances. Storm water management will be handled according to PWSA and LEED ND standards.

Mr Sittig mentioned that the Phase 1 of Block F2 open space will be part of Block E in a future Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Renee Wilson

Ms Wilson commented that they haven't been able to digest the first page. The notice was received only 2 days prior to the meeting. Elders and people with disabilities have a right to participate and should get fair warning when these meetings occur so that what has happened in the past is not repeated. People making \$22,000 a year need as much time as they can to make decisions on what they are going to do because these developments are raising rents, making them unable to live there. Let's not forget the people who came before us. Let us digest what we have before this is put on the plate of the community.

Mr Fraker recognized Chavaysha Chaney, Hill CDC.

Ms Chaney testified that the Hill CDC utilizes the DRP as its orderly and democratic process required by the RCO Ordinance. It is comprised of 9 Hill District organizations working to ensure equitable redevelopment. The Poland Group and PAR have not completed the DRP.

The second step of the DRP process was never completed because they were not ready due to Covid, and being focused on Block G1. On July 6, 2022, PPG and the Penns were invited to present an update on Block E since there were extensive changes and the 2-year time frame had elapsed. Poland Group promised to honor the DRP process but have refused to resubmit to DRP. Also, the DRP for Block G1 has failed because of low scores. She stated that the Lower Hill development team worked to form another RCO, hoping to secure a more favorable score. She commented that it is unacceptable for a private developer to meddle with City endorsement processes. She asked that the Commission instruct Buccini Pollin Group and the Pittsburgh Penguins to support equity by following through on their commitment to work with the community process.

Mr Fraker recognized Phyllis Ghafoor.

Ms Ghafoor asked if there was an action on the table today. She also asked if Mr Bomani Howze could talk with a group about what is going on.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk affirmed a vote for today, and that the development team will have to confirm with her.

Ms Ghafoor stated she will contact them later.

Mr Fraker recognized Dr Bonnie Young.

Dr Young wanted to clarify the level of community engagement by the Collaborative and Consensus Group, thinking there may be some misperception. She stated they reached out to Alliance Manor and other senior buildings in the neighborhood and took meeting flyers to people, explaining exactly what the meeting was about. More than 100 people were at the community meeting. A lower number of people scored the projects, but was still a significant number. She also stated that the repeated statement that Puccini Pollin created the Hill District Collaborative is patently false. The Collaborative came online due to grave concern about the openness and transparency of the DRP process. It is also the reason the Consensus Group started to engage in their own development review, wishing to put that on record.

Mr Fraker stated that the Hill CDC had their hand raised but believed they had already spoken.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked to confirm.

Mr Fraker recognized Glenn Grayson.

Mr Grayson wanted to state for the record that the comments he made earlier were for the PLDP and also for Block E so there is no confusion. He also had a question from his own perspective to understand what is meant when the Commission stated earlier that they are not going to enforce what is supposed to happen in the CCIP, but more encourage the applicant to show progress. As the presentation earlier was about the benefits and where they lie from the EMC point of view, from the Commission's point of view, did those things actually matter, or does the Commission have no control over them, and thus they don't go into the importance of the vote?

Mr Fraker recognized Marimba Milliones, Hill Community Development corporation.

Ms Milliones stated, regarding the statements made about propping up another RCO to achieve more favorable results, she felt it is very important that the Commission understand how critically important this is since they are specifically responsible for hearing the opinions of the RCO's. She cited a May 14, 2021, Planning Commission meeting on the YouTube Channel, Bomani Howze stated he had concerns with the DRP, insulting the development review process, he and the development team would honor the process and come back through it. You can see the commitment and exchange between Commission Brown and him. Yet, they failed to do that, probably thinking you wouldn't remember it while they were trying to secure approval for Block G1. While you may not think this is under your purview, she noted it is interesting they point out the investment they are making in the new Granada, a Hill CDC project, they have not provided that in writing. They have been asked at least 6 times over the past month to provide their commitment in writing in contractual form. They have failed to provide their contractual form for the \$2 surcharge for the parking garage. She pointed out the developer is getting a parking tax diversion that is taking money out of the City pension fund with the developer getting 75% of the proceeds, and the community is getting 25% of the proceeds. She questioned how it is equitable for the developer to get 75% of our public money and public tax dollars to go into their project while the community is stuck with 25% while they deal with complex issues around poverty. She also pointed out the while the

Workforce Development Center is doing well, the partner for work program who is supposed to be working with them is not involved in the project. She pointed out a pattern of unfulfilled promises, burden the Hill District community must bear. While we all want to see our community develop, we don't want see it develop on the backs of poor people who are just trying to ensure their community is protected. Finally, she noted that the LERTA is tax money that would have otherwise gone to Pittsburgh Public Schools, to the County, and to the City. It is tax money and public money. We are looking for are the commitments on the private investments that the Pittsburgh Penguins and the Puccini Poling Group have made.

Acting Burton-Faulk asked for comments or questions from commissioners.

Ms Dick stated it was very pleased to see the tribute to the Freedom House and the early history of the Hill District in the art.

Acting Burton-Faulk recognized Chair Mondor because her time was running short.

Chair Mondor made a couple comments first about the architecture. The biggest Improvement is the re-articulation of the public safety center in terms of it as an important Civic asset based on comments from Ms Mingo in a previous meeting. Her second comment was that probably 75% of this presentation was not about architecture. Thus, a better process may need to be in place to work through the public's concerns about the project. She hoped the EMC would be the body in which this would happen because the Commission is not in a position to manage every little detail on the issues. The applicant needs to respect the DRP process and to go through it. It is not in the Commission's purview to enforce the DRP process or the EMC. Those processes have to happen before it comes to the Commission. The developer can do a better job with the community being a part of the process. The Commission cannot be the Arbiter of all of these issues.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked, with the other Commissioners in agreement, to base a motion on the criteria set before them to approve with three conditions.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the FLDP with conditions:

1. DOMI will approve all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROZA; 2. The storm water management plan will be approved prior to issuing the ROZA; and 3. Final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

CARRIED

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00030, Liberty Avenue, Major Subdivision 1, Strip District
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00014, High Street, Minor Consolidation, Spring Garden
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00023, 11th Street, Minor Subdivision, South Side Flats
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01681, Chartiers Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Crafton Heights
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Minor Subdivision, Hays
6. DCP-LOT-2022-01623, Shady Avenue, Lot Line Revision, Squirrel Hill North

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if the plans of lots will be taken separately.

Mr Scheppke stated that there will be two batches. Item 1 will be its own. Items 2 through 6 will be taken as a batch.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk confirmed Item 1 is separate, and Items 2 through 6 will be batched together. She asked Mr Scheppke to read in the plans of lots and present the two batches.

Mr Scheppke presented Item 1 plan of lots. The recommended motion is to preliminarily approve the subdivision with final review scheduled Feb 7, 2023.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. There being none she asked for a motion for preliminary approval.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh preliminarily approve the subdivision with final review scheduled Feb 7, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

Mr Schepke presented Items 2 through 6 plans of lots. The recommended motion was to approve all items.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. There being none she asked for a motion from Commissioners.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve plan of lots Items 2 through 6.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash stated in a future meeting the Director's Report will outline an item from the Mayor's Transition Team Report, which is the development of a city-wide comprehensive plan and look forward to a longer discussion concerning the report.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:51 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

February 7, 2023 at 2:25 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Christine Mondor

In Attendance

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Jennifer Askey

Dina Blackwell
 Rachel O'Neill
 Becky Mingo

Not Present

Fred Brown

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Major Subdivision 1, Hays 2. DCP-LOT-2022-01593, Reed Roberts, Major Subdivision 2, Crawford Roberts 3. DCP-LOT-2022-01670, Watson Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff 4. DCP-LOT-2022-01677, Middletown Road, Minor Consolidation, Windgap 5. DCP-LOT-2022-01637, Penn Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Lower Lawrenceville	1

A. Approval of Minutes

No minutes were approved.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

There was no correspondence.

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2022-01099, Glass Run Road, Major Subdivision 1, Hays
2. DCP-LOT-2022-01593, Reed Roberts, Major Subdivision 2, Crawford Roberts
3. DCP-LOT-2022-01670, Watson Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01677, Middletown Road, Minor Consolidation, Windgap
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01637, Penn Avenue, Minor Consolidation, Lower Lawrenceville
6. DCP-LOT-2022-01649, Rickenbach Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Northside

Chair Mondor asked if the plans of lots will be taken together as one batch.

Mr Schepke affirmed all items as one batch. He presented each item with the recommended motion to approve all items.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. Hearing none she asked of commissioners had questions or comments. Hearing none she called for a motion to approve all plans of lots.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve plan of lots Items 1 through 6..

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Chair Mondor

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

D. Director's Report

Asst. Director Dash stated there were two items on the Director's Report. 1. Meeting with the Mayor's Office for next steps about their new terms and reappointments. 2. Scheduling follow-ups with the Director of City Planning around discussions as the City begins developing a process for the development of the comprehensive plan. This is a budget item funded in the 2023 Budget involving discussions about developing the scope, the understanding of the commissioners, and their role in the comprehensive plan as a commission and as individual members through the entire process of Scope of Work to the planning process to the implementation of outcomes. The commissioners will be contacted about scheduling discussions between now and the next commission meeting.

Chair Mondor asked for comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion to adjourn.

E. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2023 at 2:17 PM, Meeting called to order by Acting Chair Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Acting Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell

Rachel O'Neill
 Becky Mingo

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 Sabina Deitrick

Fred Brown
 Jennifer Askey

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-11908 – 626 Washington Place High wall signs for FNB tower Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood	2
2. DCP-ZDR-2020-03210 – 6112 Penn Avenue Demolition and new construction of bank East Liberty Neighborhood	
Plan of Lots	2
1. DCP-LOT-2022-11999, Hays Land, Major Consolidation 1, Hays	

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes for Jan 24, 2023.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED: Ms Mingo

CARRIED.

Minutes for Feb 7, 2023.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

515 Technology Drive

- Mark Frank

DCP-ZDR-2020-03210 – 6112 Penn Avenue

- Sean McKillop
- Skip Schwab, Deputy Director, ELDI

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-11908 – 626 Washington Place High wall signs for FNB tower Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing and action item.

Mr Gregory introduced the installation of 4 high wall signs for the FNB Tower located in a SP-11 district. Each side will have one sign 450 ft above grade. There was no request for a Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing. There was a design review by staff, and there was also a DAM meeting held 01/17/2023 with 3 RCOs, the Hill District Collaborative, the Hill CDC, and the Hill District Consensus Group. The recommendation by staff is that PC approve the signage with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to the final Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Mr Kolano presented the signs that were before the Planning Commission in a previous meeting. The signs presented today are more refined. There is just under 50,000 sq ft of total façade allowing a 996 sq ft sign. All 4 signs on each façade will be that same size. The letters of the signs are approximately 13 ft tall and have the FNB letters and signature logo. Views of all 4 sides were presented, showing the sign as navy by day and white by night. The signs have a perforated flexible material allowing the sign letters to change color, and the applicant requested that the sign change color for holidays along with other signs in the city skyline. The signs will be in compliance with the City's luminance levels for signs.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated there were no hands raised.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the high wall signage based on the application filed with the condition the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Mingo

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2020-03210 – 6112 Penn Avenue Demolition and new construction of bank East Liberty Neighborhood

Mr Kunak read in the project. It is for demolition of the existing 2-story bank building and new construction of a 2,660 sq ft 1-story bank with 8 accessory surface parking spaces. There was no request for a ZBA hearing. There was a design review by staff and a CDAP meeting held September 8, 2020. The building design was updated after a previous City Planning meeting October 12, 2021, to address commission comments. It was heard at a second City Planning meeting October 4, 2022. Both Planning Commission cases were denied without prejudice. A second staff design review and DCAP meeting was held June 7, 2022. The reviews concerning storm water management and DOMI infrastructure are ongoing. A Development Activities Meeting was not required as there was no Registered community Organization at the time of review. There was a previous historic nomination,

DCP-HN-2021-00163 that was not approved by City Council. Thus, this location does not have a local historic designation. The recommended motion is to approve this Project Development Plan with the condition that final construction documents, including landscape and site design, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Mr Knipper stated Citizens Bank entered into a new lease for a bank at 6112 Penn Avenue in March, 2020, with the plan to demolish the existing building and construct a new bank building. The team has made numerous design changes requested by the Planning Commission, including making the design more urban by changing the materials, modernizing the design, increasing the building height, adjusting the landscaping by using local and sustainable planting, and adding benches in a small Park area for the community. Mr Knipper noted in February, 2022, this Commission approved a similar sized branch office for another bank on the property next door. The team worked with various stakeholders to arrive at a design that addresses the concerns the Planning Commission expressed and comments from the community while still complying with their contemporary banking requirements. The current design meets the project development plan criteria set up in the Pittsburgh Zoning Code.

Mr Bisbano and Mr Levine offered a slide presentation. The location of the bank branch is at Center Avenue and Penn Avenue forming a triangle in East Liberty. The presentation described the development of the building using input from various sectors, CDAP, and the Planning Department. The exterior was changed to be more in keeping with properties along Center Avenue, adding some brick indentations to mimic columns, windows, and brick detailing at the cornice to create an authentic cap detail. The team explained how they satisfied each criteria item A through H and K. They also noted how the new configuration opens up the small park to the public, making the area more walkable.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for Public Testimony.

Sean Carter, Spec Asst to Cn Rev Ricky Burgess, testified that Cn Burgess supports the revised plan and hoped for favorable consideration by the Commission.

Bill Klieber stated the property has been vandalized and is in disrepair with graffiti, water intrusion into building, wall coverings and piles of ceiling material on the floor. He stated the building may be a health hazard. The new building will be much better and asked to at least allow the demolition as they did for the adjacent bank building. He stated the new branch bank will get the area looking its best again.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk called on commissioners for questions or comments.

Ms O'Neill asked if the park was owned by Citizens, and if not, was it jointly owned by someone. Was there an agreement who maintains property, or is it in the Right of Way?

Mr Kunak stated it is in the Right of Way.

Ms Reed stated that the City is most responsible for taking care of park.

Ms O'Neill asked if there had been any discussion between the responsible city department and applicant regarding maintenance of the park.

The answer was there was no discussion.

Ms O'Neill encouraged discussion on how it would operate with the City of Pittsburgh.

Ms Reed offered to be contacted about that.

Mr Bisbano stated he had a conversation with the tree warden on how to protect the trees included in their plan.

Ms O'Neill asked if there is a true 2nd story to the building.

Mr Bisbano state there is a false 2nd story with transparent windows with the illusion from a backer about a foot behind them. It won't feel like black film in a glass window.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk appreciated the nod to the former building and park, stating the format of the presentation was helpful to show the arrangement and walk-thru. She then called for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the PDP for demolition of the existing structure and new construction of a bank with accessory surface parking, with

the condition the final construction documents, including landscape and site plans, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2022-11999, Hays Land, Major Consolidation 1, Hays

Mr Scheppeke presented the plan of lots with the recommended motion to preliminarily approve the consolidation and schedule the final review March 7, 2023.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh preliminarily approve the consolidation and schedule the final review March 7, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, O'Neill

CARRIED.

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash stated there was none for this meeting.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:27 PM

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

March 7, 2023 at 2:50 PM, Meeting called to order by Acting Chair Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Acting Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell

Rachel O'Neill
 Becky Mingo
 Jennifer Askey

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 Sabina Deitrick

Fred Brown

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. Council Bill 2023-1178 Zoning text update to the standards for certain HVAC equipment in setbacks. City-wide	2
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00243, Grandview Ave, Major Subdivision, Duquesne Heights 2. DCP-LOT-2023-00204, Shakespeare Street, Major Consolidation, Shadyside Planning Commission Agenda 2 3. DCP-LOT-2023-00185, Bench Way, Minor Consolidation, New Homestead 4. DCP-LOT-2023-00127, Hays Land, Major Consolidation 2, Hays 5. DCP-LOT-2023-00196, Republic Street, Minor Consolidation, Duquesne Heights 6. DCP-LOT-2023-00207, Wood Street, Minor Consolidation, Central Business District 7. DCP-LOT-2023-00208, Forbes Ave, Minor Consolidation, Central Business District	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes for February 21, 2023

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve minutes for February 21, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED: Ms Askey

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

No Correspondence

C. Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2023-1178 Zoning text update to the standards for certain HVAC equipment in setbacks. City-wide

Mr Layman presented the Bill for staff and applicant. HVAC changed to be allowed within setbacks without a formal review. Requirements to be screened. Requires an Admin Exception. Standards for allowance within setbacks are unchanged. Simple amendment that removed setback by Admin Excep to By Right within side yards or on roofs. Clarifies is permitted within Res and Commc districts. Must be screened from neighboring property. Example of screening including privacy fences.

Cn Strassburger stated two constituents facing replacements concerned about the wait time, etc. There are easy fixes to have more seamless replacement with a simple change to the Code. Grateful for their consideration today.

Public Testimony

Mr Fraker stated no hands raised.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh send to City Council for approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00243, Grandview Ave, Major Subdivision, Duquesne Heights
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00204, Shakespeare Street, Major Consolidation, Shadyside Planning Commission Agenda 2
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00185, Bench Way, Minor Consolidation, New Homestead
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00127, Hays Land, Major Consolidation 2, Hays
5. DCP-LOT-2023-00196, Republic Street, Minor Consolidation, Duquesne Heights
6. DCP-LOT-2023-00207, Wood Street, Minor Consolidation, Central Business District
7. DCP-LOT-2023-00208, Forbes Ave, Minor Consolidation, Central Business District

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 1 and 2 batched together and then 3 through 7 together.

Mr Schepke presented Items 1 and 2. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve both Items 1 and 2 and schedule a final hearing at next PC meeting March 21, 2023. Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Pat Gianella, Democratic Committeeman for Grandview Ave area.

Mr Gianella wondered if anyone was notified of these additional changes in the plans. He thought they needed to be notified if it was in close proximity to their houses.

Mr Schepke stated there is no notification required for subdivision applications.

Mr Gianella stated they already opposed this project because the contractor did not bury telephone and utility lines in that area, and asked if they will be doing anything to Augusta St or Shaler St.

Mr Schepke stated the subdivision plans do not show any work being done on Shaler St or Augusta St.

Mr Gianella asked how they could expand their plan without showing any information or notifying the neighbors. This has been a bone of contention from the beginning of the water runoff hurting the neighbors. He had been notified by all the neighbors living on Rutledge St where all the water is going to flow.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated there is no project at this time being proposed during today's session.

Mr Layman, Ms O'Neill, Mr Kunak, and Ms Burton-Faulk clarified that these are just plans of lots either being consolidated or subdivided. The result will create 23 lots. They will be back to Planning Commission March 21, 2023, for final approval of the lots. This application is for

consolidating or subdividing land. A previous Planning Commission meeting presented the proposed development of 27 townhomes 23 of which required approval by Planning Commission. That was the time to object. Two zoning districts were previously reviewed. The Grandview Public Realm was required to be reviewed by Planning Commission for 23 of the townhomes. Another residential zone the other townhomes did not need Planning Commission approval. There is no expanded number of townhomes at this time.
Acting Chair Burton-Faulk

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily approve both Items 1 and 2 and schedule a final hearing at next PC meeting March 21, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

Mr Schepke read in Items 3 through 7 together. The recommended motion is to approve plan of lots Items 3 through 7.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there was public testimony.

Mr Fraker said no hands were raised.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve plan of lots Items 3 through 7.

MOVED BY: Ms Askey

SECONDED BY: Ms Mingo

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

E. Director's Report

None.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:22 PM

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

March 21, 2023 at 2:30 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Christine Mondor

In Attendance

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell

Sabina Deitrick
 Rachel O'Neill
 Becky Mingo
 Jennifer Askey

Not Present

Fred Brown

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-13062 – 600 Penn Avenue Exterior renovations to Heinz Hall Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood	1
2. DCP-ZDR-2022-02743 – 200 West General Robinson Street New construction of multi-unit residential structure North Shore Neighborhood	2
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00306, 450 Technology Dr, Major Consolidation 1, South Oakland 2. DCP-LOT-2023-00284, New Beaver Ave, Major Consolidation 1, Marshall-Shadeland 3. DCP-LOT-2023-00243, Grandview Ave, Major Subdivision 2, Duquesne Heights 4. DCP-LOT-2023-00204, Shakespeare St, Major Consolidation 2, Shadyside 5. DCP-LOT-2023-00324, Miltenberger St, Minor Consolidation, Bluff 6. DCP-LOT-2023-00301, Howley St, Minor Subdivision, Bloomfield 7. DCP-LOT-2023-00337, Natchez St, Minor Consolidation, Mount Washington	3

A. Approval of Minutes

No Minutes

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

No Correspondence

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-13062 – 600 Penn Avenue Exterior renovations to Heinz Hall Central Business District (Downtown) Neighborhood

Mr Gregory presented the project for DCP staff. This project is for exterior renovations for the Heinz Hall. The renovations include in kind window repair or replacements, exterior repairs, and lighting improvements on the building's Penn Avenue and Sixth Street facades. The proposed work is over the \$250,000 cost threshold for the Golden Triangle zoning district and triggers a

Planning Commission review for exterior renovations. There was no request for a Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing. The site is not located in the Penn/Liberty local historic district and no historic review was required. There was a Staff Design Review meeting January, 2023. The design staff accepted it as presented before the Planning Commission hearing with no comments. There was a Development Activities Meeting (Dam) with the Downtown Neighborhoods Registered Community Organization (RCO) February 9, 2023.

The recommendation from staff was that the Planning Commission approve the PDP with the standard condition that final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, will be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

Mr Pierce and his team made an abridged presentation based on a previous Planning Commission briefing. The primary work is a terracotta remediation, window replacements, and decorative lighting. Heinz Hall was originally created in 1971 as a historic adaptive reuse of a Lowes Theater purchased by the Heinz Endowment about 1968. It took about five years to convert it into the Symphony Hall as it is today. The addition to the right of the arched window was added around 1981. The team felt it was essential to keep Heinz Hall in its current iconic condition for the Theater District and the economic health of the downtown area. In researching the design guidelines of the Penn/Liberty historic district, throughout this entire project there was an emphasis to adhering to the historic precedence that had previously been established for the terracotta replacements, windows, and lighting to keep the historic precedents as the standard. Terracotta is a very interesting product because the molds must be enlarged by 17 percent so, upon firing the clay, the clay will become the correct size. Boston Valley, one of two leading, seasoned fabricators in the nation was chosen to create accurate molds for this type of restoration. Teresa Duff, a historic conservator, and Dr Elwyn Robinson, a nationally known terracotta consultant, provided consultancy on replacement of 160 pieces during this work. The replacement windows are ones flanking both sides at the top of the arched window on the upper three floors along Penn Ave. The replacement windows provide exact scale replications of the existing proportions, offering a historic style window that is considered among the finest replacement windows that can be purchased. The replacement blast lighting fixtures are the same fixtures used to illuminate notable commissions such as the Empire State Building. The replacement lighting creates a well-balanced dynamic light that is high efficiency and optically very clear. The lighting is also tunable to provide a very custom appearance for specific instances. The window installation would start in June and July. The majority of the terracotta replacement work will take place in August, and then in September the exterior lighting will be installed.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' comments or questions.

Ms Dick asked if the lighting was LED.

Chair Mondor questioned if replacing the Chicago style windows to the smaller window types meant the terracotta infill and cills under the windows were all new terracotta in 1970.

The team answered yes it was.

Chair Mondor asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the PDP with the standard condition that final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, will be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Chair Mondor

CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-02743 – 200 West General Robinson Street New construction of multi-unit residential structure North Shore Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for DCP staff. The PDP is for new construction of an 11-story multi-unit residential structure which includes 305 dwelling units, 117 off-street parking spaces, and approximately 2,000 gross square feet of accessory retail sales and services uses. There is no Registered Community Organization at this location and no Development Activities Meeting was required. A stormwater management plan was submitted and received conceptual review approval. This application was reviewed at Staff Design Review and the Contextual Design Advisory Panel on September 27, 2022. The transportation memo has been approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. This application is requesting seven performance points. The base height in the RIV-NS zone is 60 feet, and the maximum height is 150 feet. The proposed building height is approximately 130 feet. The proposed performance points are in the Planning Commission's report and also included the presentation for additional review. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approved this Project Development Plan as stated in the report with the following conditions: that the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; that the performance points were reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and that the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Wilkinson and the design team presented the project consisting of an 11 story, mixed-use project with 305 units, featuring some two-story units on a 12th level, and a little over 2,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor. Additional amenities are a water Filling Station, a bike repair station that caters to outdoor enthusiasts at this area, continuing the development of the North Shore into an everyday destination. Requested from a previous meeting, additional information and street level views were presented to show the public space, building, and context. The building is located just north of PNC Park between West General Robinson and Route 65 or 279 as they merge close to this site. It is a five-minute walk from the Metro and the team assumed a kind of transit-oriented development, thus providing reduced parking with only one curb cut from West General Robinson Street. The north and west sides of the site are privately owned with no public access to streets. The building is offset 50 feet from the highway to pull it away from the highway itself. The site has an undocumented PWSA water line running between the North side of the sidewalk and about 10 feet back from the building, preventing building within that area, but still meeting intent of the broker fund zoning design guidelines. A bike hub as a trail amenity for the waterfront will provide some sort of bike rental program and a permanent water bottle filling station and bike repair to make that area more of an outdoor enthusiast, bike centric type of location at a prominent corner. There is approximately 2,000 square feet of retail on the most active corner towards Federal Street with potential conversion of parking to retail provided there is enough demand in the future that will allow for retail to continue down the street. The team also added some public restrooms that are fully accessible by the public without having to go into the building as part of the riverfront trail system. Dark sky friendly lighting scenarios make sure it's a part of the dark sky initiative to reduce light pollution within the City of Pittsburgh. The entire site is accessible for all individuals using Ada detectable warning surfaces as well as lights to help protect the pedestrian traffic at the curb cut at West General Robinson St. Overall it will generate less traffic than before.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Alex Lacey.

Mr Lacey, Attorney for General Robinson Association, LP, stated the association was generally supportive, but a couple of issues needed to be raised and possibly add as conditions for final approval and as part of that final staff approval. One issue was working to arrange contractual on-street parking, and confirming that parking has been accommodated. Another issue was a secondary access point in the rear entrance for game day access exclusively would need to be approved. He also requested that Domi take a final review to make sure it does not materially affect any of the conclusions made in their transportation memorandum review.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions or comments. Chair Mondor asked Mr Kunak to address Mr Lacey's issues, noting it was an unusual rare condition and would help commissioners understand how that changes this application.

Mr Kunak asked Mr Layman for comments.

Mr Layman thought it would somehow fit within DOMI's purview. He stated this is a little unusual, and the commission certainly isn't under any obligation to apply additional conditions at the request of a neighboring property owner. A possible condition, if the commission was interested, would be something along the lines of the final DOMI and DCP review and approval of the standard transportation plan, also addressing that this review took place.

Mr Kunak stated the transportation memo has been approved

Mr Fox stated for the record there is no proposed change to Laycock Street from its current use. He added that they are there for almost every event on the North Shore, performing the traffic event management for Acrisure Stadium and PNC Park. The rear street is gated off for vehicles that have already parked in that lot, and the chain is dropped about an hour or so after the event has started. It is not used as an entrance and remains chained on a normal weekday basis outside of events. He continued that the property owner always contemplated that there would be a future development for this surface parking lot. Along with the parking agreements for the adjacent hotels, there was a parking relocation agreement that the parking would be relocated when this site was developed. The team is working through those details about relocating some of the parking that was specifically on this site to some Lots directly behind the hotel. There will be a lot less people using parking when this building is developed. The team is working through the details with the parties to make sure that parking is relocated according to the agreements that are in place, and that any traffic studies or memos take into account any traffic generated by the hotels.

Mr Layman suggested an alternative proposal to ask the neighbors to send in writing to DCP and the Commission their particular concerns, copying the applicant with a condition to take those into consideration. It would not be appropriate to make a judgment call on DOMI at the 11th hour here.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioner's comments.

Ms Burton-Faulk stated that the concerns should be in writing and should be sent over, and they should be reviewed. She didn't think that Planning Commission should include that in their scope today outside of additional review.

Ms Dick agreed with Ms Burton-Faulk.

Chair Mondor asked Ms Burton-Faulk to clarify asking that those concerns be written and sent, or that they write and send it with no condition applied by the commission.

Ms Burton-Faulk replied those concerns be written and sent.

Mr Layman stated that it should be in writing, noting without understanding the depth, and having no representative from Domi.

Chair Mondor asked for any additional comments or questions from commissioners.

Ms Dick asked that during the construction time the sidewalk on the opposite side of General Robinson would be utilized. She wanted to ensure that provisions were made for safe crossing and safe access to the sidewalk for people utilizing wheelchairs and other mobility aids because often they are forgotten when signage for alternate pathways goes up.

Mr Deklawa stated they would take that into consideration.

Mr Layman proposed a condition that upon timely receipt of written transportation concerns from the neighboring property owner DCP and DOMI staff shall take those concerns into consideration to the extent that they are relevant and agreeable.

Ms Burton-Faulk moved with that condition in place.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve this Project Development Plan as stated in the report with the following conditions: that the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; that the performance points were reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; that the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing

the Record of Zoning Approval; and that, upon timely receipt of written transportation concerns from the neighboring property owner, DCP and DOMI staff shall take those concerns into consideration to the extent that they are relevant and agreeable.

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor
CARRIED

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00306, 450 Technology Dr, Major Consolidation 1, South Oakland
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00284, New Beaver Ave, Major Consolidation 1, Marshall-Shadeland
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00243, Grandview Ave, Major Subdivision 2, Duquesne Heights
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00204, Shakespeare St, Major Consolidation 2, Shadyside
5. DCP-LOT-2023-00324, Miltenberger St, Minor Consolidation, Bluff
6. DCP-LOT-2023-00301, Howley St, Minor Subdivision, Bloomfield
7. DCP-LOT-2023-00337, Natchez St, Minor Consolidation, Mount Washington

Chair Mondor asked if any items could be batched together. Items 1, 2, & 3 were heard separately, then items 4 through 7 batched together.

Mr Kunak presented Item 1. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve Item 1 and schedule a final hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked if commissioners had questions or comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily approve Item 1 and schedule a final hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor
CARRIED

Mr Kunak presented Item 2. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve Item 2 and schedule a final hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked if commissioners had questions or comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily approve Item 2 and schedule a final hearing at next PC meeting.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor
CARRIED

Mr Kunak read in Item 3 for final approval from a previous Planning Commission meeting. The recommended motion was to approve Item 3.

Chair Mondor asked if there was public testimony.

Mr Fraker said no hands were raised.

Chair Mondor asked if commissioners had questions or comments. Chair Mondor asked about lines representing frontage on the subdivision survey, what was the purpose of the subdivision?

Mr Kunak stated it was to meet minimum lot sizes.

Mr Layman noted this subdivision was not illegal , but was not necessarily conventional nor causes parcels to not be utilized under the Zoning Code.

Chair Mondor asked commissioners for questions or comments.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve plan of lots Item 3.

MOVED BY: Ms Askey

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor
CARRIED.

Chair Mondor read in items 4 through 7.

Mr Kunak read in Item 4 for final approval. The recommended motion is to approve Item 4.

Mr Kunak read in Item 5. He stated that the report was incomplete. Item 5 was not heard.

Mr Kunak read in Items 6 and 7 for final approval. The recommended motion is to approve Items 6 and 7.

Chair Mondor asked if there was public testimony re items 4, 6, & 7.

Mr Fraker said no hands were raised.

Chair Mondor asked commissioners for questions or comments.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Items 4, 6, & 7.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor
CARRIED.

E. Director's Report

No Director's report.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:14 PM

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

April 4, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick
Dina Blackwell

Rachel O'Neill
Becky Mingo
Jennifer Askey

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
Sabina Deitrick

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Schepke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-10014 – 214 Seneca Street Partial demolition of rear portion of single-family residence Bluff Neighborhood	1
2. DCP-ZDR-2023-01295 – Minor amendment to University of Pittsburgh Institutional Master Plan Oakland Neighborhood	2
3. DCP-ZDR-2022-11509 – 3710 Terrace Street new construction for University of Pittsburgh Sports Performance Center North Oakland Neighborhood	2
Plan of Lots	3
1. DCP-LOT-2023-00274, Terrace Street, Major Subdivision 1, West Oakland	
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00362, Hamilton Ave, Major Consolidation 1, Larimer	
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00379, Mifflin Road, Major Subdivision 1, Lincoln Place	
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00377, Butler Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Lawrenceville	
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01524, N Sheridan Ave, Minor Lot Line Revision, Highland Park	
6. DCP-LOT-2023-00396, Ellsworth Ave, Minor Consolidation, Shadyside	
7. DCP-LOT-2023-00324, Miltenberger Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff	
8. DCP-LOT-2023-00306, 450 Technology Dr, Major Consolidation 2, South Oakland	
9. DCP-LOT-2023-00284, New Beaver Ave, Major Consolidation 2, Marshall-Shadeland	

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for March 7, 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Askey

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2022-11509 – 1400 Fifth Avenue

- Hill Community Development Corporation

- Hill District Consensus Group
- Hill District Collaborative
- Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-10014 – 214 Seneca Street Partial demolition of rear portion of single-family residence Bluff Neighborhood

Ms Rakus presented for DCP Staff. a partial demolition of a rear portion of a single-family residence in the Bluff neighborhood. This is an application for a partial demolition of a single-story addition at the rear of an existing two-story single unit, attached residential structure uh this is in the Uptown Public Realm Sub-district B, and as such every building demolition requires a project development plan review and approval by the Planning Commission. In the presentation, there is some proposed new construction. However, it is under the threshold for Planning Commission review. It is included in the presentation for reference only. A Development Activities Meeting was held virtually on January 17, 2023. The recommended motion that the Planning Commission approve the partial demolition with no conditions Ms Whitney and the team presented the project. This project is located in the Uptown area. There was a two-story frame addition on the rear of this residence that was in poor condition, and the owner actually has already demolished it. It was about 180 square feet and attached to the neighboring structure. The brick house structure itself remains intact. Historically, it appears that the addition was probably on this parcel for quite some time. The team intends to put something back in its place but much smaller in scale and more in line with the rest of the neighborhood in color. The team presented views of the proposed new addition.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for questions or comments from commissioners or for a motion to approve with no conditions.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves the Project Development Plan for partial demolition of a single-story addition at the rear of an existing two-story, single-unit, attached residential structure.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2023-01295 – Minor amendment to University of Pittsburgh Institutional Master Plan Oakland Neighborhood

Vice Chair read in this item with Ms O'Neill recusing from Items 2 and 3.

Ms Rakus introduced the amendment for DCP staff. The zoning code allows a minor amendment to an Institutional Master Plan as a Project Development Plan. This PDP is a minor text change to the Aliquippa Street Public Realm Plan they had presented at a previous briefing, which closes the loophole on when the Aliquippa Street Public Realm Master Plan would have to be done. A Development Activities Meeting was held with Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, Oakland Business Improvement District, and with the Hill Community Development Corporation and other Hill District groups. Both of the motions for Items 2 and 3 are in the same report. The recommended motion for Item 2 is that the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves the Project Development Plan for the minor amendment to their Institutional Master Plan.

Mr Alcorn and the team presented Item 2. This is a minor amendment to the Institutional Master Plan approved in 2021 to clarify the timing of the Aliquippa Public Realm Plan in connection with the development of a new Arena and Sports Performance Center also presented in this meeting. The Aliquippa Public Realm Plan study area starts near Trees Hall at Robinson Street, continues past the Fitzgerald Field House, the Peterson Events Center and

the future site of the Arena and Sports Performance Center, and ends around Panther Hall at Utterback Drive. so the public realm plan was identified for improvements in the hilltop District of imp Aliquippa Street with a connector street that could see future developments. the public realm plan would provide a vision of the street to ensure development sites fronting Aliquippa will enhance a development safety and sustainability goals of imp. this vision will establish guidelines for Streetscape elements such as sidewalks, open space, Landscaping, site furniture, sight lighting, and wayfinding. Imp provides Urban Design guidelines for the hilltop District and this page 191 highlights the text that we are proposing to change. the design guidelines called for a public realm plan to be required in conjunction with the first project development along Aliquippa Street. the university worked with a city to confirm the timing of this Aliquippa public realm plan in conjunction with the arena and Sports Performance Center. we have worked to modify the proposed tax based on community feedback. it removed the last portion with the timing of a plan being regarded as open-ended. the proposed text was read verbatim: a public realm plan will be developed in conjunction with a first project development plan along Aliquippa Street the project development plan for the arena Annex may be approved while the Aliquippa public realm plan is being developed the public realm plan shall be completed and accepted by the second project development plan along Aliquippa Street. we will continue to develop the plan in the coming months with the surrounding communities. Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated there were no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for questions or comments from commissioners or for a motion. Ms Mingo asked if they have coordinated with both the VA and the Falk Laboratory School as that section impacts their egress.

Mr Alcorn stated they will definitely be reaching out to the surrounding Property Owners and Community groups regarding the public realm plan, working with the city on an engagement strategy to make sure that all the community groups around this area are able to provide input, including the adjacent property owners.

Ms Mingo asked the team to explain the timing to again and how it relates to making the modifications on Aliquippa Street for 3710 Terrace Street new construction being presented next based on the public realm, even though the public realm timing is different.

Mr Alcorn explained with hopefully presenting this plan at a briefing to the Planning Commission probably late this year or early next year. That will correspond to the construction of the Arena and Sports Performance Center. Anything that would be modified based off of an initial plans for the public realm plan will be incorporated into a project since the landscaping and the sidewalks are will be the last element to be constructed.

Ms Mingo asked if that includes things like bicycle egress and pedestrians who might use wheels of varying sorts to get around, noting the difficult terrain and a commitment from Pitt to make sure that the everyone in the public realm is going to be taken care of in this project.

Mr Alcorn stated this Public Realm Plan is a vision for the street and will be implemented as development projects come up in the future citing several development sites on the streets with only one being proposed currently. The vision of the street will incorporate all those elements in all those considerations as time goes on and as these development sites come forward the street will be enhanced to this full vision.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk Commissioners asked if there were any other questions or if there was a motion on the floor for the recommended approval of the minor amendments to the University of Pitts institutional master plan.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves the Project Development Plan for the minor amendment to the University of Pittsburgh's Institutional Master Plan.

MOVED BY: Ms Askey

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2022-11509 – 3710 Terrace Street new construction for University of Pittsburgh Sports Performance Center North Oakland Neighborhood

Ms Rakus introduced this application for a structure of approximately 240,000 gross square feet for the Arena and Sports Performance Center. The amendment to the Institutional Master Plan went to a Development Activities Meeting September 12, 2022. The use of the structure will include a gym with accessory offices, locker rooms, the pedestrian bridge, and a green roof. The project complies with the adopted Institutional Master Plan. It went to Staff Design Review and the City's Contextual Design Advisory Panel December 6, 2022. The applicant team received conceptual approval for the storm water management plan, and the application is currently under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. The recommendation is to approve the Project Development Plan for new construction of an Arena and Sports Performance Center with two conditions: 1. that DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

Mr Alcorn and the team presented the project development plan approval to construct a new Arena and Sports Performance Center (ASPC). The project is bounded by the Peterson Events Center to the Southwest, Aliquippa Street to the Northwest, Panther Hall to the North, Irvis Hall to the East, and UPMC's Western Psychiatric to the southeast. Based on comments from a briefing two weeks ago the team showed several contextual images of the proposed development site with the surrounding buildings, the Peterson Event Center, Panther Hall and nearby Scaife Hall and Irvis Hall. The Arena and Sports Performance Center will have the same similar style of windows as the Panther Hall and Irvis Hall residential buildings. The new structure will also have similar ribbing feature aspects as the roof of Peterson Events Center, similar colored metal panel lane, and some of those same colors and materials used in surrounding buildings will be used in the new building. The project site is on a bowl that remains from the demolition of Pitt Stadium in 1999. The site slopes down approximately 136 feet from Aliquippa Street towards DeSoto Street and includes man-made slopes greater than 25%. Just to the left of Panther Hall is a loading area and that portion of a loading area will be integrated into a new project. It includes a downward grade for truck parking for direct access into the building as well as a screening fence to prevent or to screen views into this area as well as the view showing the proposed location of the compactor. The new building will house practice sports, performance competition sports, medicine and wellness facilities. It is only one structure, but has two sections, the Sports Performance Center and Arena, divided by a central staircase, green open space areas of respite, and pedestrian pathways surrounding the new building. The project site is identified as Site 5C which is a Peterson bowl and fill in the Hilltop District of the IMP approved in 2021. The Arena and Sports Performance Center meets or exceeds the requirements for Site 5C in the IMP.

Mr Powell presented and discussed views of exterior materials, elevations, and landscaping proposed for the project. Another new view in response to the briefing feedback showed the new Sports Performance Center in its context with the surrounding buildings and landscaping. The project supplies parking for 48 bikes. This includes 24 spaces at the 500 level immediately adjacent to Aliquippa St and 24 spaces at the lower 100 level. The university has an established public art committee to evaluate and advise on public art opportunities for potential placement of artistic works at the Arena and Sports Performance Center, being reviewed further by the Public Art Committee. The university set a goal to increase tree canopy by four percent on campus over the 10-year time period of the IMP. The project will include 65 new trees, 30 canopy or shade trees and 35 understory trees.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk after the presentation, asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments, questions or a motion to approve as noted in their report.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to approve the Project Development Plan for new construction of an Arena and Sports Performance Center with two conditions: 1. that DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00274, Terrace Street, Major Subdivision 1, West Oakland
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00362, Hamilton Ave, Major Consolidation 1, Larimer
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00379, Mifflin Road, Major Subdivision 1, Lincoln Place
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00377, Butler Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Lawrenceville
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01524, N Sheridan Ave, Minor Lot Line Revision, Highland Park
6. DCP-LOT-2023-00396, Ellsworth Ave, Minor Consolidation, Shadyside
7. DCP-LOT-2023-00324, Miltenberger Street, Minor Consolidation, Bluff
8. DCP-LOT-2023-00306, 450 Technology Dr, Major Consolidation 2, South Oakland
9. DCP-LOT-2023-00284, New Beaver Ave, Major Consolidation 2, Marshall-Shadeland

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk understood there would be two batches of plans of lots. She read through the first batch consisting of Items 1, 2, and 3.

Ms Rakus presented Items 1, 2, and 3. The recommended motion was preliminary approval of Items 1, 2, and 3, and schedule a final review at Planning Commission April 18, 2023.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily Items 1, 2, and 3, and schedule a final review at Planning Commission April 18, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read through the second batch consisting of Items 4 through 9.

Ms Rakus presented the second batch consisting of Items 4 through 9. Items 8 and 9 were first presented at Planning Commission March 21, 2023, and were presented for final review at this meeting.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Items 4 through 9.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

E. Director's Report
No Director's report.

F. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:17 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

April 18, 2023 at 2:07 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick
Dina Blackwell

Sabina Deitrick
Becky Mingo

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
Fred Brown

Jennifer Askey
Rachel O'Neill

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Schepke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2023-01460 – 1410 Fifth Avenue Exterior alterations to existing structure Bluff Neighborhood	2
2. DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 – 1400 Fifth Avenue Demolition and new construction of multi-unit residential structure Bluff Neighborhood	2
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00274, Terrace Street, Major Subdivision 2, West Oakland 2. DCP-LOT-2023-00362, Hamilton Ave, Major Consolidation 2, Larimer 3. DCP-LOT-2023-00379, Mifflin Road, Major Subdivision 2, Lincoln Place 4. DCP-LOT-2022-01278, Howe Street, Minor Subdivision, Shadyside 5. DCP-LOT-2022-01624, E Ohio Street, Minor Consolidation, East Allegheny 6. DCP-LOT-2023-00360, Minor Subdivision, Hazelwood	3

A. Approval of Minutes

No minutes for approval

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2022-11509 – 3710 Terrace Street

- Oakland Business Improvement District (OBID)

DCP-MPZC-2021-01229 – 31st Street Studio Master Development Plan

Staff Note: this project is currently scheduled for a future Planning Commission Briefing

- Dr. Robert Capretto

DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 – 1400 Fifth Avenue

- Anne Kramer

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-01460 – 1410 Fifth Avenue Exterior alterations to existing structure Bluff Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced two items for City staff, brought together under the same application and presentation. The first is DCP-ZDR-2023-01460 for exterior alterations to an existing four-story structure at 1410 Fifth Avenue. Per Section 908.01.F structures involving external alterations in excess of \$100,000 in the Uptown Public Realm require a Public Development Plan reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The proposed exterior alterations exceed \$100,000 and primarily include window replacement. A Development Activities Meeting was held virtually on September 19, 2022. The recommended motion 1 is that the Planning Commission approve PDP application DCP-ZDR-2023-01460 for exterior alterations to an existing four-story structure. The second item is DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 for the 1400 block of Fifth Avenue for demolition and new construction of a multi-use, approximately 3,400 gross square feet, four-story new structure adjacent to 1410 Fifth Avenue. It includes 34 dwelling units, accessory uses including support offices, six off-street parking spaces, dumpster enclosure, and off-street loading. A Development Activities Meeting was held virtually on September 9th, 2022. The proposed project was reviewed at Staff Design

Review on November 28, 2022. A CDAP meeting was not recommended, and the applicant worked with Staff on their Urban Design Targets. This application has received conceptual approval of its Storm Water Management Plan, and the application is currently under review by DOMI, the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. This location is within the Eco Innovation District. Per UPR development standards, new buildings with a gross floor area greater than 100,000 square feet shall undergo a Green Building Advisory Consultation and join the Pittsburgh 2030 District. The recommended motion 2 is that the Planning Commission approve PDP DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 for demolition and new construction for use as a multi-unit residential structure with the following conditions: that Domi shall review final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approval prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and that final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Schmidt and the team explained that Bethlehem Haven provides a permanent supportive housing program located at 1410 Fifth Avenue building. The renovations at 1410 Fifth Avenue are due to the fact that many of the women have been there 10 plus years. The facility is in dire need of renovations and is not up to code. The HVAC heating system is in dire need of repair. The ultimate result will be a fully renovated building with individual single-room occupancies for all of the 26 women. The second part is the Uptown Flats project also being presented that is the addition of a four-story, 34-unit, low-income affordable housing structure that will also house the administrative offices for Bethlehem Haven. Renovations to the first floor are the lobby space, some offices, and bathrooms. The lower level will be reconfigured for a community room, some staff spaces, and new bathrooms. The second floor will become new single occupancy rooms and some new bathroom spaces. The third and fourth floor single occupancy rooms will receive new finishes. The window replacements will keep the existing openings, removing the old windows and replacing those with new energy efficient windows and replacing the doors on the lower level with a storefront as well as replacing windows on a second-floor balcony. Also, the exterior stone will be cleaned, regouted and repointed, and on the rear side repairs to structural cracks.

The Uptown Flats project is a proposal to demolish four existing buildings with renovations to the brick, masonry facade elements of an existing building, break up the scale of the building using different facade design on the top floor. On the lower floors a new storefront similar to a lot of these buildings that are nearby will be installed. several scenarios were considered for keeping the facades. The owner also went through a historic review which revealed the first floor is not original, and although the upper two floors have some nice characteristics and features the historical preservation consultant deemed that this building really had no historical significance for this area. Options with the possibility to preserve that façade presented several challenges. In order to meet the program the height needs to be four floors, presenting some zoning challenges to add another floor to the buildings of being over the 50-foot requirement. Another challenge to preserve a façade like this would require a lot of engineering and shoring to keep that facade in place, becoming a very costly thing to do. Also, introducing a storefront the first floor would have been very costly from a structural standpoint. Lastly, all the floors would need to be aligned if the

floors were maintained. That would require some internal ramps which posed another set of challenges causing windows to be misaligned.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Sabreena Miller.

Ms Miller, Real Estate and Development Program Manager with Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh in support of project;

Mr Fraker no other hands raised

Chair Mondor asked for Commissioners' comments or questions.

Chair Mondor asked about one of the buildings to the right of 1410 5th Ave with some significant architectural detail and what the team is doing in the demolition of that to salvage or preserve any of it.

Mr Schmidt stated as previously outlined, working with a historic consultant on preservation if the building and finding no historical significance to the buildings; aligning floors would require ramps; preservation would be too costly. He stated the owner liked the new design being proposed.

Chair Mondor asked if Construction Junction or similar entity would come in and salvage any of the architectural elements.

Mr Schmidt stated that they could reach out to Construction Junction about salvaging some of the elements.

Chair Mondor stated that as Uptown changes and moves from the kind of granular small-scale buildings to larger institutional scale buildings she did not want to lose any of the assets that might be reused or valued architecturally in some way. She urged the team to check into that.

Ms Mingo stated the two buildings are some of the last examples of Italianate architecture on 5th Ave in a sea of parking. The City code clearly says that the proposed developments must adequately have this um retain and reuse significant structures unless it is shown that it is no longer economically or physically viable. Affordable budget is not the same as economic renovation. There is a strong emphasis on preservation of buildings. She stated that the team hasn't shown they are not economically viable only not affordable and asked if they have looked into historic tax credits to help fund project.

Mr Schmidt stated no exploration into tax credits was explored by the owner.

Ms Fatcheo appreciated the commissioners' comments and noted the challenge of continued increasing costs of materials and construction. She stated they have been very diligent in pursuing financial funding for the project so that no debt is incurred at the end of the project and dealing with the issues of Covid, increasing costs, and trying to maintain the beauty of the façade.

Chair Mondor stated public testimony closed. She recognized Ms Andrews as part of applicants as a partner.

Ms Andrews Action Housing stated the two buildings 1410 5th Ave and 1406 Gerard wouldn't work for both buildings. At 1406 Gerard as previously mentioned the floors and windows don't line up with the rest of the block. It was very hard to integrate it into a larger apartment building that works with the low-income housing tax credit project. Because this is supportive affordable housing, it must fund the entire project with grants, low-income housing tax credit equity, and historic tax credits. This wouldn't work for the entire project. For 1410 5th Ave, over \$4,000,000 has been raised to do the renovation to preserve and keep every historic element that exists in a way that will be there for the long term. Unfortunately, it didn't work to allow building a 34 unit apartment building because of an increase of about 40 percent in construction costs over the last few years. This has been very hard on affordable housing. The cap on low-income housing tax credits has been raised a little bit but not enough to cover that difference. Everything is being done with the 1410 building renovation. She liked idea of working with Construction Junction to try to preserve whatever elements could be saved as a part of the demolition.

Mr Schmidt stated Construction Junction will work with salvaging elements from the 1406 Gerard building.

Chair Mondor asked if there was any way at the corner of Stevenson & Watson to more engage the street. Is there any way to make that corner little more engaging at a pedestrian scale that exists right now with these buildings? The buildings in this block went from being very small scale and granular that characterizes historic Uptown to being an institutional scale with one entry and one treatment across all the facades. There is no real place to engage the street a little more?

Mr Schmidt noted the grade is a challenge stating where to located the entry is very limited along with having an accessible entrance. The large storefront windows are a challenge because of the raised floor level at that location. Since the aspect of that corner now is kind of a nuisance bar the community really appreciates the fact that that building will go away and a different type of activization be on that corner.

Chair Mondor stated it goes from being a nuisance bar that's very engaging to being something that's kind of defensive and that there's going to be blinds down all the time in that corner office. Also, on the back side underneath the two-bedroom apartment window, is that a better place to put the bike storage, coming off the sidewalk and showing somebody lives here? It's engaged and active in places where this reads as a kind of residential or institutional but engages the street a little more. It would be great to invoke some some of that activity out of it.

Ms Dick asked mainly for the public that uh both of these buildings the older one and the newer one uh would be totally acceptable to people utilizing Wheelchairs will they be accessible; elevators in both buildings?

Ms Dick move to approve both motions as stated in the reports.

MOTION:

RECOMMENDED MOTION 1:

That the Planning Commission approves Project Development Plan Application DCP-ZDR-2023-01460 as filed by LGA Partners on behalf of BETHLEHAM HAVEN OF PITTSBURGH INC, property owner, for exterior alterations to an existing 4-story structure.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor

OPPOSED: Ms Deitrick

CARRIED.

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 – 1400 Fifth Avenue Demolition and new construction of multi-unit residential structure Bluff Neighborhood

MOTION:

RECOMMENDED MOTION 2:

That the Planning Commission approves Project Development Plan Application DCP-ZDR-2022-03469 filed by LGA Partners on behalf of BETHLEHAM HAVEN OF PITTSBURGH INC and 1400 FIFTH AVENUE, property owners, for demolition and new construction of a multi-use residential structure, with the following conditions:

1. DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuing

the Record of Zoning Approval; and

2. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor

OPPOSED: Ms Deitrick

CARRIED.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00274, Terrace Street, Major Subdivision 2, West Oakland
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00362, Hamilton Ave, Major Consolidation 2, Larimer
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00379, Mifflin Road, Major Subdivision 2, Lincoln Place
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01278, Howe Street, Minor Subdivision, Shadyside

- 5. DCP-LOT-2022-01624, E Ohio Street, Minor Consolidation, East Allegheny
- 6. DCP-LOT-2023-00360, Minor Subdivision, Hazelwood

Chair Mondor read in Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 in one batch.

Mr Scheppke Item 5 applicant asked to remove from agenda.

Mr Scheppke read in Items 1, 2, and 3 which were first reviewed by the Planning Commission on April 4th, 2023. The recommended motion is to approve Item 1, 2, and 3. Mr Scheppke read Items 4 and 6, with the recommended motions is to approve Items 4 and 6.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony concerning Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions or comments.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily Items 1, 2, and 3, and schedule a final review at Planning Commission April 18, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mondor

CARRIED

- E. Director's Report
No Director's report.

- F. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:13 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

May 2, 2023 at 2:45 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick

Sabina Deitrick
Rachel O'Neill
Jennifer Askey

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
Fred Brown

Dina Blackwell
Becky Mingo

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Scheppeke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-00002 – 2810 South Water Street New construction of a sports court in SP-5 South Side Flats Neighborhood	2
2. DCP-ZDR-2023-02699 – 5230 Centre Avenue Exterior alterations to existing structure Shadyside Neighborhood	2
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00566, Hazelwood Green, Major Subdivision, Hazelwood 2. DCP-LOT-2023-00531, Reed Roberts, Major Consolidation 1, Crawford-Roberts 3. DCP-LOT-2023-00547, Railroad Street, Major Consolidation 1, Strip District 4. DCP-LOT-2023-00549, Greenbush Street, Lot Line Revision, Mount Washington 5. DCP-LOT-2023-00502, Ellers Street, Lot Line Revision, West Oakland 6. DCP-LOT-2023-00554, Butler Street, Minor Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville	3

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for March 21, 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Askey

SECONDED: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

Approval of minutes for April 4, 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick,

ABSTAINED: Ms Deitrick, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-MPZC-2021-01229 – 31st Street Studio Master Development Plan

- Strip District Neighbors
- Riverlife

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02699 – 5230 Centre Avenue Exterior alterations to existing structure Shadyside Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced the project for City Planning. The existing structure is part of the Baum-Center Corridor Overlay District. Since it involves exterior alterations in excess of \$50,000, a Planning Commission review and approval as a Project Development Plan is required. The scope of work includes exterior alterations to replace the facade of a portion of structure at the rear of the property. A Development Activities Meeting is not required as this address is not located within a Registered Community Organization boundary. A Staff Design Review was held because the structure faces toward the rear of the property. The City Planning staff had no outstanding concerns. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission approves this PDP for exterior alterations to the existing structure with the following condition: that final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Altmeyer and the team presented slides and views to illustrate their PDP to repair approximately 102 linear feet of an aggregate precast wall panel system that has failed above the Ambulance Entry Façade within the UPMC Shadyside campus behind the South Aiken Garage.

This happened late last year when pieces started falling from the façade. The replacement was designed to look as much like the adjacent and existing paneling as possible that are still in acceptable condition. Four windows that are located in the Precast panels will be replaced. In order to mitigate and minimize damage to vehicles and to individuals, a scaffolding system was placed above or below the failing area to catch debris. An architectural partner was engaged to create a design which was presented for application to PLI, and was referred to the Planning Commission process.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Lenore Williams, representing the Baum-Centre Initiative.

Ms Williams stated that there was a review of this project by the BCI on April 18, 2023, with UPMC in which it was unanimously and heartily recommended that it be approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of approves this PDP for exterior alterations to the existing structure with the following condition: that final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-00002 – 2810 South Water Street New construction of a sports court in SP-5 South Side Flats Neighborhood

Ms O'Neill recused herself from this item.

Mr Gregory introduced the project for City Planning the application for site improvements and new construction of a sports court for basketball and pickleball enclosed by a 10 foot

fence as well as other minor Landscaping at 2801 South Water Street in the South Side Flats located in the SP5 Specialty Planned District. This development was reviewed against the Preliminary Land Use Development plan or PLDP for the SP5 South Side Works area. The applicant proposed some minor amendments to allow this development as a sports court and fencing under the adopted PLDP included as part of the Tunnel Park. It is intended to be used only as a landscape plan amendment to allow for the Sports Court which is a more intensive use than just open, passive recreation. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing under ZBA Case 86 of 2022 occurred July, 2022, approved a variance for a 10 foot tall fence around the Sports Court with no conditions. A Staff Design Review was held January, 2022.

There were no design comments. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure or Domi staff reviewed and approved the site plan. A Development Activities Meeting or was held virtually March 19, 2022, with the South Side Community Council, the Registered Community Organization for the area. The DCP Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Final Land Use Development Plan and Associated minor amendments to the Project Development Plan for use of the sports court with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans, landscape plans, and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr McCune and the team presented before and after slides and photos showing the overall plan, intending to locate the sports court in the middle of the vacant lot over the CSX tunnel with trees surrounding the area. There will be minimal impact to the area of disturbance. The overall vision is to create an urban environment that is active and vibrant with basketball and pickleball. The fence received a variance for a height of 10 feet for safety to keep the balls and the players enclosed in the court area. A few benches will be added and a few trees will be relocated, replacing trees wherever needed to fit the sport court in the width of the property lines without encroaching onto the public right-of-way. The sidewalk will be completed to circle the area with a crosswalk on the bottom. There will be an accessible access on a paved area, meeting accessible requirements for the sport court.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there was any public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated there were no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions or comments or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved with standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans, landscape plans, and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms Askey

IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00566, Hazelwood Green, Major Subdivision, Hazelwood
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00531, Reed Roberts, Major Consolidation 1, Crawford-Roberts
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00547, Railroad Street, Major Consolidation 1, Strip District
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00549, Greenbush Street, Lot Line Revision, Mount Washington
5. DCP-LOT-2023-00502, Eilers Street, Lot Line Revision, West Oakland
6. DCP-LOT-2023-00554, Butler Street, Minor Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville

Ms Askey recused from Item 1.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read in Item 1

Mr Schepke presented Item 1, recommending preliminarily approve with final review schedule May 16, 2023.
Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a preliminary motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily Items 1, 2, and 3, and schedule a final review at Planning Commission April 18, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick
SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick
IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick
RECUSED: Ms Askey, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 2 and 3.
Mr Schepke presented Items 2 and 3, recommending preliminarily approve Items 2 and 3 with final review scheduled May 16, 2023.
Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a preliminary motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily Items 2, and 3, and schedule a final review at Planning Commission May 16, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick
SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill
IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 4 through 6.
Mr Schepke presented Items 4, 5, and 6, recommending approval of Items 4, 5, and 6.
Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.
Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.
Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to approve Items 4, 5, and 6.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill
SECONDED BY: Ms Askey
IN FAVOR: Ms Askey, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash presented the Director's Report. Noted City Council's approval of two new Commissioners, joining the Planning Commission are Monica Ruiz and Peter Quintanilla. Commissioners thanked departing Commissioners Jennifer Askey and Fred Brown for their service.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:28 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other

notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick
Peter Quintanilla
Dina Blackwell

Becky Mingo
Rachel O'Neill
Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor

Sabina Deitrick

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Schepke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZCP-2022-12524 – 201 Amber Street Alterations to Enright Park East Liberty Neighborhood	2
2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04415 – 843 Freeport Road Demolition and new construction of bank Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar Neighborhood	2
3. DCP-MPZC-2021-01229 – 31st Street Studios Master Development Plan for 31st Street Studios site Strip District Neighborhood	
Plan of Lots	3
1. DCP-LOT-2023-00566, Hazelwood Green, Major Subdivision 2, Hazelwood	
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00531, Reed Roberts, Major Consolidation 2, Crawford-Roberts	
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00547, Railroad Street, Major Consolidation 2, Strip District	
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00436, Henderson Street, Minor Consolidation, Fineview	
5. DCP-LOT-2023-00616, Marina Drive, Lot line revision, New Homestead	

Mr Dash welcomed two new commissioners, Peter Quintanilla and Monica Ruiz,

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for, April 18, 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo

SECONDED: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED: Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

Approval of minutes for, May 2, 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED: Ms Mingo, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-MPZC-2021-01229 – 31st Street Studio Master Development Plan

- Bobby Wilson, Councilman, City of Pittsburgh, District 1
- David Heaton, President & CEO, The Buncher Company

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZCP-2022-12524 – 201 Amber Street Alterations to Enright Park East Liberty Neighborhood

Mr Gregory introduced the project for City Planning. FLDP for redevelopment of Enright Park. Engagement slide from presentation. the application includes site improvements for Enright Park including a new sports court enclosed by 10 foot tall fence and a new pavilion.

planned unit developments, including the AP district require Planning Commission review as an FLDP which is reviewed against the Preliminary Land Development Plan and is compliant with the PLDP which was adopted in 2018. Staff reviewed this development against the adopted Pennley and Enright Park Master Plan. A variance to allow a 10-foot high fence within the required exterior side setback was approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment Case 5 of 2023 in March 2023. The project obtained the necessary approval from the Public Art and Civic Design Commission in March 2023, which is required for a work on City owned property. The stormwater management plan for this development has been approved. A Development Activities Meeting was held last year. DCP Staff recommended that Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the FLDP based on the application filed by Patrick MTR on behalf of the City of Pittsburgh with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Andrea Ketzel presented the project for the Department of Public Works who met with the area community groups Bloomfield Garfield Corporation, Friendship Community Group and Neighbors, and the Village Collaborative of East Liberty. The presentation included slides of existing conditions and proposed renovations. The site is located behind the new Whole Foods development situated between Friendship, East Liberty and Shadyside neighborhoods. Some of the priorities from the master plan include preserving as many large trees as possible, especially the Oaks, including a number of new tree plantings in the park to create shade. A significant number of trees will be replanted, only removing three trees as part of the park renovations. The renovations will include open and flexible park space to keep or augment the existing programming on site, which is at least one full basketball court, lighting included in the design, as well as space devoted to the playground, open lawn, and some unprogrammed paved areas for different types of play. The water feature that was in the previous park will be expanded to create a larger spray feature space, which will include the salvaged whale from the previous park, additional shade, and seating. Another priority was to reuse some of the wood from the trees that had to be removed for reclaimed wood benches, a natural seating area, and tables also made from repurposed wood. Rain gardens were not required for the storm water management plan, but a small depression next to the basketball court was included. The community requested more natural, interesting plantings for a more natural aesthetic to the play equipment and space. The spray features themselves will also be ADA accessible, along with some ADA swings, a friendship swing, and traditional belt swings and top swings. Typical standard park features include picnic tables and benches, trash receptacles, water fountain, lighting and a grill in the pavilion, standard bike racks, and screened Port-O-Johns.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for commissioners' questions or comments.

Ms Mingo asked if the sidewalk runs the entire length of Eva Street from Negley Ave to Amber St because, from Amber St to South Euclid Ave, the sidewalk is discontinued.

Ms Ketzel stated the park space contains a walkway that comes to Amber Street and then diverts into the park and then reconnects to South Euclid Street.

Ms Mingo asked about people who are crossing at South Negley to go to the park and maybe using wheels or other things to get to the playground or pass through to the library on South Euclid. She stated that they are going to walk across the grass creating a dirt path there. She asked if it is possible to add a sidewalk to that entire side versus having to cross back and forth, noting it is probably the most practical and most accessible solution for the neighborhood.

Ms Ketzel believed that there is a contiguous sidewalk on the north side of Eva Street and is the reason the sidewalk is not on both sides, noting then there is a crosswalk at the entrance to the center of the park.

Ms Mingo asked if there are crosswalks on the new street that the Whole Foods is on above Eva.

Ms Ketzel stated there are two crosswalks there.

Ms Mingo asked if the crosswalks are painted. She also asked if DOMI has plans to put crosswalks at intersections on that side and on S Negley Ave.

Ms Ketzel stated there are two entrances at the Eva St label, and there will be two striped crosswalks coming across Eva Street.

Ms Mingo asked if DOMI intends too to make a crosswalk at the intersection from South Euclid Ave across Eva Street, voicing her concerns about the kids coming across from that area and it being chaos right now.

Ms Ketzel stated she could talk with Domi about getting that added into their budget to have the South Negley cross right where the bus station is located.

Ms Mingo stated concerns at South Negley, already seeing kids crossing either Coral or South Negley, and cars not used to humans being there yet. Her concerns also included the same thing at South Euclid Avenue.

Ms Ketzel and Ms Reed stated they will consult about it.

Ms Ketzel confirmed for Ms O'Neill that at the Eva St connection the side walk is 6 feet wide and due to the grading along that area only a single bench was added.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if there were additional questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve FLDP with standard condition

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Mingo

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04415 – 843 Freeport Road Demolition and new construction of bank Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced the project for City Planning FLDP for Demolition of an existing one-story structure and new construction of a one-story structure for use as a bank with accessory drive through lanes and surface parking. The zoning district is a CP, Commercial Planning and Development District. Allowable uses in the CP District of those approved by the Planning Commission in accordance with PLDP, Preliminary Land Development Plan. The Planning Commission shall have the authority to approve any use that is allowed in the HC District subject to the same conditions and limitations as apply to those areas when located in the HC District. A Bank or Financial Institution, General, is a permitted use in the HC zoning District. The proposed drive-through is a permitted use in the HC District as well per Section 912.04.M. The applicant must provide a transportation impact study for review and approval by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. Domi provided an approval letter in June of 2022.

A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Lincoln-Lemington Collaborative, the Registered Community Organization, May 14, 2023. A variance to exceed the maximum number of 19 parking spaces to 37 spaces was approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment as Case 130 of 2022 subject to the condition that landscaping and screening be installed in accordance with the Zoning Code requirements. The project was reviewed at Staff Design Review. The recommended motion was that Planning Commission approve the Final Land Development Plan for demolition of an existing one-story structure and new construction of a one-story structure for use as a bank with the accessory drive through and its surface parking subject to the following conditions: that final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and that the applicant continues to work with City Planning Staff to finalize and approve the landscaping and screening requirements per the ZBA decision.

Ms Temika Latilla and the applicant team presented the Bank of America project located at 843 Freeport Road, demolishing the existing Pier One retail store and constructing a new 4,240 square foot Bank of America branch. The applicant team presented photos and slides of existing conditions and the proposed design of the bank structure, proposed parking and two drive-up ATM lanes as well as one bypass lane with a total of four planned in the future. The site also included upgrades to the existing stormwater facilities, reduction of impervious surfaces, and installation of landscaping and associated infrastructure. Materials used are consistent with the surrounding area. The Department of City Planning staff expressed some concerns towards the amount of glazing on the other facets of the building other than the building entrance. To address those concerns the team increased the glazing along both the North and the South facades. DCP staff also encouraged ways to minimize the auto-centric design of the site by either pushing the building closer to Freeport Road or by incorporating more landscaping. Since the building could not be relocated due to parking constraints additional landscaping was added to the site. Downsizing from the original approximately 9,000 sq ft Pier One to a 4,240 square foot building substantially increased the green space compared to the previous landscaping. There will be one public access off of Freeport Road and one private entrance/exit through the Waterworks development. A third access point to the Northwest will be closed to provide safer and more direct traffic flow and queuing through the drive-through lanes. Nine trees will be added throughout the property along with an entire row of landscaping for a buffer on the outside of the drive-through lane. Along the Freeport Road frontage the property line against the edge of the existing parking spaces on the south is a very limited area for improvements. The team stated they have done what they can throughout the remainder of the site to meet the intent of the Landscaping ordinance. Both the electric and data connection public service will be coming in from an existing utility pole on the site. A private sewer service parallel to Freeport Road will enter into the building on the southwest corner, along with water service from the Water Works which will tap in at its current location on the property and running through the new green space to the southwest corner of the building. All downspouts from the new building will connect into an underground storm water system, ultimately flowing down to a new connection port into Freeport Road. Water will run through a TerraClean water quality device to ensure no excess pollutants leave the property into the public system. In addition, there will be upgrades and replacements to the existing trench drain across the Freeport Road entrance, running back through the system to ensure all water is controlled throughout the site. Some additional features of the storm water system are permanent inlet protection bags for the primary inlets that will not run through the system, keeping the underground system and basin clean and able to handle particulate loads and promote infiltration into the site. ADA compliance is up to code, including turning radius and path of travel into the main entrance. The ADA accessible parking was shifted from directly in front of the door to provide adequate access into the building creating the shortest path without impacting mode of travel.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions or comments or motion.

Mr Quintanilla asked if he heard correctly that the team was asking for more parking?

Mr Mastowski stated parking will be maintained to maintain the retaining wall.

There is a retaining wall that is right along the property line and just behind the retaining wall is a 96-inch water line. The intent is to maintain that existing parking to help maintain that retaining wall and protect that utility. There is additional existing parking along Freeport Road. There is an overhead power line and utility conduit that runs through that easement above those parking spaces. Maintaining those parking spaces will allow the utility providers to access those utilities without landscaping improvements getting in the way.

Mr Quintanilla noted there is a large amount of parking that is underutilized in the near vicinity. Driving up and down the view is actually one of the worst along Freeport Rd. There is an opportunity to probably add more landscaping and buffer from Freeport. Utilities deal with landscaping so he didn't necessarily see that as an obstacle.

Mr Mastowski said it was discussed with the Waterworks development landlord. The property line does run right along the private drive. The option for the northern parking was explored. However, the evaluation that sidewalk access to that parking would be unsafe for any users of the bank, crossing that private drive. There is no posted speed limit on the private drive, and this would keep the accessibility to the site and maintain the existing curb line and parking along Freeport Rd for any additional parking spaces.

Mr Quintanilla also stated that after Covid he didn't see how a Bank of America would actually have a bigger draw than the commercial retail shop that used to be there.

Ms Mingo stated there is a stop sign there because there is a major bus stop directly along that road near the Giant Eagle. She stated people will walk through the parking lot and then cross to Pier One by walking. She expressed disappointment that no attempt to take the opportunity to change the nature of this place by adding some sidewalks where an enormous amount of people takes the bus. She noted the requirements for the FLDP to address pedestrian safety and sidewalk capacity, no attempt was made to make a fairly dangerous situation for them any better.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there were any other comments or a motion?

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Final Land Development Plan Application for a one-story structure for use as a Bank with accessory drive-throughs and surface parking, subject to the following conditions:

1. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval;
2. The applicant continues to work with City Planning staff to finalize and approve the landscaping and screening requirements per the ZBA decision.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill,

OPPOSED: Ms Mingo, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms Ruiz

CARRIED.

3. DCP-MPZC-2021-01229 – 31st Street Studios Master Development Plan for 31st Street Studios site Strip District Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced the Master Development Plan for a multi-phase development, including multi-unit residential, retail sales and service, accessory parking structure, and accessory exterior open space. The proposed Master Development Plan encompasses approximately 9.7 acres and includes phased development of approximately four buildings within four blocks and four internal, shared streets. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing was not required for project development plans within Block B. Block C may require a variance for relief to the build-to zone requirements due to the PennDOT aerial easements for the 31st Street Bridge. Future project development plans within this Master Development Plan will be subject to the design standards of the RIV District, and will also, address storm water management plan requirements independently. The Department of

Mobility and Infrastructure, DOMI, staff is currently reviewing the Transportation Impact Study. Parking for this Master Development Plan will primarily be provided in the parking structure located in Block B. Supplemental on-street and internal parking will be provided on each block. In order to achieve the development as proposed, future Project Development Plans, PDP's, will incorporate performance points per Section 915.07.D. This will be reviewed in the presentation proposed: Block A will achieve one point, Block B four points, and Block D four points. A Development Activities Meeting was not required as this address is not located within the area of a Registered Community Organization. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve this Master Development Plan application as stated above with the following condition: that DOMI approves the Transportation Impact Study, and that any recommendations be accepted and implemented.

Mr Cavaluzzi and the team presented the former plate steel manufacturing site as four development sites, improvements to the Railroad St site line, 785 parking spaces, and ground-level convenience parking, and reintroducing access to the riverfront and an area of the Strip District between 31st St and 32nd St. None of the development blocks will be built in the flood plain, which runs along the riverside edge of interior Street B. Block A will consist of adaptive reuse into a community facility and residential amenity building. Blocks B & C will house 250 residential units, parking in Block B, and organizing Block C to take advantage of the view. Block D will be another main waterfront development block with 250 units, 100 parking spaces, and open space. Roadways and sidewalks will be provided between 31st St & 32nd St. The riverfront will be developed for pedestrian cyclists and public activities with interior streets A, B & C for pedestrian & cyclist traffic only except for emergency vehicles. Retail will be located in Blocks C & D. A traffic study included stop signs and entrance points, optimization of signals, and traffic demand management to increase multi modal travel around the site. Both Liberty Ave and Penn Ave provide public transportation to stops that would provide access for pedestrians and cyclists. All the internal streets', especially Street C's, sidewalks are sized larger than the drive aisles to make sure that it's a comfortable and safe pedestrian environment for cyclists and pedestrians. A 95-foot setback from the riverfront will provide a generous amount of space to create unique, diverse, engaging environments for both the residents of the site and for visitors. At each phase of development stormwater management will incorporate best practices for capturing and treating storm water and reusing as much as possible onsite. Each phase of development will include rooftop solar energy generation on the parking structure and potentially on residential buildings. A key component of developing each phase will be an aggressive effort in reducing the amount of energy each of these buildings uses.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated there were no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments, questions, or a motion.

Ms O'Neill had a few questions. She confirmed that citing the RIV requirements build-to lines, the internal private streets will have 60 percent of those building frontages within those build-to lines on each side of each building. She also asked for clarification about the Railroad Street Frontage between 31st and 32nd Streets being outside the deed line or if it is on the site.

Mr Seybert stated it is in the property line and has not been dedicated. It is a key goal of the City to improve Railroad Street over time. In the interim a street and sidewalk will be built out to provide access both for pedestrians and vehicles between 31st and 32nd Street. Ms O'Neill clarified that the intention is to build out as stated, assuming working with DOMI misread on here and then eventually Domi, who would accept that for dedication.

Ms Reed stated that regarding Railroad Street DOMI is asking developments that are abutting the street to set a condition where there's a 10-foot sidewalk with allowance for right-of-way, just setting everything up in preparation in the hope that one day that will become right-of-way.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk seeing no more comments asked for a motion to approved with conditions as stated in the report.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve a multi-phase development including multi-unit residential, retail sales and services, accessory parking structure, and accessory exterior open space with the condition that DOMI approves the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) and that any recommendations be accepted and implemented.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00566, Hazelwood Green, Major Subdivision 2, Hazelwood
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00531, Reed Roberts, Major Consolidation 2, Crawford-Roberts
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00547, Railroad Street, Major Consolidation 2, Strip District
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00436, Henderson Street, Minor Consolidation, Fineview
5. DCP-LOT-2023-00616, Marina Drive, Lot line revision, New Homestead

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read Items 1 through 5. All items taken as one batch.

Mr Scheppeke presented Items 1 through 5. Items 1 and 2 were first reviewed 05/02/23. The recommended motion was to approve Items 1 and 2. After presenting the remaining items, the recommended motion was to approve Items 3 through 5.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

None.

F. Adjournment

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk thanked outgoing commission members and welcomed incoming new members.

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:44 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

May 30, 2023 at 2:55 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick
Peter Quintanilla

Sabina Deitrick
Becky Mingo
Dina Blackwell
Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Rachel O'Neill

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Schepke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2022-14438 – 2114 Tustin Street New construction of single unit detached home in the UPR zoning district Bluff Neighborhood	2
2. DCP- ZDR-2021-06752 – 506 West Jefferson Street New construction of residential accessory space in Steep Slopes Overlay Central Northside Neighborhood	2
3. DCP-ZDR-2022-10252 – 4801 Baum Boulevard Exterior alterations to an existing structure in Baum-Centre Overlay Bloomfield Neighborhood	
Plan of Lots	3
1. DCP-LOT-2023-00673, 230 Cedarhurst Street, Major Consolidation, Beltzhoover	
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00672, 214 Cedarhurst Street, Minor Consolidation, Beltzhoover	
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00620, Climax Street, Minor Consolidation, Beltzhoover	
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00669, E Ohio Street, Minor Consolidation, East Allegheny	

A. Approval of Minutes

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 – 320 East North Avenue – AGH IMP

- Megan McKelvey
- Bob Malakoff
- Alex Pagareski
- Donald J. Dugal
- Randy Smith

DCP- ZDR-2021-06752 – 506 West Jefferson Street

- Don & Justine Cunningham
- Subdivision Regulations
- Alex Pagareski

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-14438 – 2114 Tustin Street New construction of single unit detached home in the UPR zoning district Bluff Neighborhood

Mr Gregory introduced the project for City staff. The project is a Project Development Plan (PDP) in the Uptown Public Realm Subdistrict B for new construction of a three-story single unit dwelling with an integral garage at the front and an attached deck at the rear on a currently vacant lot. New construction or development in the UPR costing more than \$100,000 requires review and approval by the Planning Commission. There were no requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for this project. No storm water management plans were required for this development. Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approved the proposed curb cut for the integral garage off Tustin Street. A Development Activities Meeting (DAM) was held virtually April 17, 2023, with the Uptown Neighborhood's three Registered Community Organizations, the Hill District Collaborative, the Hill CDC, and Uptown Partners.

Mr David Roth presented the project as the first new house construction being built with the new zoning code. The adjacent lot will likely always remain vacant with billboards that are leased in perpetuity. Contextual images were presented, showing the Billboards and elevations of a relatively timeless, modern building. The palette of proposed products and materials used will be Hardy fiber cement siding with the colors meant to be sympathetic with the context of the surroundings, concrete block, which is somewhat contextual to the industrial nature of the area. The west side the building is zero lot line party wall. The rear south side facing the Boulevard of the Allies will have a deck and an egress window on the lower level with flex space that could be used as a third bedroom. The rear of the property is facing south and could include a retractable awning. One of the provisions unique in the zoning code is the requirement for some transparency at the ground floor between the heights of three feet and eight feet with sixty percent of the facade to be transparent. There were three meetings with Uptown Partners who envisioned this setting the tone for some similar projects that are to come. Also, in a meeting with the RCO's, two indicated their support but they didn't think they had a need for a formal review. Mr Roth also worked closely with City Planning and the community group and received permission for the garage to be actually translucent as opposed to transparent. A floor plan was also included in the presentation to show the planning concept for the building with the first-floor garage, flex space that could also be used as a bedroom, upstairs great room concept with a nice big kitchen, and then two primary bedrooms on the third floor.

Chair Mondor opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Chair Mondor asked for questions or comments from commissioners.

Mr Quintanilla stated a concern about the materials used on the garage and main entrance. The garage would be faced with the nicer stone type of wall and then the main entrance faced with siding, which in terms of hierarchy of the materials, they are not the same. He felt that the main entrance should be expressed and accentuated with better materials. He asked if there was less need for that exchange of materials in the façade with one neutral facade so that it still feels like a house.

Mr Roth stated there were no comments at a previous briefing. He was trying to make the transition a little less suburban by having the front facade include the block at the ground floor. He stated he was not expecting too many comments today, and his preference would be to not have to make any revisions necessary to bring back to the Commission.

As a response to the feedback from Uptown, it has a nice sense of entrance. It's going to have a small entrance canopy over it. He thought the hierarchy was there. Yet, he was not averse to doing what the commissioner was suggesting. Mr Roth felt that the zoning requirements imposed the district now really apply to more public buildings and big commercial buildings on primary streets as opposed to smaller scale construction buildings on secondary streets. He noted this has been an onerous task trying to navigate the approval process of this private development house being held to a standard that typically would be for larger scale commercial buildings, and would really like to leave this meeting with the approval to move this project forward. It would be very helpful to not have to reconvene another meeting for this building in two weeks.

Chair Mondor opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Chair Mondor opened the floor for commissioners' questions or comments.

Mr Quintanilla and Chair Mondor had a brief discussion about suggested recommendations with a small change and whether they would need to come back to the commission and which criteria it most aligns with, along with the zoning district standards, and hearing and action reports, to help the rest of the commission make their decision. Chair Mondor stated it is atypical to attach a condition for a project this size, but that doesn't mean a commissioner doesn't have the prerogative of bringing that forward at any time.

Chair Mondor stated typically this is applied to building anomalies or different uses and resolving them. This project already has a curb cut and an allowance for the garage that already has an entitlement. It should be leveraged in a case where we feel that there is some adverse effect in the public realm, something would need to be crafted that commissioners agree, that would rise to the level of the condition.

Mr Quintanilla withdrew.

Chair Mondor stated commissioners can always make comments and ask questions for discussion. When it comes down to attaching a condition or approving or denying something, those are different levels of concern.

Chair Mondor asked commissioners if there were additional questions, comments, or a motion.

Ms Dick moved that it be approved as presented

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve the PDP with the following condition: the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

2. DCP- ZDR-2021-06752 – 506 West Jefferson Street New construction of residential accessory space in Steep Slopes Overlay Central Northside Neighborhood

Mr Gregory introduced the project for City Planning. This project proposes new work, in addition to what was approved in 2019 under DCP-ZDR-2019-01147, into the adjoining lot and behind. It includes site improvements and new construction of six single-unit residences, including 506 West Jefferson Street, an elevated plaza for a pool and hot tub, as well as fencing and landscaping, and a playground at the rear. It was back before the Planning Commission for re-review against the steep slopes overlay. A geotechnical report is required for work within the steep slopes overlay. Staff reviewed the submitted geotechnical report and found it administratively sufficient. The grading plans and the retaining walls were found to be compliant with Zoning Code Sections 915.02.B and 915.02.D, Slope Revegetation and Tree Replacement standards, that were still under review with staff. A storm water management plan was not required for this development. City Planning staff posted on-site notices in the area May 30, 2023. Planning Commission hearing notices were mailed to abutting property owners 21 days in advance and posted on the City Planning Website. Mr Gregory encountered technical difficulties and the recommended motion was read by Mr Kunak.

Mr Kunak read in the recommended motion that the Planning Commission approve this Project Development Plan with the following conditions: all measures recommended in the applicant's geotechnical report shall be implemented; the final landscape plan, including tree replacement and slope stabilization and revegetation, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval (Roza); and the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, to be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Tyson Miller and the applicant team presented two homes have been constructed as an accessory use to 506 W Jefferson St, approved, constructed, and occupied last year. The

applicant purchased a separate piece of property, parcel 23-E-74, that was not part of the previous approval. This parcel is adjacent to parcel 23-E-390, which was one of those two homes. The lot area is 4,000 square feet. Therefore stormwater management is not required. A portion of this lot is in the steep slope overlay. Views showing conditions of the lot were presented along with slides showing the proposed outdoor patio living space, outdoor kitchen, a pool and a hot tub and, retaining walls, additional landscaping, hardscaping, and fencing. Materials include a variety of paver stones, cast-in-place concrete retaining wall with a stone veneer, benches, either grass or a turf material, one of the fences will be a black ornamental style and the perimeter fence will be a board on board fence.

One of the conditions of approval was an updated landscaping plan that was submitted to the department last week or the week before showing additional slope for vegetation as required in the steep slope overlay, adding some shrubs along the property line and along West Jefferson Street. A geotechnical investigation was done and recommendations in that report will be followed as part of the construction.

Chair Mondor opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Mondor asked for commissioners' questions or comments or motion.

Chair Mondor asked about the condition of neighboring back yards if and if the new retaining wall is a continuation of their retaining wall.

Mr Miller stated that there was a retaining wall installed as part of 508 W Jefferson St. there were no retaining walls installed as part of 506 W Jefferson St. Additional approval was needed as this is an addition to the original approval. It is basically an accessory use to that to that house.

Chair Mondor verified there was the fence on the retaining wall to keep people from falling off the retaining wall and then a privacy fence on the property line.

Chair Mondor asked if staff could speak to the additional levels of review that occur when there is a steep slope application.

Mr Gregory stated it is the project's interaction with the steep and vulnerable slopes raises it before the commission to ensure that all the recommendations within the geotechnical report have been implemented as they pertain to Section 915 standards

around the maximum grade that they can do, how tall retaining walls can be, as well as slope for vegetation will be applied to make sure that the final site design is compliant with the code.

Mr Layman added that there is also a relationship between the Land Operations Code that requires the same geotechnical report to be reviewed and comments made by the PLI reviewers who are providing a more technical review, while following the recommendations through the inspection, and including a special inspector, if necessary. Steep slope and landslide prone applications are taken seriously, and that is integrated in the process throughout construction to ensure that those recommendations are adhered to, and there is no vulnerability.

Chair Mondor asked if there were any other questions or concerns from commissioners.

Chair Mondor asked for motion to approve as stated.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Project Development Plan with the following conditions: all measures recommended in the applicant's geotechnical report shall be implemented; the final landscape plan, including tree replacement and slope stabilization and revegetation, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval (Roza); and the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, to be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED.

3. DCP-ZDR-2022-10252 – 4801 Baum Boulevard Exterior alterations to an existing structure in Baum-Centre Overlay Bloomfield Neighborhood

Mr Gregory introduced the Project Development Plan for exterior renovations to an existing car dealership in the Urban Neighbor Commercial or UNC zoning district and the Baum Centre Overlay. This application includes site improvements to the existing parking area and installation of a new storefront window system to the building's southerly and westerly facades. The design staff reviewed the proposed renovations in March, 2023, and accepted the renovations as proposed, noting that they appreciated that the project increased the building's transparency especially along Baum Boulevard. There were no requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for this case. No storm water management plan was required for this project. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) staff reviewed and approved the site work to the existing parking areas. A Development Activities Meeting (DAM) was held virtually on April 14, 2023, with the Bloomfield Development Corporation, the Registered Community Organization for this area. This project is before the Planning Commission as a Project Development Plan because it is in the Baum Center Overlay, and the cost of the exterior renovations exceeds the \$50,000 threshold, requiring a Planning Commission review. City Planning staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve this PDP with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval. Mr Chris Peters and the team presented the project for improvements at the BMW dealership on Baum Boulevard for exterior renovation of the parking lot to provide new ADA parking for a new accessible entrance along the one face of the building. The renovations for the building include increasing the transparency along the Baum Boulevard façade. The team presented photos and an updated building elevation as requested from a previous meeting, providing more detail along the Baum Blvd façade, photos of the existing facade and windows, and more detail on architectural elements and facade improvements. The existing BMW standard is a white color while the BMW Mini is white with a black strip of some sort of extruded material to project outward. In this situation the street presence will remain the same with the application of a vinyl band Kynar painted band, giving the illusion with no significant projection from the building. The black band on the storefront will define that part of the store as the Mini side. The windows on the south elevation will be modified from 17 ft wide to a width of about 22 to 24 ft, depending on the design pattern and supporting steel for the windows. The window heights are remaining the same. A new metal panel system around the windows will be replaced to match the existing white metal panel system. In the new storefront system, the glazing will remain clear as it is now in the building. The color of the window system is sterling gray which is a slightly darker color than regular anodized aluminum.

Chair Mondor opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker none

Chair Mondor questions or comments from commissioners. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve this PDP with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00673, 230 Cedarhurst Street, Major Consolidation, Beltzhoover
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00672, 214 Cedarhurst Street, Minor Consolidation, Beltzhoover
3. DCP-LOT-2023-00620, Climax Street, Minor Consolidation, Beltzhoover
4. DCP-LOT-2023-00669, E Ohio Street, Minor Consolidation, East Allegheny (Rescheduled)

Mr Schepke stated Item 1 will be a batched. The first one is a major consolidation. Then, the applicant requested to move Item 4, the last item on the plan of lots, to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr Schepke presented Item 1. The recommended motion was for preliminary approval with final approval scheduled for June 13, 2023.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Mondor questions or comments from commissioners; hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh preliminarily approve Item 1 with final approval scheduled for June 13, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

Chair Mondor read the next Items 2 and 3.

Mr Schepke batched Item 2 and 3 as a batch. The recommendation motion was to approve both Items 2 and 3.

Chair Mondor asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker no hands raised.

Chair Mondor questions or comments from commissioners; hearing none motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved Items 2 and 3.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Burton-Faulk

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Mondor, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Ms Abrams welcomed new commissioners Quintanilla and Ruiz. The Director's report focused around the RFP's for the Comprehensive Plan The RFP's are in our system. Ms Abrams read the draft stating there are two RFP's going out, one for Technical Services and one for Engagement. They will go out the end of this week or sometime next week. There will be two information sessions in June for both RFP's. There are three different dates, and there will be a press release with all the information coming out hopefully when the RFP's drop.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:59 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

**City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission**

Meeting Minutes

June 13, 2023 at 2:10 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Vice Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Secretary, Holly Dick
Peter Quintanilla

Rachel O'Neill
Becky Mingo
Dina Blackwell
Sabina Deitrick

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor

Monica Ruiz

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
Katherine Reed
Daniel Schepke
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02744 – 5122 Skibo Drive New infill construction for CMU Margaret Morrison St Neighborhood Commons Squirrel Hill North Neighborhood	2
2. Zoning Code Text Amendment Fresh Food Performance Points to RIV Riverfront Zoning District (RIV)	2
3. New Subdivision Standards and Regulations Citywide	
4. DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 – 320 East North Avenue Allegheny General Hospital Institutional Master Plan Central Northside Neighborhood	
Plan of Lots	3
1. DCP-LOT-2023-00673, 230 Cedarhurst Street, Major Consolidation 2, Beltzhoover	
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00669, E Ohio Street, Minor Consolidation, East Allegheny	

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of 05/16/23 Minutes

MOTION:

To approve Planning Commission minutes for 05/16/2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

- DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 – 320 East North Avenue – AGH IMP
- Richard Smith
- Sara Lewis
- Seth Hallam
- Rebecca White

- Richard Thompson
- Julianne Hluska
- Steve Jason
- Candice Cain
- Brian Grshaw
-
- DCP- ZDR-2022-13515 – 2929 Smallman
- Jana Lake, Strip District Neighbors
-
- DCP- ZDR-2023-00370 – 1334 Fifth Avenue
- Dr. Brittany McDonald, Uptown Partners
-
- DCP- ZDR-2022-10252 – 4801 Baum Boulevard
- Bloomfield Development Corporation

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02744 – 5122 Skibo Drive New infill construction for CMU Margaret Morrison St Neighborhood Commons Squirrel Hill North Neighborhood
 Mr Kunak introduced the Project Development Plan for the Margaret Morrison Street neighborhood commons at the existing Hammerschlag House. The application includes approximately 5,800 gross square feet for use as student commons programming within a one-story infill structure. The application was reviewed against the Institutional Master Plan adopted in 2022 and is identified as Site Nine Student Support Expansion within the 10-year development plan historic core district. The proposed scope of work complies with the approved IMP. This application is within the Registered Community Organization areas for the Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition and the Oakland Business Improvement District. A Development Activities Meeting was held May 3rd, 2023. The proposed project was reviewed by Staff Design Review staff who had no concerns. It was also reviewed by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve this Project Development Plan based on the application filed by Carnegie Mellon University with the following condition: the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).
 Mr Reppe presented the Margaret Morrison Neighborhood Commons which will be inserted underneath the strong eave edge of the existing Hammerschlag House, infilling a one-story facility up to six thousand square feet. This is the first project under the recently adopted 2022 Institutional Master Plan that has significant impact for student life on campus. Part of the IMP was to focus on developing more on-campus undergraduate housing and additional student spaces available to all students at the university whether or not they live in the building that is associated with the commons. This new proposed student commons will have an art theme, but is really intended to add amenities and social space for students on campus. This project is identified in the Institutional Master Plan as project number nine. This building will have a LEED Silver minimum as required for all projects on the campus. There will be several access areas. One main approach will be the East-West walkway across campus. A second accessible route is the sloping sidewalk pathway up onto the plaza. There is also Skibo Drive between Welch and Scoble Houses which also provides an accessible pathway as there is an accessible parking space that serves that area, and then finally via the Margaret Morrison Apartments courtyard. A series of elevations was presented, showing the original building above the eave and the new infilled building below. A proposed chiller as an associated project to the infill development underneath while the building is offline will bring air conditioning into the building by installing a roof mounted chiller inside a mechanical penthouse as far away as possible from the neighboring properties, which will meet or exceed the city noise ordinance requirements.
 Mr LaForest stated the roof plane clearly delineates between the existing facility and the new space below. The roof will create a series of outdoor porches and covered outdoor spaces because of the Pittsburgh climate. The roof will also be separated with a skylight down the

center that marks the axis, and drives daylight deep into the space below this existing building. This area will maintain a lot of glass, and natural finishes with authentic natural materials throughout the space, creating a chemical free healthy interior environment that promotes wellness and uses efficient mechanical systems and low flow plumbing fixtures to reduce water. Everett Bike Parking will also be tucked under this extended roof as well. A key element will be a hearth where students, staff and faculty could gather. It is both an indoor and outdoor hearth so that people can gather undercover around a hearth in all seasons both on the inside and on the outside.

The ceiling will have a bamboo finish, connecting the inside to the outside to connect to anyone passing by to draw as many students into the space as possible to maximize its use. The space will give students an opportunity to break away from their studies while still finding fulfillment in the art and craft space, an active wellness/yoga studio, media rooms, various study rooms, and a multi-purpose room, or just to casually gather at the fireplace.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if there were questions, comments, or a motion.

Ms Dick moved that it be approved with condition.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve with condition

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. Zoning Code Text Amendment Fresh Food Performance Points to RIV Riverfront Zoning District (RIV)

Ms Rakus presented the zoning code text amendment proposed to amend Chapter 905.04 for the riverfront districts, adding fresh food access as a Performance Point option as part of the zoning recommendations that came out of the Oakland Plan, the land use, and zoning recommendations. At that time the only amendments to the design code were for the new base zoning districts UC-MU, UC-E, AND R-MU. None of the other performance points were added as an option in any of the other zoning districts. This is a pretty simple zoning text amendment, and it would allow fresh food access to be used as a performance point in the Riverfront Zoning District. A summary of the text for the fresh food access was provided in the presentation to explain that there are requirements relative to the grocery store use, minimum requirements regarding size, and also maintaining tenants for the use. There are two performance points for providing the grocery store as a tenant. A map showing the RIV Zoning District and grocery store locations with radii as per the zoning code text, prepared by Stephanie Joy Everett, Planning Manager in Strategic Planning, together with City GIS staff. There are areas in the RIV that are served by a fresh food grocery store but there are significant areas within the RIV District that do not have that access to fresh food. City Staff is urging that the Planning Commission makes a positive recommendation of an ordinance amending the Pittsburgh Code, Title Nine, Zoning, Chapters 905.04 to add Fresh Food Access to the Riverfront Zoning District.

Vice Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions or comments. She took the opportunity to thank the staff for really working hard at looking at options that definitely give what she considered better and improved opportunities throughout the City. Hearing no additional comments or questions she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh makes a positive recommendation of an ordinance amending the Pittsburgh Code, Title Nine,

Zoning, Chapters 905.04 to add Fresh Food Access to the Riverfront Zoning District.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Mr Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Me Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED.

3. New Subdivision Standards and Regulations Citywide

Mr Layman presented the new subdivision regulations to the Planning Commission. This is an effort to update the subdivision regulations. A subdivision is a legal process to divide a property into two or more parcels, and a consolidation is to combine multiple properties into one parcel. In most of the surrounding municipalities commission level type reviews are reserved for the larger sort of new subdivision type developments, which is a rarity in the City of Pittsburgh. There are already standards within the Zoning Code to regulate those types of development subdivisions, as well as a preserved process in the new subdivision regulations that would still bring those types of plans before the Planning Commission. The subdivision regulations were initially adopted in 1963 and then amended in 1971. This is a revision for the first time since 1971. Currently, all consolidations and subdivisions are reviewed by the Planning Commission. Major consolidations and subdivisions are reviewed twice by the Planning Commission. The subdivision regulations have some out of date and superseded regulations. The proposed changes simplify the process and use more common language. Sections from the regulations that are no longer necessary, are redundant, or are superseded by the City Zoning Code have been removed, but sections that are referenced within the Zoning Code such as the PUD Standards and the Hillside Development Standards have been preserved. The process for the typical smaller ministerial type applications have been updated to be approved administratively by City staff, preserving the public process for those larger subdivisions and consolidations. Along with other recent changes the commission supported, such as the HVAC Amendment, the fence and small residential parking pad amendments, the updated subdivision regulations are simplifying the process, reducing the burden on applicants, reducing the burden on the City Staff, which has the joint benefit of helping our citizens and customers along with helping the city save money and preserve staff time for the larger, more substantial projects.

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Eric Vanistendael.

Mr Vanistendael stated that he looked at the subdivision diagramming representations on how to shape the built environment. Subdivisions seem to be the main purpose in building new construction. He hoped that when the Department of City Planning and staffers review some of these smaller, minor subdivisions that they consider educating and linking the administrative efforts within the Zoning Department and neighborhood planners to engage with the RCO community who are given some opportunity to comment on limited subdivisions where there are also ZBA variances. He thought a lot of the revisions looked really great and definitely demystified a lot of the process. He thought it was good to see that the City is also establishing some suggestion of formal zoning instead of codified and thanked them for their efforts.

Mr Fraker recognized Stephen Pascal.

Mr Pascal asked as somebody who has been involved in some litigation that involved subdivisions, he wondered, under the new regulations, what will be the process of appeal? What will be the process where people who live in the neighborhood who may have an issue with one of these subdivisions or lot consolidations to make an appeal? He noted that previously this has been the venue where one could say, wait a second there is a problem here that you may not be aware of, or there is a negotiation in process. This sounds it's been done administratively. Where is that resource? There ought to be some way aside from simply posting it on the agenda. Many people do not routinely look at the zoning board agenda with all the attachments and the subdivisions and so forth. He asked that there be an allowance for those occasions built into the process.

Mr Layman stated there is a clear due process under the Zoning Code. His general understanding was that any action that is taken under the Zoning Code regarding development in the City would be appealable as a protest appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, and an additional appeal process beyond that. He stated that information is available through other online sites like the OneStopPGH portal. He stated he would need to check to see whether or not subdivisions and consolidations appear on the agency counter website, and if they don't, he thought that was something to look into and put forward as an update.

Ms O'Neill thanked the Department of City Planning and the Law Department for their work on this. Having presented subdivisions as staff member, she stated it is a very time consuming act for what is a ministerial approval unlike subdivision codes throughout the state. Most of the review process for development is baked into the Zoning Code. Here, as you all know, we're mostly looking at the placement of lot lines and very little else. Having commission time and staff time present that is not the best use of resources. She said she much appreciated these changes, and everything that Mr Layman said during his presentation was correct. She noted this also eliminates some potential for abuse of process. Holding up applications for a subdivision when one is actually protesting another issue related to the property is not what the subdivision code is intended for. As Mr Layman said, any potential objection to a subdivision would go through the normal channels for any other approval and people still have that amount of due process. It does kind of limit Law Department resources and judicial resources on unnecessary appeals. She was glad to see this change. She thought that making this more available and readable was an excellent move forward. She then made a motion to approve the regulations.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh adopt the proposed Subdivision Standards and Regulations dated June 13, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED.

4. DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 – 320 East North Avenue Allegheny General Hospital Institutional Master Plan Central Northside Neighborhood
Vice Chair Burton-Faulk and Commissioner O'Neill recused from this item and passed the hearing to Commissioner Mingo.
Mr Rakus introduced the new IMP. The last update to the Allegheny General Institutional Master Plan was in February, 2018. this is a request for an approval of a new Institutional master plan submitted for the existing campus on the Central Northside and will restart the clock valid for 10 years. There are four new projects within the 10-year development envelope. There are no proposed zoning map amendments as part of this institutional master plan. This IMP was reviewed by staff. Allegheny General Hospital addressed staff comments, including requiring ground floor transparency on the new buildings, committing to a minimum sidewalk adjacent to projects in the development envelope, and providing bird safe glass in new developments. A transportation impact study was reviewed and approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI). Property Owners within 150 feet of the proposed institutional master plan were notified of this hearing by mail, and notices were posted around the campus. There are no Registered Community Organizations in the area of AGH, and no Development Activities Meeting was required. City Planning staff is recommending a positive recommendation to City Council. Mr Keelan and the team presented the project. AGH is an urban campus located in the Central North Side of Pittsburgh directly adjacent to the Fineview neighborhood and Allegheny Commons Park to the south. AGH began in 1855 with 55 beds in two adjoining homes and since then it's built out its campus with the most recent addition being the AGH Cancer Center completed in 2020. The campus is located in an Educational Medical

Institution (EMI) district. The team presented slides and views of the campus and context of the area. They showed areas within a thousand feet of the EMI district included in part of the IMP study area, AGH owned buildings on the North side, some inside the one-thousand-foot radius, and some outside the thousand-foot radius. They stated AGH has heard the community's concerns about expanding the campus and reiterated that there is no intention to expand the AGH campus on the North Side. They are partially satisfied with the amount of space they have inside the campus right now, and plan to be nothing but a good neighbor in the North Side community. The Institutional Master Plan area is the area of the Emi District itself plus any owned properties within one thousand feet around that area, and identifies the buildings that are owned by AGH as buildings 1 through 13. It also identifies six additional properties within the one thousand feet of the EMI district as numbers 14 through 19, and finally, properties owned by AGH directly outside the thousand-foot radius but still have an impact on AGH planning. The AGH campus is densely built and is dominated by two tall structures, the South Tower historic yellow brick structure as well as the Snyder Pavilion at the rear of the campus. In response to commissioners' requests, contextual photographs were presented from North Avenue toward the AGH campus, from the corner of North Ave and Sandusky St, from the upper side of Sandusky St toward North Commons Park, from the top of James Street toward North Ave, and from James Street at Norris toward the north. The purpose of the IMP is to identify the future needs of visitors, employees, and patients, ensuring continual service for the community and allowing flexibility as these plans are further developed. Goal one of the IMP is transitioning away from semi-private rooms to private rooms, not necessarily on seeing more patients. The benefit relates to both privacy and safety stemming from the pandemic. This is particularly important based on the acuity of the patients cared for, who are staying longer, and modernizing some procedural and clinical spaces, and continuing to engage in the community. AGH currently has 524 licensed beds, approximately 800 physicians, 100 medical students, and 4,000 staff members. Each year approximately 24,000 patients are admitted, 300,000 outpatient visits are registered, handled approximately 55,000 emergencies, as well as performed 23,000 surgical procedures. In the next 10 years they anticipate seeing minimal growth in some key service lines, cardiac, neurosurgery and medicine. Their focus is on ensuring they are able to accommodate sick patients and ensure that they are able to continue to meet patients' needs at the AGH campus. This transition requires an increase in the number and size of the rooms, not necessarily a number of beds. Goal two is optimizing their clinical service lines by consolidating services that are spread throughout the campus. This will allow a more efficient delivery of care, reduce wayfinding confusion, and focus on the patients and visitors' experience. Goal three is modernizing their procedural and clinical spaces with the ever-evolving clinical standards, including the growing cardiac neurosurgery. Some examples related to this are larger operating rooms and an emergency department, increased space for new medical equipment to allow state-of-the-art care. Goal four is community engagement through ongoing program partnerships, annual special community events, and community sponsorships, the Community Health Needs Assessment, neighborhood health programs, and sponsoring a variety of Workforce Development initiatives. AGH has made a commitment to continue their conversations with the community as any development planning proceeds. The community asked to limit expansion of the campus into the North Side Community. AGH is not seeking to change the boundaries or expand the existing EMI zoning district. The community expressed concerns related to the helipad location and noise. There are no plans to change the flight path for the helicopters. AGH is looking into moving it higher up on the campus, anticipating that will limit the noise and disruption to the surrounding communities. The community had a concern related to the height of potential projects. Potential buildings have not been designed but will comply with city limitations on height adjacent to residential zones, and AGH won't be seeking variances from that requirement. No new building will be higher than the Snyder Pavilion. The community had concerns about parking. Employees and visitors' parking will be prioritized on campus, ensuring that patients and visitors are prioritized first where they are not pushed out into the street, and encouraging employees to park in AGH's off-site locations to arrive at AGH via shuttle. AGH will continue to advise employees not to park in residential areas or permit parking areas. Finally, concerns related to litter near the campus edge were clearly

understood that it is a challenge. AGH will continue to do their part to make sure employees and visitors keep the campus clean. Also, the ongoing construction that currently exists is clearly an important focus for AGH.

The most recent IMP was submitted in 2017 and was approved in 2018. The 2017 IMP was primarily focused on the academic cancer center and identified two smaller project sites, an MRI/CT dock and a small storage area which were consistent with the initial IMP. A comparison of the 10-year and the 25-year potential development sites of the 2017 IMP and the current IMP showed they are consistent with each other and there's nothing in the new master plan that contradicts or expands on the previous master plan. The 25-year development window includes the possible development of the Porterfield and Hemlock property. Because it is directly adjacent to a residential area, it would be heavily restricted and probably limited to three stories in height with a step back. Also, sometime within the next 25 years there will be some potential consideration or redevelopment of the Snyder Pavilion. There are three and a half development sites included in the current master plan representing the maximum allowable envelope for development. The actual development inside of that envelope has yet to be determined. These are boxes into which a building might be put. The building height is not really known yet, but it might be a one-story building, a five-story building, or a 10-story building. This gives the institution flexibility to build the right kind of building of the right size at the right location on campus to serve their patients. Any decision to develop any of these three sites will come before Planning Commission again for review, and the neighborhood communities for review and comments.

These sites are not buildings, they are the potential to develop on those sites. Nothing is required to be built there. Just because AGH is given permission to build on these sites doesn't mean they are actually going to build on any of these sites. Mr Keelan presented views and discussed potential development of each site, relocation, and sound issues of the helipad during construction, site development standards and residential compatibility standards, urban design guidelines, including evaluating different aspects and specific nature of architectural character around the neighborhood, campus materials, colors, and design elements along with universal design and accessibility. Ms Wick presented the environmental and sustainability goals, emissions, energy and renewable energy, water consumption, stormwater management and pervious runoff, and waste management, existing tree canopy and green space protection, creation of engaging greenways, outdoor seating, landmark streetscape improvement, and pedestrian safety enhancements and public transit improvements.

Ms Jampole summarized the Transportation Impact Study required by DOMI and the mobility plan, addressing existing and future parking conditions on campus, meeting the parking needs of patients and visitors in areas nearest to where they will receive service, patient visitor parking locations, and employee parking. The goal of AGH is to meet all of its parking demand within its on-campus facilities and using the satellite parking lots. Transportation Demand Management initiatives as documented addressed the goal of decreasing single occupancy vehicles coming to the campus and a variety of other initiatives including PRT service, ride sharing, bicycling, and walking. There will be TDN information on the AGH Website and a real-time information kiosk in the building lobby.

Acting Chair Mingo opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker introduced Gina Grone, Executive Director of the North Side North Shore Chamber of Commerce.

Ms Grone commented there are 310 businesses and organizations in or near the North Side that are members of the chamber and our work to promote, connect, and support that work oftentimes involves connections between larger institutional partners like Allegheny Health Network Allegheny General Hospital and the smaller businesses or community organizations. She stated she thought they have always strived to genuinely connect with and listen to both residential and business neighbors and wanted to say that the North Side overall is full of historic assets, institutions, partners, spaces, that Allegheny General Hospital is a North Side pillar and has really been part of the fabric of the North Side for more than a century and a half. Actually, it has had monumental impact on the community and the developments outlined in the IMP overall are just great examples of reinvestment in the North Side. So, my overall comment is that as Executive Director representing the North

Side North Shore Chamber of Commerce, I think the IMP's plans and everything within the plan are a great thing for our people and our businesses and our overall community.

Mr Fraker introduced Sarah Purcell.

Ms Purcell stated she had reviewed the plans and attended a few of the sessions and had a few concerns regarding the planning documents grouped into two different areas of impact during construction or potential construction of these buildings, along with some concerns regarding parking, environmental impact, and privacy after completion. She believed there were comments about parking, and there are plans for different options for employees to commute together into the area. She noted one thing not heard nor seen in the plans was regarding the location of construction vehicles and how to prevent them from impacting the residents living on James Street. She noted a project of this size was a little concerning that she wouldn't be able to leave her house as the demands of her job required her to be kind of in and out of her house. She also noted in general the possible problem with construction equipment blocking residential parking every day. There is also the environmental impact dirt and noise generated by the construction. She stated the ordinances regulating when construction can take place does not stop the crews from coming in early and making noise. She also expressed concerns about how the dirt will be cleaned up and minimized, and issues concerning overall privacy. She noted the proposed Hemlock Building and how it would impact the view at Hemlock and James Streets. She will no longer be able to see down the street, and it will impact sunlight impeding her ability to grow vegetables she does every year.

Mr Fraker introduced Ellen Mazo.

Ms Mazo stated she has been a resident to Fineview for 35 years and one of many with the panoramic view of our beautiful city just across from the Fineview Overlook. As a reporter at the old Pittsburgh Press she wrote stories of Allegheny General Hospital's becoming a valuable partner of Northside organizations and, thanks to that partnership, an agreement was reached to ensure the hospital's buildings continue to be an integral part of the Northside overall. She asked for more images and details of the planned buildings so the Northside residents can visualize their heights. She also asked for more meetings with many more details to make sure that more community members become part of the discussions. She stated from what she could gather Allegheny General Hospital's proposed new building along Sandusky St will be the same height as the Snyder Pavilion. On paper that may seem fine, but because it will extend west, it likely will hinder Fineview's views of our city, especially from Henderson and Fountain Streets. She also noted the new Sandusky Tower at Sandusky St and East North Avenue will be 12 stories, more than twice as high as the building being constructed at the corner of Federal Street and North Avenue that became a five-story building because of discussions about the Integrity of the entire Northside. Those types of discussions need to continue, and no decisions made until the community can study the plans and work together with AGH to ensure the north side does not become a walled barrier of destructive buildings while the hospital can continue its focus on advancing its community engagement strategy.

Mr Fraker recognized Caitlyn Turowski.

Ms Turowski stated one of the many things that makes Pittsburgh great is our historic neighborhoods. This proposed plan by Allegheny General will negatively affect our City's historic view from the Northside, specifically the view from James Street, which has been immortalized in film and is also featured in a race that takes place on James Street every year. It brings tourists to the neighborhood. She believed any of the proposed new buildings in the neighborhood should be limited to the three-story height as to not change this historic view. She stated, having lived through the construction of the Hemlock Building across the street, some of the things that we have been dealing with over the past two years are of course all of the trash and dirt from the construction site as well as the noise happening everyday, including on the weekends. She stated like most people in this transition period, working from home some days it is hard to have meetings when there is a construction site outside. I didn't see addressed in the mobility plan what information was found? Also, the Hemlock Street stop sign at James Street no one stops at this stop sign. It is very difficult to get in and out of her driveway, or house, or just walking in the neighborhood. When there is a shift change it is almost impossible to get in and out. The plans for the proposed building at the corner of Hemlock and James shown in the meeting

earlier will completely block all of the natural light into her residence. There are wooded areas behind her this proposed building and her residence, and behind the proposed Hemlock Building site. The environmental impact on the wildlife and green spaces in our neighborhood would be detrimental to say the least. She urged the City Planning Commission to please listen to the residents, and to AGH to hold more meetings with the residents to really see that these large buildings will change the neighborhood for the worse. Mr Fraker introduced Dana Fruzynski, Interim Executive Director of the Northside Leadership Conference.

Ms Fruzynski commented the Northside Leadership Conference is a coalition of 15 community groups on the Northside, and need to discuss related issues that impact the entire Northside. She stated that having been involved in the community process and having attended several public meetings related to the IMP, they met with the leadership of AGH to further discuss their application. The Conference board voted and approved the submission of the Allegheny General Hospital IMP, and they strongly endorse the IMP and believe their plan is responsive to neighborhood stability and preservation, and very responsive to addressing our concerns and specific questions that community members have relating to the plan. She stated they were confident, if this IMP is passed, the hospital would come back to the neighborhoods to address specific construction activities and neighborhood concerns related to traffic and construction.

Mr Fraker introduced Joan Kimmel.

Ms Kimmel commented she is in a direct line for helicopter takeoffs and landings, and she is under much stress from this. Move the helicopter to the front of the plan temporarily. Add sound baffles on any side that faces the neighborhood. She had two requests. One, that they move as fast as they can to temporarily relocate the helicopter the top of the Snyder Pavilion at the very front of the plan within a year or two. Two, when it returns to the structure being built at the Sandusky Street corner, since they have years to plan this, add sound baffles on any side that faces the neighborhood.

Mr Fraker introduced Mark Masterson, Executive Director of The Neighborhood Community Development Fund.

Mr Masterson stated the NCDI started on the North side and about a third of their loan customers are on the North side. Having an organization like Allegheny General Hospital as one of the anchors on the North side leads to a lot of economic vitality, job creation, and other things that go with having that kind of anchor. He wanted to express their support for the hospital's proposed IMP. Having had a long-time relationship with Allegheny General, they have always met their obligations in the community, and felt nothing would different this time. He expressed confidence they would come back to the community and work through particular issues around construction as they have always done in the past.

Mr Fraker introduced Richard Smith.

Mr Smith stated his biggest concerns are with construction, as AGH has proven with the most recent Hemlock Building construction they don't really follow through with what they say. Construction has started before legal hours both on weekdays and weekends. Our complaints have been ignored. Even though the hospital did respond, construction still happened at times when it shouldn't have. He stated they have dealt with a massive amount of trash from construction workers and hospital employees over the years. They, as neighbors, have cleaned it up themselves because the hospital doesn't clean up on a regular basis. Across the street there is an overgrowth of weeds and grass that they have left untouched for the past several months. He stated he has struggled with what he hears because what he sees is not what is being said. He is opposed to this plan as it stands and would like to see more detailed plans for what is actually going to happen. He understands this is the beginning of the process and doesn't want to approve a plan that is not very clear on how it is going to pan out. He also commented about construction vehicles and construction work being extremely disruptive, sometimes finding construction workers either smoking on his property, parking in his parking pad next to his house, or parking in front of that parking pad. It has been extremely stressful and frustrating that it goes unheard when they have talked about those things. In addition, he spoke to multiple neighbors who were unfamiliar with what was going on. Despite the hospital reaching out to community organizations, he didn't think it was enough. He stated he would like to see them do more outreach and get more community input. The City Planning Commission sent a letter

directly, but the hospital never called asking him about this plan. As someone who is directly impacted it would have been nice to give his input about what would go across the street and about the noise pollution, light pollution, blocking natural sunlight, as well as blocking the city views.

Mr Fraker introduced Robert Clift.

Mr Clift commented in favor of anything that will reduce the noise from the helicopters. My house was built in 1878 when those helicopters fly by my entire house shakes, the porch vibrates, the windows rattle, my dog hides, my two-year-old wakes up if he is sleeping in the middle of the night. This is an historic neighborhood and that's part of its charm and identity but these homes were not built for helicopters. They park on a helipad essentially on the street. I mean I've never been to a city where helicopters park basically on the street directly adjacent to an elementary school in a historic neighborhood and it should be noted that noise is not just annoying but it's a health threat that increases the risk of hypertension, stroke, and heart attacks. It's unacceptable so I'd say this plan is great if it's going to reduce that noise and I'd like to request that the part of the plan that moves the helipad should be the first priority moving forward if agh is going to indeed be a responsive neighbor. I have a few questions I would like to see addressed one is are there expectations that the changes would increase the traffic of helicopters in the area Two have there been studies on how much noise reduction would occur if these plans move forward and Three if the helipad the temporary location in Sandusky is so much better why not plan to make that the permanent location for the helicopter?

Mr Fraker introduced David Demko.

Mr Demko commented within 500 ft of hospital. Building heights ½ hgt limit more appropriate. Drop offs along North Ave, must double park, nothing to say it is a drop off zone. Have DOMI and redesign the drop off areas. Use of funeral home vacant, spaces used for surface parking, not allowed, school site & old hospital becoming a blight. I've gathered a number of issues from the neighborhoods I'd like to present here rather quickly The first one has to do with the building heights at the size of the buildings 200 and 135 foot buildings are frightening prospects being adjacent to three-story neighborhoods and a park. I think half of that height limit would be more appropriate proposals and given that size of expansion we're dubious that you won't have increased parking demand. Second thing I like to mention is the interface between along North Avenue there's drop-offs going all along North Avenue whether the patient drop off employee drop off shuttle drop off bus stops there. You basically have to double park there's nothing that shows you that that's a regular drop-off place or that makes drop-off easy. I would suggest that the hospital get with Domi and redesign that section of North Avenue. There's an extra Lane in the middle between the west and eastbound lanes that's not being used. The North lanes could be moved South one lane and the lane that's adjacent to the sidewalk can be painted and redesigned with either bollards, curb cuts, certainly paint on that lane that shows that it is for drop-offs. There's no choice but to double park. There should be either bump outs or bump ins. I like the landscaping at the front of the hospital but I'd give it up if you need to move the sidewalk in some in order to enable drop-offs. Third I'd like to bring up some things that are despicably absent from the plan One is the use for the vacant Aberly Funeral Home It would be appropriate if it's used for some kind of business either that or let it go. Two the three spaces on the 1200 block of Sandusky that are used for surface parking. My belief is that we live in a parking overlay district that does not allow surface parking lots. Third I would like to know what's going to happen with the Crowley Elementary School site on Sherman Avenue and the former Kindred Hospital by the Aviary on Arch Street that's falling into serious disrepair and it's becoming a blight.

Mr Fraker introduced Hillary Demmon.

Ms Demmon commented on the noise of the helicopters. She stated the presenters said that they expected the noise would go down by the temporary placement of the helicopter pad. She did not think a guess was sufficient. She stated the need for a study to make it clear how the hospital will be able to reduce noise in the neighborhood. She stated she could feel the helicopters in her living space, and it is quite an impact. She thought there is a need for more specifics and a demonstrated commitment to try to reduce the noise. All of the helicopters are right above the school, and it is contributing to the baseline noise pollution in the area.

Mr Fraker introduced Stephen Pascill.

Mr Pascill addressed specific parking issues. He wanted AGH to confirm they will not be expanding or constructing parking lots outside of the parcel identified in this plan as its campus and its existing lots, and that no part of the IMP would include construction of parking lots or structures in the East Allegheny Central, Allegheny, or the Allegheny Center neighborhoods, and that any such parking construction will require an amendment of the plan and Planning Commission approval. He noted that total parking in various lots are in the 1000's, and he believed at least three lots on Sandusky St are owned by AGH, holding about 10 cars each. He felt it would be a much better use to infill them with any kind of structures that would fit the context of the neighborhood. He also objected to the height of the buildings. On North Ave they are well over the limit 45 ft. on most of that street.

Mr Fraker introduced Douglas Kamper, EACC.

Mr Kamper commented AGH is a good partner and very responsive to comments and concerns of neighbors. He has been serving as the president for the East Allegheny Community Council since September, 2000. The East Allegheny Community Council community group is just south of the hospital recognized that AGH has been a good partner for the Northside and the neighborhood for many years. They have been engaged EACC this IMP process and have been very responsive to questions, comments, and concerns from the neighbors. They live up to that commitment and continue to be responsive moving forward.

Mr Fraker introduced Jo Deming, former executive director for the Fineview and Perry Hilltop Citizens Councils.

Ms Deming commented she served for six years, overseeing many meetings with Allegheny General Hospital specifically regarding the IMP and was also on the board for the Northside Leadership Conference and were able to get their questions answered and their concerns addressed.

Mr Fraker introduced Randy Smith.

Mr Smith commented directly impact day to day life. Work from home. Must be another way than blocking out the sunlight. Reducing carbon emission not realistic to ride the bus to the hospital. Especially for sick patients. Direct neighbors do not want towers built directly across from them. uh Randy Smith echoed his neighbors. This will directly impact his day-to-day life, working from home. The construction will be directly outside of his bedroom. Acknowledging the need to improve patient rooms, he questioned digging out the entire hillside and blocking sun. He also asked about the transportation incentives presented. He noted over 90 percent of their staff drive, and asked the presenters if they will be foregoing their parking spaces and taking the bus or riding their bikes, especially in the cold winters. He thought reducing carbon emissions and carpooling was a great idea that looks good on paper, but didn't think it was realistic, especially with PACE patients. If he was a PACE patient, he would not be riding a bike to an appointment. He also pointed out there is not enough parking. He asked that the applicant please listen to their neighbors' objections to towers built across from them.

Acting Chair Mingo asked commissioners for questions, comments.

Ms Blackwell commented on concerns from the community about noise, the environmental concerns with blocking of the sun, the traffic, remediations planning for the neighbors, and how many community meetings were actually held? Were these concerns considered? Would this be a time to respond to the neighbors' concerns before a vote on this IMP? She asked how many community meetings did the applicant have.

Mr Nussbaum stated those are some of the things that they have heard in their various community meetings and said they take those issues very seriously. They very much appreciated and understood the comments that were made. He said they would further address them as individual projects are developed going forward. He stated there are no direct plans for construction at this moment in time and this is really just to create the framework to assess their future needs. He also commented specifically about the helicopter, stating they have commissioned a study on the noise and how the results will play into future plans if and when moving the helicopter makes sense. The results are not in at this point in time.

Ms Deitrick commented they have had the helicopter issues before during the project um at the corner of Federal St and North Avenue. The positioning of the helicopter and when they

come in seems to be ongoing with the community. She said she would like to see them figure it out. It's hard because they have to helicopter people in but the issues with the community repeat and repeat, and whatever dialogue you're having with the community doesn't seem terribly productive each time you come in front of the commission with the same issues in hand.

Ms Nussbaum thought the imp addressed the potential move for the helipad, noting there are no easy fixes but this IMP allows them to start discussing to move it away from the street level and address a number of their concerns.

Acting Chair Mingo had comments. AGH has a tight sight, and in the past for other projects, expanding into large areas they have kept this in their tight square. She appreciated the difficulty it takes for a business to grow within existing buildings and stay occupied. She stated this site is in a historic neighborhood and wondered if there is a commissioner who would like to make a motion to approve this plan as it stands, or try to look at some other options at this point.

Ms Blackwell commented that if this were approved she thought they should make note and include that the applicants will continue discussion per project with the community members regarding the noise and the environment issues of the public, the applicant stated that they plan to discuss it moving forward with each project. She thought it should be included in the language when commissioners make the vote.

Acting Chair Mingo commented it is true that when the applicant comes back to look at very specific buildings within these frameworks they have to provide the Planning Commission with things like shade drawings, full exterior designs, public space impact drawings sections and how they relate to the buildings surrounding them among other things, and multiple Community meetings. They will also have to provide construction documents and work with Domi. When they come back to the commission with specific buildings there is a much more detailed plan that has to be approved. She suggested if Mr Layman wants to add anything. Mr Layman proposed a condition that the applicant shall continue community meeting discussions regarding ongoing concerns around noise, construction management, building massing, etc., prior to approval of the project development plan under the institutional master plan.

Ms Rakus reminded the commission that this needs to go to Council.

Mr Layman clarified it as a recommended condition or a condition on the recommendation.

Ms Dick made a motion to approve the IMP as presented with the addition of the condition as proposed by Mr Layman and Commissioner Blackwell.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh give a positive recommendation to City Council of the Proposed Institutional Master DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 for Allegheny General Hospital dated March 2023

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED.

Acting Chair Mingo thanked everybody who testified and expressed their concerns. She then stated she was sure Allegheny General will write them down and listen to them going forward. She then passed the chair back to Commissioner Burton-Faulk.

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00673, 230 Cedarhurst Street, Major Consolidation, Beltzhoover
2. DCP-LOT-2023-00672, 214 Cedarhurst Street, Minor Consolidation, Beltzhoover

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk stated that Item 1 would be hear and then Item 2, which she needed to pass this off to Commissioner O'Neill.

Mr Scheppke stated Item 2 does not require Planning Commission approval since the new subdivision ordinance had been passed. It could be removed from the agenda.

He presented Item 1 with the recommended motion to approval the consolidation.
 Vice Chair Burton-Faulk stated there was then no need to recuse from Item 2 and asked for public testimony.
 Mr Fraker stated no hands raised.
 Vice Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion for Item 1.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Item 1.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash stated that Director Abrams had spoken to the commission a couple of weeks ago, updating them on the Department's progress on Citywide Comprehensive Planning. Mr Dash updated Commissioners, stating two RFP's were released for consultant services. There is an RFP that is presently out looking for consultants to work on Public Engagement and Public Engagement Services for the Department relative to the Comprehensive Plan. A second RFP is looking at Technical Services for Planners to assist the Department in the creation and development of a comprehensive plan, and is right now actively soliciting firms for that work. As it stands right now proposals are to close by the submission deadline which is the fourteenth of July, and we will be doing some pre-proposal meetings for interested consultants with one meeting this Friday, and then two next week as well. He stated he wanted the commission members to be aware of the progress there. As the proposals close and we go through the project selection process identification, the next time that we would come to the commission with an update would be probably in late July right before the Planning Commission recess. At that time there will be another update on this RFP and consultant selection process.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

June 27, 2023 at 2:41 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Becky Mingo
 Peter Quintanilla

Not Present

Monica Ruiz
 Sabina Deitrick

Dina Blackwell

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-00794, Termon Garden Homes, Major Subdivision, Brighton Heights	3
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-MPZC-2023-00525 / Council Bill 2023-1393 – Fifth Avenue, bounded by Kelly Street, Frankstown Avenue, and AVRR Zone Change Petition for multiple parcels to change from R1D-L to UI Homewood West Neighborhood	3

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of 05/30/23 Minutes

MOTION:

To approve Planning Commission minutes for 05/30/2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-MPZC-2021-01413 – Allegheny General Institutional Master Plan

- Randy Smith
- Mark P. Masterson, Executive Director, Neighborhood Community Development Fund
- Sarah Bailey
- Robert Bobeck

Frick Park apartment zoning (Staff note: this project has not been scheduled for Planning Commission)

- Lawrence Hayhurst

DCP-ZDR-2023-02426 The Standard

- Dr. Brittany McDonald, Executive Director, Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh
- DCP-ZDR-2022-13515 DCP-ZDR-2022-13518 2929 Smallman 6 30th Street
- Geoff Clauss
- DCP-MPZC-2023-00525 / Council Bill 2023-1393
- Sergei Gorloff

Vice Chairwoman Burton-Faulk recognized Mr Layman to discuss some organizational items before moving on to other Planning Commission items.

Mr Layman stated Chair Christine Mondor, after over a decade of service, put in her letter of resignation as the chair of the Planning Commission. Mr Layman commended Chair Mondor as a leader for the city in design, her work on the commission, and her leadership for the Planning Department as well. He stated the need for potential nominations on the floor for a new chairperson. Mr Layman recognized Commissioner Dick.

Ms Dick thanked Commissioner Mondor for her many years of service and her very skillful and insightful work. She stated that all deeply appreciated that. Ms Dick then moved to nominate LaShawn Burton-Falk as the new chairperson of the Planning Commission.

SECOND: Ms Mingo

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk accepted the nomination and took a roll call vote.

ABSTAINED: Ms Burton-Faulk

IN FAVOR: Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

Chair Burton-Faulk commented that Ms Mondor made a significant impact and contribution to the Planning Commission under her leadership and dedication. She was thankful to have served with Chair Mondor and looked forward to seeing her impact in other ways in the City. She then asked for any other comments from commissioners.

Ms Mingo commented that Ms Mondor was a wonderful leader, design advocate, and thoughtful responder about issues in the public realm. She also noted she was always very generous in her ability to acknowledge the positive aspects of a project and was a master of communicating in this public forum.

Ms O'Neill echoed all the sentiments about Ms Mondor and thanked her for an excellent job and all her background work and effort on the planning commission.

Chair Burton-Faulk looked forward to continued service with commissioners and thanked them for their trust and confidence. She stated she intended to serve well and was honored. She then stated the need for a new Vice Chair.

Mr Dash took a moment on behalf of himself and the Director to state they were very appreciative of the leadership that Ms Mondor exhibited over multiple administrations that created a lasting impact on how development happens and how the public are more integrated into the development review process.

Chair Burton-Faulk made a motion to nominate Commissioner Rachel O'Neill as Vice Chair and asked for a second to the motion.

SECOND: Ms Dick.

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

Ms O'Neill thanked the commission for the nomination and looked forward to working with everyone.

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-00794, Termon Garden Homes, Major Subdivision, Brighton Heights

Vice Chair Burton-Faulk read in Item 1.

Mr Scheppke presented Item 1. The recommended motion was for approval.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Termon Garden Homes Major Subdivision.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECOND: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-MPZC-2023-00525 / Council Bill 2023-1393 – Fifth Avenue, bounded by Kelly Street, Frankstown Avenue, and AVRR Zone Change Petition for multiple parcels to change from R1D-L to UI Homewood West Neighborhood

Mr Kunak stated the zone change petition was introduced in City Council April 4th, 2023, where it was referred to the April 12, 2023, Planning Commission for the commission's report and recommendation. The legislation proposed to change the zoning district for multiple parcels generally bounded by Fifth Avenue, Kelly Street, Frankstown Avenue, and the Allegheny Valley Railroad line to permit the involved property to be developed for uses permitted in the UI, Urban Industrial, Zoning District. Property Owners within 150 feet of the proposed zone change were notified of this proposal, and notices were mailed to abutting property owners 21 days in advance, posted on the City Planning Website, and posted on the site. No application for development has been submitted to the Planning Department at this time. A Development Activities Meeting was held May 11, 2023. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission recommends approval to City Council of the zone change petition to rezone the proposed parcels from R1A-L, Residential, Single-unit, Attached, Low Density to UI, Urban Industrial.

Mr Carter first wanted to take a moment on behalf of city Councilman Rev. Ricky Burgess to thank outgoing Chair Christine Mondor for her years of dedicated service both to the Commission and to the city and congratulated incoming Chair LaShawn Burton-Faulk. He also congratulated Commissioner Rachel O'Neill on being elected vice chair.

Mr Carter then spoke about being approached with an idea to build a Get-Go gas station at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Frankstown Avenue. Having been a lifelong resident of Homewood he found it frustrating at night after working late or out and about not having a safe, genuinely useful gas station in the neighborhood and noted having to drive to the Waterworks or other Get-Go stores or find a Sheets. Reverend Burgess and his chief of staff had concerns about large and small issues, the variety of food that will be offered, the hours of operation, and some of the amenities. The two other gas stations on the adjacent corners are not as functional as this Get-Go will be. After working through their concerns Mr Carter stated they reached a position where Reverend Burgess was comfortable in introducing the zone change petition, believing this was a necessary addition to the community. He was willing to introduce the zone change petition to change from R1D-L to UI in order for the next step to proceed. After conversations with planning staff, design issues will need to be worked out during the design phase, noting the design phase is separate from whether or not the parcels are rezoned. He stated that Reverend Burgess sincerely requests that the commission grants a positive recommendation to this zone change request so the next step can be taken.

Mr McKeegan and the team presented the zone change of about 19 vacant parcels, totaling about one and one third acres that lie roughly between Kelly Street and Frankstown Avenue very close to the intersection with Fifth Avenue. Both Kelly Street and Frankstown Avenue are the main thoroughfares leading into the greater Homewood neighborhood. A vacant local fast food restaurant lies between the rezoning site and Fifth Avenue and will be part of the project, if the project moves forward. There is one property, 125-G-6, which is still owned by a private individual. The other vacant parcels are owned by the Allegheny Valley Railroad.

The team presented slides and views of the neighborhood and the properties, depicting a dense urban environment, a multitude of different types of uses in and around the area, a block and lot or tax parcel map of the proposed rezoning site identifying their block and lot

numbers, aerial views of the area from 1995 to the present, depicting how the property has gradually become vacant over the years with most of the site cleared of structures between the mid-1990s and the early 2000s, and several views showing the context of the area. A view of the railroad further into Homewood showed the barrier that it creates between the site and the balance of the Homewood neighborhood. Close-up slides of the railroad overpass showed a substantial structure which the team hoped could become part of the bike pathway from Aspinwall extending back into the city as part of the long-term plan. They also presented building perspectives showing the concept with heavy architectural detail with heavy use of brick on the building, the types of Windows, and the use of metal awnings. The building will be a big brick building of a type more substantial than a suburban structure.

The Urban Industrial zoning classification is actually considered a mixed-use zoning district, and under the city's code, allows for a wide variety of uses, including multi-family and similar uses. For purposes of the record the team included a survey of the area to be rezoned along with site information. In an analysis by the team, none of the 19 parcels under their current zoning classification of R1D-L satisfied any of the site development standards for that zone, all being too small, too narrow, and essentially undevelopable. The team considered them orphan parcels absent some sort of consolidation.

The team brought this zone change proposal before the Planning Commission, hoping to develop this site with a Get-Go convenience store, including automobile fuel sales. Part of the discussion with Reverend Burgess's office was directed towards providing additional grocery and food shopping opportunities for the neighborhood. This Get-Go will be different from the ones encountered in the suburbs. This is a very conceptual and preliminary site plan put in front of the commission just to let the commission know the concept the team was thinking with fuel sales closer to Fifth Avenue, the store located further into the site between Kelly Street and Frankstown Avenue, heavy landscaping, and a green buffer area closer to the railroad bridge to be worked out later. The team also emphasized, as Mr Carter did, that this plan is by no means final. There is quite a lot of work that still needs to be done to satisfy not only the Department of City Planning requirements but also those of the neighborhood.

Mr May presented a layout and photos noting that GetGo has many different formats throughout the Pittsburgh area, but this GetGo will have a totally new format in a larger building of almost 6,400 square feet, offering basic food items such as fresh produce, sliced deli meats and fresh meats, and multiple dairy items. He discussed the floor plan, which has yet to be finalized, but will have a primary public entrance as a focal point of that façade, and then another secondary public entrance near the checkout area. Centrally located between those entrances will be an expanded area for a bakery and fresh produce, and to the right grocery offerings with expanded frozen foods and chilled food. There will also be a kitchen behind an open, made-to-order food prep area where customers will order food on touch screens, along with inside dining with seating for at least 30 guests and expanded restrooms with multiple fixtures to eliminate any lines.

Mr McKeegan presented a slide showing the process to date, extensive meetings with Councilman Burgess's staff, City Planning, and the Homewood Community Development Collaborative executive committee, at a Development Activities Meeting, and continuing conversations at a community meet and greet.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Sergei Gorloff.

Mr Gorloff opposed the project citing several reasons why the GetGo will not serve the Homewood community, noting a high crime rate and Homewood and nearby communities identified as the most dangerous. He noted there will be a 240 sq ft beer cooler in the store, and that alcohol is associated with high crime, shootings, and assaults.

Mr Fraker recognized Leonard Carter.

Mr Leonard Carter stated his home is directly across the street. He opposed the project noting the \$150,000 expense he incurred improving his home because it was residential. He stated there are currently three homes left on the block in which each remaining owner is doing similar work as himself. Only the lot directly adjacent to his property and one directly across the street have been maintained in some fashion by the URA. The rest of the property across the street has been in horrible condition. He stated he has often called the city to have

the problem addressed only to be told the owner was a corporation in Florida, and there was little if anything that could be done to alleviate the situation. He contacted Cn Burgess's office to inquire about the proposed project and was told they had no knowledge of any such project. He noted the traffic, noise, and trash accompanying this business will be substantial as well as the lighting required to attract customers will be disruptive. He also stated there have been no assurances from Giant Eagle that any concerns will be addressed. He stated it is disconcerting that the immediate area around his home will be at the mercy and whim of a corporation, and despite his commitment to the neighborhood, and the fact that he will be greatly affected by the project, he has no voice in what will occur. Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk thanked those who gave testimony. She then reminded commissioners that the criteria to be considered regarding this application is Section 922.05.F. She asked commissioners if there were additional questions, comments, or a motion.

Ms Mingo asked Mr Carter, when looking at the blocks across from the rear part of the proposed zone change, are there houses on Kelly Street and on Frankstown Avenue that face the proposed zoning lot change? She also asked if he had spoken to those property owners? And, are those properties owned by homeowners, are they vacant or are they occupied?

Mr McKeegan stated with respect to the properties on the opposite side of Frankstown Avenue, those houses are in a UI zone and not necessarily residentially zoned right now. Mr Ferguson stated he spoke to Mr Carter, and stated he definitely heard his concerns. They will be working with him, but he explained to him this meeting is just for rezoning the land and not the development portion. If the zone change is approved, the next steps in the development stage will be to work with the community group to address their concerns. Also, he explained that the front entrance of the building will be facing either 5th Ave or Frankstown Ave. Mr Ferguson stated he understood Mr Carter's complaints, and if this gets approved, looks forward to working with him to do as much as he can to help alleviate his concerns.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if the zoning map in the presentation could be shown so that Commissioner Mingo could get an idea of where Kelly St faces the proposed consolidation and potential future proposed project. She asked Ms Mingo if it helped her understand.

Ms Mingo's stated it was helpful. She then recalled in the 1990s participating in a zone change in her area where there were parcels like this that may have been left in a sort of island residential zone on purpose. Whoever was advocating for these properties to stay residential next to this UI zone was very intentionally leaving it this way. It's a vacant parcel, but there are still people on Kelly Street and even though it's surrounded by UI what is the context? There may be houses across the street on Frankstown Ave that are occupied by homeowners or renters that are in a UI zoned area.

Mr McKeegan appreciated Mr Carter's remarks. The property has been vacant since the 90s when it began to be cleared both by the URA and the private out of town owner. He stated as far as he knew nobody has considered this property for any sort of residential development which left this vacant Island that nobody seems to want to do anything with. The only person who does is admittedly a commercial type development. He noted this will not assuage Mr Carter's fears, but this is only the very first step of a long process that will involve quite a bit of planning, site plan review, and negotiation with the community, Mr Carter, and the Department of City Planning. But, they can't really start down that road until the property has an appropriate zoning classification.

Ms Mingo noted that near the edge of Baum, Centre and Negley Avenues, in her neighborhood a number of these issues did get resolved in the next stage of the process. She stated that Giant Eagle is a long-time good neighbor and will make good decisions.

Regarding Mr Gorloff's testimony about alcohol, Ms Mingo then asked if there is an intention to serve beer and liquor at this store.

Mr Ferguson stated every GetGo serves alcohol but pointed out there is a beer distributor right across Kelly St on Fifth Ave. He stated alcohol sales helps every GetGo, pointing out the store will not be to open 24/7. The store will close at 10:00 and mirror the hours of the GetGo on Penn Ave in Wilksburg. He also stated there will be a security guard as well.

Mr McKeegan clarified the liquor license approval process is outside of the Planning Commission's jurisdiction. Pennsylvania does allow liquor sales in grocery stores now. There

will be no on-site consumption. He stated the important point that the Homewood Plan clearly called for more food opportunities in the neighborhood, and this project is designed to help address that community need.

Ms O'Neill stated she wanted to be clear on the record that the zoning code and planning commission don't have any jurisdiction over regulating alcohol and didn't think that should be impacting this decision. She stated this is a rezoning and not an approval of the use or the site plan and wanted to stick to those criteria. She pointed out that since the applicant stated that there are multiple opportunities to continue discussions with the community, in a UI district she did not know that is entirely true. This would probably be going through site plan review and wouldn't have another public approval unless they were seeking some sort of variance. She stated Planning Commission may not be required, and asked if they expected to request any variances or other public approvals, or would they seek approval by right.

Mr McKeegan stated he believed a service station is a Special Exception at the Zoning Board Adjustment but given the codes requirements for setbacks, the placement of entrances, ground floor glazing and the like those design issues often require that. Since the Planning Commission rightfully does not want the city to look like the suburbs, this project would probably be referred to CDAP and the Planning Commission for some sort of site plan consideration. At a briefing two weeks ago, there was a similar GetGo proposed at the West End Bridge that is being sent to CDAP, and he would expect the same thing to happen here as well.

Ms O'Neill looked at the zoning code and found in the UI district a service station is an Administrator Exception. She stated that the commissioners expect the team to continue talking to Mr Carter moving forward, and hoped there will be opportunities for additional public meetings and public approvals. She expected that conversation to keep moving forward, knowing there are some protections in the zoning code for nearby residential districts, but wanted to make sure that someone who moved into a residential district and may or not be living next to one still has some of those protections moving forward.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there were any other comments or questions as they pertain to criteria in Section 922.05.F or a motion. Based on the criteria this would be a positive recommendation to City Council on the zone change. Is there a motion from the floor?

Ms Mingo asked, mentioned in the discussion there might be other gas stations closing on this particular section of Fifth Avenue, and this area has not had much planning other than the Homewood Plan, it seems like this is a place where a lot of change is happening. Are there plans in the city to think very strategically about this section of land.

Mr Sean Carter stated he has seen most of the community plans from inception. He gave an example of a senior low rise at the corner of North Homewood Avenue and Finance Street directly across from the Homewood East busway stop which the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Association offered 11 million dollars and told them they were going to build a senior low rise instead an apartment building, even though that was not what was intended. When they had to come to the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board, there was quite a bit of contention from the neighborhood, but it did serve the vulnerable senior population, and they had to be flexible. As a result of that project, 30 to 40 town homes were built behind it, which were more homes than the original apartment units. Mr Carter stated what was supposed to go with this corner was a very large apartment complex, but the market did not allow that to happen. One of Reverend Burgess's demands to the development team was that he would not consider this zone change until they had site control. Changing the zoning from R1D-L, which is very restrictive to UI, even after accounting for the residential compatibility standards, allows for more intensive uses than the existing zoning. We were uncomfortable doing that for the previous ownership, and we required the site assemblage. Reverend Burgess was comfortable that this is a good use for this site. After several months of back and forth with the development team he opted to introduce the zone change petition. He noted there are always going to be concerns and would prefer a 24/7 GetGo, but that is not what the people who live closest to it want. There is a balance there. It may not be perfect and some residents, unfortunately, will still be upset. That is often one of the trade-offs, but that site was going to sit there in its present condition for perhaps another decade and that motivated Reverend Burgess to go for this project.

Ms O'Neill moved to recommend approval.

Chair Burton-Faulk before taking a full vote, strongly recommended the Giant Eagle team continue to work with the community. As time goes on maybe this development can evolve to something more beneficial to the community and maybe also something else with more reciprocity to the community in other ways.

Ms Dick seconded the chairwoman's comments.

Chair Burton-Faulk stated this is not the end, and to ramp it up and work hard to make this project into something special for the community.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve Zone Change Petition DCP-MPZC-2023-00525 to rezone the proposed parcels from Residential Single-Unit Detached, Low Density (R1D-L) to Urban Industrial (UI).

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECOND: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman made a brief announcement two staff Joe Fraker and Maryam Moradian promoted to the position of Senior Planner in Code Development, working with Planning Commission, preparing reports and presentations, reviewing projects, and ensuring the meetings run smoothly, and there is a quorum. Both staff members have been with the department for a while now and it's an excellent progression for them professionally.

Ms Dick and others welcomed them and looked forward to working with them.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

July 11, 2023 at 3:20 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Jennifer Askey

Becky Mingo
 Dina Blackwell
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Sabina Deitrick

Peter Quintanilla

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Schepke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. West General Robinson Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00856, Major Subdivision, North Shore 2. Shakespeare Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00884, Major Consolidation, Shadyside	3
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-03325 – 4401 Penn Avenue New Construction for UPMC CHP Heart Institute in the EMI Central Lawrenceville Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-13515 – 2929 Smallman Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood 3. DCP-ZDR-2022-13518 – 6 30th Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood	3

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of June 27, 2023 Minutes

MOTION:

To approve Planning Commission minutes for June 27, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2022-13518 – 6 30th Street DCP-ZDR-2022-13515 – 2929 Smallman Street

- Councilman Bobby Wilson
Shakespeare Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00884, Major Consolidation, Shadyside
- Melissa Miller

C. Plan of Lots

1. West General Robinson Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00856, Major Subdivision, North Shore

2. Shakespeare Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00884, Major Consolidation, Shadyside
 Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 1 and 2.
 Mr Schepke presented Items 1 and 2. The recommended motion for each was approval.
 Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.
 Mr Fraker stated no hands raised.
 Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion to approve Items 1 and 2.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Items 1 and 2.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz
 CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-03325 – 4401 Penn Avenue New Construction for UPMC CHP Heart Institute in the EMI Central Lawrenceville Neighborhood
 Vice Chair O'Neill Recused from this hearing item.

Ms Rakus introduced the application for an expansion of Children's Hospital as a Project Development Plan in the Educational Medical Institution District. The application includes approximately 50,000 gross feet of additional hospital use for the Children's Hospital Heart Institute. It was reviewed against the Institutional Master Plan adopted in 2013, and is in compliant with what was outlined in the 10-year development envelope. A Contextual Design Advisory Panel meeting was not needed. A Staff Design Review was held and urban design targets were provided. Staff found their responses adequate. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing was not required. No storm water management was required since the proposed construction is over an existing structure. A transportation impact memo has been submitted and is under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. A development activities meeting was not required because there are no Registered Community Organizations in this location. The recommended motion was for approval with DCP's standard conditions that the final construction drawings be reviewed prior to approval of the Record of Zoning Approval. Mr Kyle Weisman, Diane Hupp, Shawn McCloskey, Michael Joyce, Cindy Jampole and the team presented the project which will see nearly 30,000 children and adults that come to Children's for a number of heart anomalies and conditions. The Heart Institute here was ranked by U.S news and World Report as one of the best pediatric heart programs. Some of the most challenging and unique cases are referred here from other children's hospitals and other centers in the country given the expertise here. Unique to this program patients are cared for into adulthood, oftentimes having congenital heart anomalies. The Imp was approved for substantially more square footage than proposed at this meeting. In 2013 the IMP for the campus was approved to accommodate growth at 180,000 square feet, allowing for 85 feet of height above the existing mid-campus garage along 45th Street. The project is substantially smaller than that, adding only three floors at just over 50,000 square feet of new construction and only 80 feet in height. This new space for the Heart Institute is much smaller than previously approved in the Institutional Master Plan, and will include upgrades and a new hybrid catheterization lab, containing an MRI to help improve imaging and diagnostics.

The team met with leaders from both community groups, Lawrenceville Corporation and Lawrenceville United, in April, 2023, and then participated in their meetings May 4 and May 25, 2023, and received positive reviews from both community groups.

The team presented slides and site plans of the project, showing the new expansion located on the mid-campus garage, expanding vertically and providing a connecting bridge on the fourth floor to the cardiac ICU and existing surgical platform at Children's Campus. There are multiple portals from the main entry inside the existing campus, with connections to the mid-campus garage stairs, and elevator tower to the new Heart Institute.

One of the concerns during reviews and discussions with the city was about tree protection and the impact of construction at grade level, even though the building is on top of the garage. There will be some at-grade impacts due to construction. In the hearing, the team stressed to the public that they will do everything they can to protect the existing trees and landscaping on

the streetscape, and will replace in kind anything that is damaged, including sidewalks. Additionally, the team highlighted maintaining the children's statue that is at the streetscape on level one of the existing campus.

They are maintaining all of the existing requirements for setbacks, parking, no impact to the helipad, and no change in the impervious surface requirements on the campus.

Beginning with the existing color palette of Children's Hospital architecture and being mindful how the new Heart Institute will bring a new and uplifting presence at the northwest edge of the campus and to the community's edge. The entry of the mid-campus garage will be emphasized with a new glowing stair, cladding glass, and colorful vertical mullions. The new Heart Institute above the garage will have a pre-patina copper band and another large span of glass. The window is a two-story curtain wall. The upper part of the window allows light into the future use of the shell space with great views and daylight. The lower section actually brings in eyeglass and daylight to the areas that support the catheter labs and MRI beyond. To minimize the effect of the garage a perforated screen wall along 45th Street will ground the addition while screening out views of the garage interior. At the third-floor parking garage deck the administration level entry is emphasized by a pre-patina green copper panel and lighting from the soffit above to afford safety and illuminate the beautiful metal panel band. Three different hues of the warm champagne color will be used on the building and provides a pearlescent effect by using the different hues and different finishes which varies the look at different times of the day. The paneling references masonry in some ways which mimics the other building. A view of the back of the building showing the sky bridge that connects from the Heart Institute to the existing surgical rooms is not a public corridor. A view requested from a previous meeting depicted 44th Street heading south. A summary of the parking and trips information indicated the current and future parking capacity on the campus. At the completion of the construction, 60 spaces will be removed from the mid-campus garage to accommodate construction of the project, adjusted by the hospital's on campus and shuttle wide off campus parking, which is used by employees. No change to the shuttle wide capacity was anticipated as part of the project. As requested by DOMI, the potential number of vehicular trips moving in and out that might change was calculated, and in no cases were there more than the 18 trips, which is very small and not anticipated to impact traffic circulation at either the campus or the off-campus parking.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a motion.

Ms Dick commented with fond remembrance of Saint Francis Medical Center that occupied this land until approximately 20 years ago, she moved that the project be approved.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve DCP-ZDR-2023- 03325 for expansion of the existing UPMC Children's Hospital with the following condition:

1. The final constructions documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Ruiz

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-13515 – 2929 Smallman Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced this project located at 2929 Smallman Street, parcel 25-F-184, for demolition of an existing structure and new construction of a six-story, multi-unit residential building with 105 dwelling units, including 46 ground level parking spaces, 36 bike parking spaces, and associated second floor amenity space. There is no Registered Community Organization at this location and no Development Activities Meeting was required. The stormwater management permit received conceptual review approval through the design review process, and there were no substantial comments. The transportation memo was

approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. The application is requesting two performance points per Section 905.04.K.1. The base height in the RIV-IMU is 60 feet, the maximum height is 90 feet, the proposed building height is approximately 76 feet. The applicant requested two performance points under Item i, Urban Fabric, where structured parking is designed to allow conversion to other non-parking uses. The applicant statement of compliance per the review criteria was attached. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve the project with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Jonathan Hudson, Ryan Indovina, Cliff Levine, and the team presented the project, noting the Hudson Companies are the developer, owner, general contractor, and eventual property manager of this and another future project. The site is located midblock between 29th and 30th Streets and between Smallman Street and Bruce Way, fronting on Smallman Street. Included in the presentation were aerial views and contextual images of the site in the middle of the RIV-IMU zoning district. No other zoning districts required any additional constraints on the site development. The RIV-IMU requirements table in Section 904.04.C dictate the site development standards. There is a zero front and rear yard setback required. For buildings over 65 feet there is a 10-foot setback required on the primary street, which is Smallman St. The minimum height in the district is 60 feet, the maximum height in this district is 90 feet, and the proposed height of the building is 75 feet 6 inches. One of the two bonus points was requested on the height of the building which is between the 60-foot minimum height and the 90-foot maximum. The other urban fabric bonus point was requested for a convertible ground floor which is structured parking designed to allow for conversion to non-parking uses. There are three different primary elements, a series of five multi-family residential units with slightly above grade inset front porches, the public component consisting of lobby, bike storage area, mail drop-off, etc., vehicular garage access from Spruce Way into one fully enclosed open internal parking area instead of screened parking, and site utilities in the rear as well with a fully enclosed transformer vault and generator room. There is a 50% parking reduction and another 70 % bike parking reduction. Therefore, the required parking is 37 spaces on-site. Forty-six spaces will be provided on-site with 36 internal bike parking spaces in the building. A curb cut along Smallman Street will be removed and replaced with an appropriate sidewalk and street trees. The second floor consists of residential units and the amenity spaces with a pool as well as completely open-air amenity spaces. On both the east and west sides of the site above the second floor the building sets back another 10 feet from the adjacent property lines to reduce the mass of the building and also provide a large space buffer for light and air between the proposed project and the existing buildings, especially to the multi-family condominium building to the west. As part of that site there is a 20-foot private parking area. There will be another 10-foot setback on the proposed site totaling a 34-foot buffer between the buildings. On the top floor the building is set back 10 feet along Smallman Street in accordance with the Riverfront zoning requirements. The rest of the floor is multi-family use. Proposed alterations under the performance points would reconfigure the internal parking as well as residential units into three retail spaces of varying sizes, should that market arise, with a smaller portion of the garage to remain and a public entrance for the building. In conjunction with the conversion requirement, there is also a required 15-foot ground level. The architecture of the building is an appropriately designed to relate to the existing context of turn-of-the-century buildings on both the west and east. The exterior of the building will be broken into vertically oriented peers of masonry veneer clad in a limestone or pre-cast ash or masonry veneer extending to the second floor. The second to the sixth floors would be a red brick veneer that is articulated with vertical piers interspersed with a contrasting dark brick color creating vertical bands separating the large-scale windows. On the sixth level will be a Luca Bond panel as a contrasting material to reduce the scale and the visibility of that floor. The Spruce Way elevation will be visible from all sides and will use the same masonry veneer material on all sides from ground level to the next four floors, and then the metal panel on the top floor using the same articulation of architecture, the same window spacing, sizing, etc. Two slides added since a previous briefing showed the west side of the building using the same material on all six floors. The ground level is the only portion that sits on the property line and is required to be an opaque, two-hour fire rated wall of masonry in a contrasting color

to the red brick above set back 10 feet off the property line then, continuing that red brick and metal panel articulation for the remaining floors. On the east elevation, this building will be built against the adjacent building until it sets back 10 feet for the usable space on the upper levels. The three primary components' material will also be the black anodized Luca Bond panel at the top floor, red Belden Brick with a nice range to it for the typical red area, the contrasting Bellcrest black smooth brick between the windows, and the horizontal banding as a precast concrete trim element at each floor level intended to break up the architecture and overall banding of the building. Additional slides were presented with an overview on the building's overall massing as it relates to the adjacent parcels, the entrance to the building which is full height storefront glazing with projecting canopy that will be illuminated in the evening, and a site plan for the proposed structure occupying the majority of the site. The stormwater management plan utilizes below grade storage tanks that withhold the required water stored per City of Pittsburgh regulations. A landscape plan to provide eight street trees along Smallman St, and to replace a full curb cut with a standard curb and the new street trees was presented. During the previous briefing, it was recommended that the team select locally appropriate trees, which they revised to include Eastern Redbuds, more appropriate to the environment here. A solar study showing the proposed building on selected dates March 21, June 21, and December 21, showed the impacts of the sun during the day. The March 21 9:00 a.m. impact is to the northwest, with very little impact on adjacent parcels. By 10:00 am the building started to shade only Spruce Way, a portion of the future project to be proposed, and by 3:00 pm it was providing almost a fully eastern shadow on the existing roof of the adjacent building. By December 21 the worst condition had the longest shadows and very limited impact on any adjacent parcels as the sun began to shade Spruce Way and shifted to the east throughout the day. The team met with the Strip District Neighbors group last November and followed with another meeting in April with some changes to the project. They also attended a Strip District Neighbors town hall meeting in April, which was a public meeting. The team received a letter of support from the Strip District Neighbors in April. An additional letter of support was provided by District 1 Councilman Bobby Wilson after a previous briefing was complete. They also met with the city staff, the neighboring property owners, stakeholders and other neighborhood groups. Community discussions concerned a focus on articulation and activity on the ground level particularly on Smallman St. The team understood different concerns and felt the project they presented reflected those conversations, noting they would continue that dialogue after Planning Commission approval and on to the construction phase of the project. They were happy to be very open and transparent in communicating the construction timeline with all other individuals that may benefit from knowing.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Maribeth Johnson, President of the Multi-family Condominium Association.

Ms Johnson commented on behalf of the residents of 2901 Smallman that Mr Hudson has been very open with us and has engaged us in this process sending multiple emails and addressing the concerns that we had. She thought that the Strip District was turning into something that she believed everyone in the room may not even have envisioned. She stated Mr Hudson was addressing that and, as people who live and who are the neighbors of a person who's developing property, they have had dialogue about what will happen to their cars and what will happen to Spruce Way. She commented that Ms Dick has asked if Spruce Way is a two-way street and said that's a nightmare that at some point they will be talking about it. She appreciated the ability to have a continuing dialogue and to have Mr Hudson's email and phone number. She also appreciated, as residents of the Strip District Lofts who are his neighbors, his talking to them and working with them. She believed they will have a continuing dialogue as this progresses, and my aversion to dust is something that we'll have to work with. She wanted to go on record at this meeting on behalf of the members of the building who will be his neighbors by saying we appreciate his engagement and look forward to a continuing dialogue because that's what neighbors and neighborhoods are all about. Mr Hudson stated that dialogue will most definitely be open in the future and coordination will need to occur and looked forward to keeping this nice neighborly relationship that they have made over the last year going forward.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve DCP-ZDR-2022-13515 filed by HUDSON RAILROAD LP, property owner, for demolition of an existing structure and new construction of a multi-unit residential building with 105 dwelling units, with the following conditions:

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The final constructions documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms Ruiz

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2022-13518 – 6 30th Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential in the RIV-IMU Strip District Neighborhood

Mr Levine asked Chair Burton-Faulk if she would you have any objection consolidating the testimony from this and the previous 2929 Smallman St record for purposes of these cases so we don't have to repeat all of the testimony in the first case. For instance Miss Johnson's testimony would be applicable to this case as well.

Chair Burton-Faulk had no objection.

Mr Kunak introduced the project. He noted that Railroad Street in this location is owned by the Allegheny Valley Railroad Company. The proposed project at 6 30th Street, parcel 28-F-110, is for demolition of an existing warehouse structure and new construction of a six-story, multi-unit, residential building with 129 dwelling units, 72 ground level parking spaces, 46 bike parking spaces, and an associated second floor amenity space. No Development Activities Meeting was required because there is no Registered Community Organization at this location. The stormwater management permit was received and conceptual review was approved. A Design Review was held and the application with no substantial comments. The transportation memo was approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. One performance point was requested for a proposed building height of approximately 70 feet. The applicant is pursuing one point under Section 915.07.D.9.a, Public Art, at least 1% of the estimated gross construction cost is made as a one-time contribution to the City's Public Art Fund for use by the City for art on publicly owned lands within the same neighborhood. The applicant's statement of compliance is attached. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission approves this application with the following conditions: 1. that DOMI approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROSA, 2. that the Public Art Performance Point contribution to the city Public Art Fund be paid prior to issuing the ROSA, and 3. that the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROSA.

Mr Jonathan Hudson, Ryan Indovina, Cliff Levine, and the team presented the project located at the intersection of 30th and Railroad Street. They presented aerial views and contextual images of the parcel situated in the RIV-IMU zoning district, showing the existing condition which is a machine shop warehouse structure occupying about half the block to be demolished and active railroad tracks separating this parcel from the actual right-of-way on Railroad Street. Other views included 30th Street looking towards Railroad Street at the intersection with Spruce Way, and views on Spruce Way looking downtown and looking uptown. The site development standards for the Riverfront district are under Section 904.04.C. There is a zero-foot front setback with a required 10-foot sidewalk on any public street side. In this case, because there is no sidewalk on Railroad Street due to the railroad tracks, a 10-foot sidewalk on the interior of the property will set the proposed building back 10 feet. A requirement of the Riverfront zoning district is to have a 10-foot setback on any portion of the structure over 65 feet. There is also a proposed colonnade on a portion of the site that provides that 10-foot setback with the building situated above it. The base height standard is

60 feet, the maximum height is 90 feet, and the proposed building will be 70 feet. There is no rear setback requirement. One height performance point was requested to be applied to public art. About a year ago in September a pre-application meeting began along with other meetings from that point, arriving at the DOMI right-of-way transportation memo approval as of late April and stormwater management conceptual approval.

Mr Levine asked that the exhibits be admitted into evidence and any redundant exhibits to the 2929 Smallman project referenced by page number as the same.

Page seven is an overview of the project development schedule as was provided in the previous presentation and would be constructed at the same time. Page eight is a view of the proposed project as it will be situated at the corner of 30th Street. Page 9 indicated the existing site plan with the existing building occupying 100% of the site. There is no sidewalk between the building's property line and Railroad Street itself. There is an existing sidewalk on 30th Street that will remain and is compliant with the Riverfront zoning requirements. It will be reconfigured and adjusted to meet both ADA requirements as well as entrance points for the proposed project. Page 10 indicates the ground level of the building which is a majority of the internal parking completely enclosed on all sides of the building. There is an entrance point at the corner of Railroad and 30th Streets into the building lobby as well as the bike storage area directly accessed both through the lobby and on the Railroad Street sidewalk. There will also be two vehicular entrances to the internal garage off 30th Street and off Spruce Way. Also, off Spruce Way will be the fully enclosed internal utility services, electrical transformer and generator components. Along the provided 10-foot sidewalk on Railroad St there will be partial landscaping and the colonnade from midblock to 30th Street. The building itself as it extends off the ground level plinth is an L shape. From the second through the sixth floors are residential units. The amenity space on the second floor facing Spruce Way will include a range of outdoor seating areas, a sport court space, and an exterior stairway that extends from the second floor to grade level at Spruce Way, allowing residents to mingle with residents of the Smallman Street building. A sidewalk will be added along Spruce Way to activate it as a pedestrian

experience between the two structures. Page 12 showed the L-shaped floor plan of levels three through five. The Railroad and 30th Street sides will have a combination of insets and projecting balconies to create an articulated façade. Page 13 showed the sixth floor set back 10 feet per the setback requirement above 65 feet.

Page 17 showed the exterior materials, Belden Brick which is a smooth coloration from a light red brick color to almost a purple color contrasted with black anodized Luca Bond metal panels, open joint rain screen, and aluminum frame windows throughout. Page 18 showed the Mayo Blend smooth veneer in the tan/buff range with a contrasting darker color brick to be used instead of an entirely white brick veneer to mitigate any cleanliness concerns that may arise over the lifetime of the building, which was a concern about environmental contaminants mentioned in a previous briefing. A ground level view of the colonnade at the building entrance showed a full height glazed storefront with the underside of the colonnade clad in a light wood look material and extensive lighting throughout to create a unique condition along the roadway and mitigate any safety concerns. Several slides depicting the proposed building from various angles were presented. A proposed site plan was presented indicating a reduction in the footprint relative to the existing 100% lot coverage. Page 25 showed the storm water management plan of entirely below grade tanks in accordance with the City of Pittsburgh storm water management requirements, which is the same plan as the previous Smallman Street building. The landscape plan exhibited trees chosen from the City of Pittsburgh standard tree list, which was a concern about local trees in a previous briefing. Proposed are four State Street maple trees and four Ginkgo Biloba Magyar trees. A shadow study similar to the previous project showed the building only impacting Railroad Street or 30th Street primarily in the 9 A.M. period both in March 21, June 21, and December, at the height of the day at noon, as well as 3:00 P.M. The site across the street was not impacted because it is too far away.

Mr Levine asked that the exhibits be included as in their respective presentation.

Chairwoman Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker Saw no hands raised.

Chairwoman Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a

motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve DCP-ZDR-2022-13518 filed by HUDSON RAILROAD LP, property owner, for demolition of an existing warehouse structure and new construction of a multi-unit residential building with 129 dwelling units, with the following conditions: 1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and 2. The Public Art Performance Point contribution to the City Public Art Fund be paid prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and 3. The final constructions documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz
CARRIED

- E. Director's Report
No Director's Report.

- F. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:47 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

July 25, 2023 at 2:20 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Becky Mingo
 Peter Quintanilla
 Dina Blackwell

Not Present

Monica Ruiz

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Will Gregory
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Scheppeke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. 7800 Susquehanna Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00929, Major Consolidation, Homewood South 2. 4400 Lytle Street, DCP-LOT-2023-01009, Proposed subdivision of one parcel into two parcels, Hazelwood	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02426 – 2120 Fifth Avenue New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04872 – Colwell Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood 3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00634 & DCP-ZDR-2022-13396 – Tullymet St/Shared Way PLDP Amendment and New Construction for CMU Robotics Innovation Center at Hazelwood Green Hazelwood Neighborhood	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of June 13, 2023 Minutes

MOTION:

To approve Planning Commission minutes for June 13, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Quintanilla

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

Approval of July 11, 2023 Minutes

MOTION:

To approve Planning Commission minutes for July 11, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Quintanilla

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

None

C. Plan of Lots

1. 7800 Susquehanna Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00929, Major Consolidation, Homewood South
2. 4400 Lytle Street, DCP-LOT-2023-01009, Proposed subdivision of one parcel into two parcels, Hazelwood

Chair Burton-Faulk read in Items 1 and 2.

Mr Scheppke presented Items 1 and 2. The recommended was to approval Item 1 and 2.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion to approve Items 1 and 2.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Items 1 and 2.

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Ms Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02426 – 2120 Fifth Avenue New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced the application for demolition of two existing vacant structures and new construction of an approximately 50,000 gross square foot, four-story, multi-unit residential building with 51 dwelling units and accessory support offices, four off-street parking spaces, and off-street loading per section 908.01.F. Demolition and structures involving external alterations in excess of one hundred thousand dollars, \$100,000, in the Uptown Public Realm require a project development plan (PDP) reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. A Development Activities Meeting (DAM) has been completed. The proposed project was reviewed through the Staff Design Review process. A storm water management permit was submitted and is under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI). The project location is within the Uptown Eco-innovation District. The applicant provided responses to the development guide. Per the UPR Development Standards, new buildings with the gross floor area greater than 10,000 square feet undergo a green building advisory consultation. That consultation has been completed, and the applicant provided a statement of compliance to the review criteria. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve this Project Development Plan with the following conditions: 1. DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA), 2. the storm water permit receives conceptual approval, and 3. final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA.

Mr Campbell, Ms Sheldon, Mr Draper and the team presented the project. Beacon communities based in Boston have established eight communities in Pittsburgh, including most recently the Letsche School in the Hill District currently under construction and the Carina Apartments at 327 North Negley Avenue, which just opened last month. This proposed project is located on the East End of Uptown.

The site falls within the district of four distinct RCO's. The owners actually reached out to each one of them well in advance of any sort of development activities process. Uptown Partners is a co-owner on this project. The team has had numerous conversations with them. The team met with the Hill District Collaborative in October, reached out to the Hill District Consensus Group, and through that correspondence were asked to loop in their conversations with the Hill District CDC, having about three meetings in total, and the Design Review Panel. The first time they went through their process and their scoring criteria, the project actually didn't pass. Once the team received their funding, as part of their DRP process, they met again with some changes made based on those conversations. An additional Development Activities Meeting was held June 20th. The Hill DRP which represents nine different organizations issued a letter of support as has the Uptown Partners. The team presented slides depicting the site location and context between Fifth Avenue and Forbes Avenue, and Watson Street, a 20 ft wide way, on the rear, and the eastern end of Uptown near the Bloomfield Bridge. The site is attractive with its proximity and connection to multimodal transportation going through the site, the Bus Rapid Transit system, the bike network being established through the BRT system, and two massive employment districts between downtown and Oakland. Around the building the bike lane is one way along 5th Avenue, the other way along Forbes Avenue, with Moultrie Street as the connector, allowing great access through Watson Street. The BRT configuration will have a big change from what is there today. Currently the bus lane and Fifth Avenue are directly off the sidewalk. Over the next couple of years, the future configuration will actually include a bike lane first, then a five-foot landscape area with trees, then a parking lane, and then the higher traffic area. This site is more geared toward workforce owners. This project is a low-income housing tax credit project. The team has received tax credit allocations for the proposed 51-unit building of which 78% is either workforce or deeply affordable. Also proposed are 11 market rate units with a generous mix of units, 31 one-bedroom, 9 two-bedroom, and 11 three-bedroom units. There are 41 type B accessible units, 10 fully accessible units comprising almost 20% of the units, as well as two elevators.

The owner has committed partly through funding and partly through their own initiatives to a minimum of 25 MBE and 10 WB requirements hope to hit 30 and 15 respectively. There is also a commitment to a minimum of 12 percent of work hours that would be filled by minority employees. The project is fully compliant with the zoning code and permitted by right. No variances were sought at the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). The site is in the Uptown Public Realm and it is in the eco-innovation district, which is noteworthy because the eco-innovation district is designed to help promote sustainability and affordability. The base zoning has 40 feet of height with up to 70 feet of height if requesting two additional performance points. The team has six performance points based on the affordable housing, and even more points for sustainability should they choose to pursue those. There is actually no parking requirement on the site itself. Trying to promote public transit, the team proposed four parking spaces. At a previous briefing the team looked at the neighboring context and tried to understand the characteristics that make an uptown building, looking at materials, the brick and the stone, the window patterns, the overall building scale, some of the more unique color schemes, and both three-story and four-story buildings as well.

The site is bounded on the east and west by two existing buildings on the site and two adjacent vacant structures mentioned in a previous briefing. The team tried very hard to preserve the vacant structures, but between the condition of the buildings and some of the realities of the site there was no way to do that.

Based on both community process and some site forces the team also focused on creating a usable functional green space at Fifth Avenue. In doing that, the building is pushed back a little bit further away from Fifth Avenue. Respecting the context and meeting the street at the appropriate scale, the team is proposing a three-story element for the entry, community room, and offices fronted as close to 5th Avenue as possible. As far as materials and scale the building looks comparable to the rest of what you see in Uptown. Also, the public space was changed in response to both CDAP comments and some commissioner comments from a previous briefing. All entrances are accessible. A 30-inch high planter is proposed with plants to give it a semi-private nature instead of a fence. Other changes include the cornice which

was a bit heavier in the earlier designs. CDAP also encouraged the team to consider double hung windows. However, the double hung windows have some energy requirements that are hard to achieve for a passive house certified project. Although they have not been ruled out entirely. The topography of the site has 18 feet of change throughout the course of the site such that the structure becomes a five-story building in the back with much more visibility. Knowing that the corner was going to be more visible, more focus was given to the corner of the building. Also, there is an accessible parking space, a loading Space, screened trash, the rear entrance as well as three parking spaces. Amenities inside include a fitness room, a pet wash, and a bike storage area.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a motion.

Ms Mingo thanked the team for looking at the design review committee's comments and for rethinking that front area and the landscaping.

Ms Dick moved that the commission accept the proposed motion as is. III

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve PDP Application DCP-ZDR-2023-02426 for demolition and new construction of a multi-use residential structure, with the following conditions:

1. DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The Stormwater Permit receives conceptual approval; and
3. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04872 – Colwell Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced this Final Development Plan for new construction of three structures for use as multi-unit residential including 123 dwelling units across both a Residentially Planned Unit Development, RP, zoning district and an RM-M, Residential Multi-unit Medium density, zoning district. The overall application is under concurrent zoning review. The application scope illustrated in the RM-M zoning district is shown to the commission for reference the development scope within the RP zoning district is under review by the commission. The RP scope proposes new construction of three multi-unit residential structures with 104 dwelling units. Phase one includes a three-story structure with five dwelling units indicated as Building C1, a four-story structure with 46 dwelling units indicated as Building A. Phase 1B includes a six-story structure with 53 dwelling units indicated as Building B. Buildings D1, D2, D3, D4, and C2 are located in the RM-M zoning district. A Development Activities Meeting has been completed. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing was held as Case 218 of 2022. The project was reviewed at Staff Design Review. The applicant worked with staff on the urban design targets. The stormwater management permit has been submitted and has received conceptual approval. The application is currently in review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI). A statement of compliance has been provided. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve this FLDP with the following conditions, 1. DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction document shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Addy Cullen, Mr Troy Urman, Mr Joe Hackett and the team presented the project. Choice Redevelopment is engaged in a great deal of community engagement so far and will continue this engagement for all subsequent phases. Since August of last year there's been a number

of specific focus groups with residents, talking about what they need and what they want in a new neighborhood. There have been charettes to talk about the design and how buildings will be placed and what might happen in certain locations. There have also been a number of meetings with the Hill Collaborative or the Upper Hill Community, trying to get out and talk to as many residents as possible, actually getting out on site, putting up boards, and talking to folks. There has been a great deal of input from this, and the team is looking forward to future phases of construction as residents see the level of quality and what they can expect. They will have a better picture of what to expect in those subsequent phases.

Bedford Dwellings Phase One is part of a larger Choice Redevelopment of 411 units expanding Bedford Dwellings into 823 units across the entire Hill District neighborhood. The Middle Hill is bordered from Fifth Avenue to the end of the Lower Hill, Herron Avenue on the eastern border and Bigelow Blvd on the northern border. This phase will be 123 total units in eight new buildings, part of the 823 units total, of which 411 will be replacements, 205 will be additional affordable, and 206 will be market rate. There are 16 fully accessible units, one in C1, one in C2, and the other 14 in buildings A and B. All of the units in the two larger multi-family buildings are flats and either accessible or potentially adaptable. The units that are in the lower rise buildings, the townhome style or the triplex style, are multi-story units with the exception of Buildings C1 and C2. Each have a fully accessible flat on the ground level with an adjacent accessible parking space. Given the slopes and the neighborhood context, in order to provide a fair amount of affordable housing on the site, the team will develop two larger multi-family buildings at the crown of the hill where they're best situated for access, to parking, and the more level areas of the site. The low-rise buildings fit within the context on some of the more steeply sloped roadways that have narrower frontages. Building A will be a four-story structure, Building B will be six stories, and the balance of the other buildings will be garage plus two stories or a flat plus two stories, roughly three stories total for the balance of the units. The team presented slides and views as a well-positioned site with a lot of great amenities immediately around it that residents can take advantage of.

The site is bordered by Reed St to the north, Dinwiddie Street to the east, Colwell Street to the south, and Miller Street to the west. The total acreage of the site is about five acres. The project is split into Phase 1A and 1B for financing purposes. There are two separate tax credit applications but will be built as one project. There are two different zoning districts, the RM-M and the RP District. The team was able to furnish good solutions for how to address the different characteristics on the different streets. The mixture of townhouses, and multi-story buildings Miller Street blend in with the scale of the existing townhouses along Reed Street. Buildings C1, D1, and D2 are townhouses and all have garages on the lower level. There is a small parking space next to building C1 which contains an accessible unit. There are townhouses along Reed Street, Heldman Street, and Roberts Street which will blend into the scale of the existing neighborhood. There is a small lot off of Heldman Street behind Building C2 to serve those units. There is a small existing parking off Reed Street that serves three existing units at the corner of Reed St and Miller St which will be expanded. Buildings A and B which are four and five story buildings served by elevators with parking on the ground floor will occupy the main plateau of the site. Another existing parking lot will be expanded for some of the new buildings but the majority of parking spaces will be underneath buildings A or B. Access to parking for buildings A and B comes from a single entrance at the end of Roberts Street along Reed Street. Residents in Building A will actually drive under Building B and come to parking spaces in Building A. There will also be 46 bike parking spaces. Many will be contained inside buildings A and B, but there will also be exterior bike racks for residents to use as well. Between buildings A and B there will be a public green space. Since there is a lack of green space or publicly accessible green space in this part of the neighborhood, the team will create a place where everyone is welcome and serve as the entrance plaza into Buildings A and B. Behind Buildings A and B will be private green space for the residents with a small half-court basketball court, a playground, a picnic pavilion, and some open lawn. The topography is incredibly dramatic. That area is much higher than Miller Street and residents will enjoy great views of downtown, standing in the green space or at the picnic pavilion. This part of the neighborhood is incredibly steep. There is an 81-foot grade change from Colwell Street, and a very steep slope up to the plateau that used to be the

former Reed Roberts neighborhood, continuing to rise up to Roberts Street. The steep areas are located in the City Steep Slope Overlay, and none of these slopes are naturally occurring. They have all been graded, shaped and changed over time. There are some remnant foundations of buildings that were demolished decades ago along Colwell Street. The team is proposing a series of retaining walls in the backyards of buildings C1, D1, and D2, and in the slope up to Building A, which will be revegetated with a native steep slope wildflower mix. The team also proposes to reforest that area to build back some of the canopy that was lost. There is a stand of existing trees separating this site from Dinwiddie Street. All those trees will remain with the edge reforested as well.

The team looked around the neighborhood for inspiration from the materials, the scale, the massing, and the nature of the nearby buildings and made a contemporary interpretation of that image. The view from Reed and Roberts Streets highlights the front yard of Buildings A and B as a common public green area. Building A, which is a four-story building, becomes three stories with two community spaces at the street frontage, stepping down and relating to the townhomes in the area. The main entry on the corner and the windows would all look into a common community room fronting Reed Street, which would be available for access by the other residents. Building B's entrance facing Reed Street will be a little further away from the street. The team also presented views and elevations depicting limited visibility of the buildings over the heavily forested steep slope that runs down to Dinwiddie Street or Colwell Street. These elevations will only be visible from a distance because it will be so high and obscured by the trees. Distant views may see it peak up above the trees. Materials will be a mix of brick, brick detailing, including Flemish bonds, fiber cement siding and corrugated metal, as well as colors for variation and interest in the framing and the windows. The team stated they will comply with Enterprise Green Communities with sustainability features in lighting fixtures, Energy Star rated appliances, and the zero energy ready homes program which ensures that the building performs very well and efficiently, as well as the EPA's indoor air plus requirements which means that the indoor air quality requirements are held to a higher standard. Also, the buildings are designed to comply with the Pennsylvania Uniform Construction Codes and fair housing and UFAS, which is the program reflected in the HUD requirements under the federal accessibility standards. The project was presented to the Zoning Board of Adjustment last October and November where approval was granted for a number of dimensional variances for the front yard setback, interior side yard setback, and exterior side yard setback. The project went through the Hill CDC's design review panel, receiving a passing grade. The project has also received support from the Housing Authority's Board to proceed forward, which is critical. The team had a number of public meetings from August through last December which will continue as they develop future phases of the project. After meeting with the Planning Commission in July, 2023, the goal is to get to financial closing in September, start construction right afterwards, and then have construction completed in 24 months in order to open in September 2025.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve PDP Application DCP-ZDR-2022-04872 for new construction of two structures for use as multi-unit residential, with the following conditions:

1. DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approvals prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The Stormwater Permit receives conceptual approval; and

3. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00634 & DCP-ZDR-2022-13396 – Tullymet St/Shared Way PLDP Amendment and New Construction for CMU Robotics Innovation Center at Hazelwood Green Hazelwood Neighborhood

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing item.

Ms Rakus introduced this amendment to the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Hazelwood Green and a Final Land Development Plan for Hazelwood Green for the actual development project. There will need to be two motions, one for the PLDP and the other for the FLDP. The applicant will cover the PLDP in their presentation. The FLDP is for a three-story, approximately 150 000 square-foot structure for college and university use with an additional 65,000 square feet of enclosed outdoor space for robotics. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing was held for ZBA Case 64 of 2023 and received relief for two sections to the zoning code provided to the commission. A Development Activities Meeting was held April 13, 2023. The conceptual stormwater management plan has been reviewed and approved by City staff. Hazelwood has an approved neighborhood plan. A planned compliance letter from the neighborhood planner was provided. The project was reviewed in Staff Design Review and then by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel. A letter summarizing the review was provided to the commission. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure was reviewing the transportation memos, streets and way design, site plan, and curb cuts. The report outlines the criteria for both the PLDP and the FLDP. The recommended motions are a positive recommendation on the changes to the PLDP, and two conditions on the FLDP, 1. that the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approves all applicable permits prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. that the final construction drawings be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval. Mr Reppe, and Jennifer Askey presented the proposed project of a 150,000 square-foot, three-story building for robotics research and a 1.5-acre outdoor laboratory, or the Running Room, for robotic testing for larger things. The project will also include innovation on display where people can see the robotics research happening at this site. There is also a proposed public art program. The site is located in Hazelwood Green on parcels 33, 37, and 42 with the recently completed plaza on the west, Mill 19 on the northwest, and an active rail line to the east. The main entrance and the robotics innovation center are intended to front on the plaza with the outdoor laboratory space to be viewed from the plaza. The team presented a site plan of the site and a series of contextual images of the Mill 19 structure, rail line, and the plaza. The maximum building length is under 500 feet and there is a 10-foot step back provided.

The team proposed some amendments to the PLDP approved through ZBA variances. One was the elimination of two shared ways. Though allowed in the PLDP, the variance to eliminate the shared ways was approved because there is nowhere to go on the other side. The second variance for the build-to compliance was approved to allow the perimeter of the outdoor enclosure to count as perimeter space. There were three other proposed minor amendments to the PLDP. The first is for the college or university ground floor uses that satisfy the transparency. The proposed minor amendment asks that it should be exempt from the 30-foot entry spacing at regular levels. There are three entrances into the building, the main entrance in the middle directly opposite the plaza walkway, entrance for future nonretail food service, and an entrance at the northwest corner of the building near Mill 19. The entire area between the northwest corner secondary entrance and the main entrance will be an indoor public corridor for actively viewing all the robotics research happening inside the building, and also leading to a public event space. The second minor amendment is for the

outdoor robotics research space enclosure. The height is allowed to be no more than 48 inches. However, the team asked for the height to be taller than that for the three parcels as long as they included varying transparency throughout. The third minor amendment to the PLDP is for the lot coverage. Because the lot type is Type B there is a requirement for an 80% lot coverage. The project is about two-thirds to one-third in lot coverage. The team asked to allow for less than 80 % to accommodate the outdoor research and testing. This outdoor space is equally as important to the research as the indoor space. While it is an outdoor space, the team saw it as active research being utilized as any of the indoor space would be.

The team presented a floor plan showing project areas on the ground floor, the axis spine of the building going from the loading dock on the north to the exit out into Berwick Street on the south, the indoor water tank prototyping space at the drone cage, and the large opening at the south end of the building that opens directly out into the outdoor Running Room, showing the fluidity between the outdoor research space and the indoor research space. Further slides showed the variation along the

length of the building as well as meeting the PLDP step back requirements. The building is broken into four different profiles, creating some variety of texture, light, and shadow, that reflect the function of the building's interior. Two long bars flank the high-base more traditional project suite with more traditional projects based on either side, a gallery zone for the main public interface for the project, as well as the shorter bar that meets the PLDP step back requirements, the exterior drone cage structure, and then some entry access nodes incorporating CMU red to really drive home CMU's presence at Hazelwood Green. The material palette is primarily metal in two shades of a gray with mica finish as well as the CMU red color. Along the length of the building there will be a limited amount of concrete masonry used at the base where the building meets the sidewalk and the grass within the Running Room. A sloped roof configuration of standing seam metal roofs, serve both to relate to architecture elsewhere on the site, meet the step-back requirements, and also shield the mechanical equipment on the roof, which is a PLDP requirement. The team presented building elevations and renderings showing the material palette and the massing as a direct reflection of the work that's happening inside. This will not be a traditional academic building and the nature of the robotics research that's taking place inside requires a lot of space.

There will be very generous floor to floor heights, a double-height bay volume and a number of very large window openings and roll-up doors to accommodate robotics research. The architecture is intended to both support that research and also relate to Pittsburgh's history of making

things. The other two elevations wrapping around to Second Avenue will have a similar architectural expression on all facades of the building with large storefront windows at the ground floor to see the research activities, and then a punched window expression on the second and third floors with more traditional project space. The building along the full length of the plaza will create a strong urban edge and visibility from the plaza to all the research taking place. The main entry of CMU red will announce Carnegie Mellon's presence to the community and create an architectural expression that encourages the public to come in and see all the research activity that's happening inside. On the second and third floors the punched window expression will also have window shrouds that wrap across the top of each window and then down on the south side that serve both to create some interesting articulation and shadow, but also to create solar shading for the interior research environment. There is about 10 feet of grade change to deal with along the length of the building. Inside, the gallery actually slopes along with the slope of the sidewalk in order to maintain a lower window sill height to the large storefront windows, encouraging that indoor-outdoor interaction. The secondary entrance with the CMU red at the second and third floors above the entrance will be used primarily by researchers who will occupy both the CMU RIC as well as Mill 19 to provide convenient access between the two buildings and also to the indoor bike room directly adjacent to the entrance. The pass-through bay and loading dock forms a really important spine through the building for both loading as well as different robots, autonomous vehicles, and research activities to access the indoor and outdoor spaces. The proposed building will have a zero lotline. The PLDP intended Second Avenue to be a future public street along that

side of the building. For now, the intent is to temporarily seed the area directly in front of the building until the long-term plans for Second Avenue in the PLDP can be realized. The main image that the RIC will portray to the community will be from Irvine Street as one is driving along Irvine Street through the greater Hazelwood neighborhood. Standing within the Running Room exterior research environment is a view of the drone cage intended for exterior drone research, and also a very flexible outdoor research environment where the researchers will have the ability to build up different types of terrain. The landscape plan will include street trees along Telemet and Composite Streets, additional wider sidewalks meeting the PLDP requirement, as well as a raised crosswalk coming from the entrance to the building on the plaza. The Running Room is an interesting, highly functional outdoor research space with the drone cage in the northeast corner of the Running Room area. In the southeast corner area there will be agricultural robotic research, with the main area changing over time. Some days one might see moon rocks. Other days one might see piles of dirt or other things for the robots to learn to climb, to roll over, and work with the researchers. The two public viewing areas are important for people to see the work that will happen in this research space and, hopefully, spur the next young minds to want to get into robotics research. The team is also looking at where to create planting areas for shade and other green components to the building. Facing the plaza will be a very visible fence with a seating area, a more solid component giving way to another seating area, which will give way to the new secondary axis into the facility to show off the work that's happening. The enclosure also will include a component of public art. The team is working with the University's public art curator to put together an RFP soliciting artists as part of the enclosure facing onto the plaza. This will be a fully accessible building. The three main entrances, the main entrance in the middle, the future food service entrance, and the secondary entrance to Mill 19 will be on grade. The secondary entrance has a grade to it, sloping about 10 feet across the site. Ramps inside in that gallery space will be ADA compliant as well as the interior of the building with an elevator that serves all three floors, accessible restrooms throughout, all-gender restrooms throughout. Sidewalks around the site will also make it fully accessible. The university has been very successful in LEED Gold Certification on many of its most recent buildings. Specific components of the PLDP being prioritized are meeting no dedicated on-site parking, using native plants, optimizing our building envelope for energy efficiency, commitment to the 2030 District, enhanced indoor air quality, and also targeting urban open space that sets the stage for future continued urban development of the Mill District. There are parking requirements which will be met with off-site parking provided as part of the overall development of Hazelwood Green. Two hundred forty spaces with seven ADA spaces is the required amount. The team is also taking the bicycle reduction as well. The off-site parking lot is being developed by the Hazelwood Green Master Development team and is about a five-minute walk from the main front door of the building. Bike lanes are already integrated into the Hazelwood Green development. There are two bus routes, one through the Hazelwood Green site and one along 2nd Avenue just off site from the development. Loading and service to the building is actually interior to the building. Trucks will pull in from the north end of Telemet Street with a garage door that is closed when loading is not in use. Vehicles may also drive through the entire building to the outdoor Running Room to service the research activities happening in that space. There is also another exit onto Berwick Street on the south end of the site.

The team is working with the Hazelwood Green PLDP regarding transportation for the reduction of individual vehicle movements, off-site parking including bicycles, and CMU shuttles to the site.

The team's community engagement process has been a two-pronged approach. Part one has been working to become a partner to the Hazelwood community and how to embed ourselves long-term and make ourselves available to the community as development partners. The second part has been focused on the building and our long-term interaction with the Greater Hazelwood Community Collaborative and the Hazelwood Initiative while we are down there. The team hopes to mobilize construction late this summer or early fall, with steel going up next spring and substantial completion in early summer of 2025.

Chairwoman Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker Saw no hands raised.

Chairwoman Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

1. The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve DCP-MPZC-2023-00634 filed by Carnegie Mellon University on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for amendments to the Hazelwood Green PDLP.
2. That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES DCP-ZDR-2022-13396 filed by Carnegie Mellon University on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for new construction at Hazelwood Green with the following conditions:
 - a. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
 - b. The final constructions documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Dick on part 1.

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo on part 2.

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash announced this was Ms Mingo's last commission meeting. He expressed appreciation for her six years of service on the commission and her participation not only at the leadership level, but also as a secretary for a period of time. Her community perspective in deliberations from her prior experience really helped give depth to the commission discussions. Her advocacy and contributions for those with disabilities, for families, her advocacy around transportation, and relationship to development and housing have really helped improve not only developments that we've seen in the city but the products that have come out of our department as well. Mr Dash and commissioners expressed their appreciation and thanked Becky for her service.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:13 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

September 5, 2023 at 2:55 PM, Meeting called to order by Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill

In Attendance

Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Sabina Deitrick
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Mel Ngami
 Peter Quintanilla
 Monica Ruiz
 Dina Blackwell

Not Present

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh

Kevin Kunak
 Katherine Reed
 Daniel Scheppeke
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. 7800 Susquehanna Street, DCP-LOT-2023-00929, Major Consolidation, Homewood South 2. 4400 Lytle Street, DCP-LOT-2023-01009, Proposed subdivision of one parcel into two parcels, Hazelwood	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-02426 – 2120 Fifth Avenue New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04872 – Colwell Street New Construction for Multi-Unit Residential Bluff Neighborhood 3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00634 & DCP-ZDR-2022-13396 – Tullymet St/Shared Way PLDP Amendment and New Construction for CMU Robotics Innovation Center at Hazelwood Green Hazelwood Neighborhood	2

A. Approval of Minutes

No minutes for approval.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2023-06302 - 4401 Liberty Avenue

- Amy Burris

DCP-ZDR-2022-12563 – Beehive Street

- Sonya Tilghman, Executive Director, Hazelwood Initiative, Inc

DCP-ZDR-2022-06282 – 3401 Milwaukee Street

- Marimba Milliones, President and CEO, Hill House

Former Turn Halle - 855 S. Canal Street

- Isaac Falvey, Vice-President, Community Alliance of Spring Garden & East Deutschtown
- Inga Gudmundsson McGuire

C. Plan of Lots

1. Lytle Street, DCP-LOT-2023-01009, Major Subdivision, Hazelwood
Acting Chair O'Neill recused herself from this hearing portion after reading in the plan of lots. Commissioner Dick chaired this hearing of plan of lots.
Mr Scheppke presented the plan of lots to the commission, which was first reviewed by Planning Commission July 25, 2023. The recommendation was to approval the subdivision. Commissioner Dick asked for public testimony.
Mr Fraker stated no hands raised.
Commissioner Dick asked for any discussion from commissioners. Hearing none she asked for a motion to approve the subdivision.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Lytle Street subdivision.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-HN-2023-00470 – 201 N MURLAND ST Historic Nomination for Ella & Emil Keller House Point Breeze North Neighborhood
Acting Chair O'Neill read in this application for historic nomination stating that the Historic Review Commission had already reviewed this application and Planning Commission made a recommendation to City Council.
Ms Quinn presented the nomination to the commission. The building was built in 1905. Ms Quinn presented aerial views and modern-day photos of the property. She stated the Historic Review Commission reviewed the property and felt the property was significant because of the persons associated with the building. The property was designed by the owner and his wife neither of which were architects. The main reason that the property is significant is that its owner, Amel Keller, was the right-hand man of George Westinghouse, the innovator of electrical appliances and headquarters located in Pittsburgh. Also of significance, Mr Keller managed the design installation and breakdown of the lighting of the World's Fair in 1893,. He created the generators that supplied the power for the fair when most people didn't have electricity in their homes. It was considered the largest electrical contract of its time.
Subsequently, he was hired by George Westinghouse to run the Westinghouse Machine Company and was basically given a freehand, which was unusual for Westinghouse's style of management. Ultimately, Keller was put in charge of relocating the entire Westinghouse operations to the Turtle Creek Valley in Wilmerding, Turtle Creek, PA. A rail line was built specifically for the Westinghouse Company to route equipment, supplies, and personnel back and forth from the Lawrenceville area. Ms Quinn stated they had a chance to speak with Mr Fisher, the current owner, at the hearing who stated that the interior of this house is full of gadgets and gizmos that Mr Keller designed for his own use, including an electric water heater that's been in operation for over a hundred years. Ms Quinn believed the neighborhood community group was looking at potentially purchasing this property to turn it into a museum for electrical innovation, George Westinghouse, and the Keller family. The commission felt this property is unique architecturally as a combination of prairie style and neoclassical style designed by the owners, an unusual feat in itself. For those two reasons the commission felt the city council should move forward with the historic nomination and provide a positive recommendation.
Acting Chair O'Neill opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Matthew Falcone, President of Preservation Pittsburgh. Mr Falcone stated he was the nominator of this property. He thanked them for their consideration and said that it has been a wonderful journey on this nomination and as they have gone forward over the years, it has been great to be able to expand the narratives and share that they're reflected. He offered to answer any questions the commission may have had.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked commissioners if they had any comments.

Ms Dick commented after reading the fascinating report with the history and description of the house and so on it sounded just amazing. She was very proud to nominate and make a positive recommendation to City Council for the historic nomination of this property.

MOTION:

Staff finds that the nomination submitted for 201 N. Murtland Street meets the required criteria and integrity standards for listing as a city-designated historic structure.

The Historic Review Commission voted to provide a positive recommendation on historic designation to City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

2. DCP-HN-2023-00756 – 855 S Canal Street Historic Nomination for Allegheny Turn Halle North Shore Neighborhood

Ms Quinn presented this item for historic nomination. The Historic Review Commission voted to provide a positive recommendation to City Council. This property was built in 1898 in the East Allegheny neighborhood. The Historic Review Commission felt that this property was significant under four criteria. The first criteria is architecture. The building is facing the hillside where the rail line was located, which is somewhat unusual. The building itself is advanced for its fire protection technology. There is extensive use of steel beams and terracotta in the structure. There are automatic fire doors included in the building. It is one of six buildings in the city to this day that still has the highest-level fire rating. It is believed the building was built this way because, prior to its construction, there was another building used as a social hall on the site that burned down and may have resulted in some injuries. The building is associated with a famous architect, Joseph Stilling. He designed the Penn Brewery, the Spring Hill School, and the Troy Hill Firehouse, which have also come before Planning Commission for historic nominations. He was also a mentor of architect Frederick Osterling. The Historic Review Commission also felt this building was significant for its cultural history and its relation to German immigrants, in particular the German Turners. The Turners were a group founded in 1811 and based their philosophy on Health National Gymnastics as they called it. Eventually they became more than just a physical fitness organization and grew to be political. They were very liberal for the time and were heavily involved in the German Revolution of 1848. When their side lost, many of them came to the United States. The Turners opposed slavery. They ceased their activities during the Civil War so their members could fight because they were so opposed to slavery. In 1871 they advocated for women's right to vote. Probably their most lasting legacy in Pennsylvania is their ability to achieve physical education and gym class in public schools. Quite interesting is cycling. The existing building is the only building left. There are parking lots on all sides. For that reason, this building is a landmark for its visual prominence. It can be seen from any direction. It is very unusual to see a building so alone in its context. The Historic Review Commission felt this building was worthy of becoming a landmark.

Acting Chair O'Neill opened floor for public testimony. She recognized Mr Matthew Falcone. Mr Falcone, representing Preservation Pittsburgh, commented that one of the fascinating threads of this building was that it was one of the first projects, a model that was primarily

centered on this neighborhood and was a forerunner for all of the community development corporations in Pittsburgh today. They look at the buildings that were past their prime or going into another use. It is wonderful that we still have this piece of immigrant history and community development history with us today.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked commissioners if they had any comments.

Ms Deitrick commented on Ms Quinn's very nice presentation and discussion of the building.

It touches so much of our history as well as the building itself.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked if there were any more comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

Staff finds that the nomination submitted for 855 Canal Street meets the required criteria and integrity standards for listing as a city-designated historic structure.

The Historic Review Commission voted to provide a positive recommendation for historic designation to City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2022-13832 – 5303 Butler Street New Construction of Multi-Unit Residential Upper Lawrenceville Neighborhood

Mr Kunak introduced this Project Development Plan for new construction of a five-story development approximately 72 feet 6-inch tall that includes approximately 350,000 square feet for use as multi-unit residential with 267 dwelling units, 4,400 square feet of retail, 198 off-street parking spaces, and 100 bicycle parking spaces. An existing approximately 6,000 square-foot structure formerly used as a firehouse will be renovated and include approximately 1,900 square feet for use as retail sales and services. There is no Registered Community Organization at this location and no Development Activities Meeting was required. This application appeared before the Zoning Board of Adjustment as Case 294 of 2022. This application is subject to the Inclusionary Housing Overlay District per Chapter 907.04 of the Zoning Code. Standards include a minimum of 10% of units shall be inclusionary units, they must be integrated with and distributed throughout, and units shall be equivalent to market rate units within the project. The distribution is under review by DCP staff who will work with community groups on that. Of the proposed 267 dwelling units 27 inclusionary units will be provided. This application went through Staff Design Review. The transportation memo, site circulation, and proposed improvements to Berlin Way are under review by DOMI, the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. This application also requested three performance points per Chapter 905.04.K.1. The base height in the RIV-IMU zone is 60 feet and the maximum height is 90 feet. The base height and the maximum height in the RIV-MU zone is 45 feet, and the proposed building height is approximately 72 feet 6 inches as granted by the ZBA decision. The applicant is pursuing points under energy affordable housing and rainwater. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission approves this Project Development Plan with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the ROZA, 2. the stormwater permit receives conceptual approval. It is currently in review, 3. the construction management plan, with additional criteria as outlined in the ZBA decision, is approved by both DCP and DOMI prior to issuing the ROZA, and 4. the final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the ROZA or Record of Zoning Approval.

Bill Sittig, Paul Alessandro, Andrew Ruel, Chris Droznick, and Dan McDowell presented the project. The project's design inspiration is based on both the industrial character of the site dating back to at least the late 1800s and the retail-with-residential-over environment that sits along Butler Street including the cast iron storefronts, large plate glass windows, and sign

bands, will all be part of the design. Although the building footprint is less than 50,000 square feet, the criteria in Chapter 922.04.E.6 of the Zoning Code are being used as guideposts. The proposed affordable units will be a mixture of unit types built to FHA standards. In addition to the required accessible units, all the units are adaptable. Entrances will be at grade, there will be a building elevator, and accessible parking. The team presented slides, historic images, and views showing the site's vehicular access points, the massing and setbacks of the façade, as well as a public plaza between the building and the fire station. The team presented elevation details showing the use of masonry, metal cladding, and large storefront glazing at the first floor with the large double hung windows for residential use above. Two different colors of brick and tinted mortar will be used as well as the inclusion of all the metal elements at the base, emulating the retail storefronts across the street. The building entrance will be along Butler Street, and a fitness center will occupy the full front facade. There will be lighting in the panels above the entry and an open canopy will have the address and signage. The lobby will be open to the public during regular business hours for anyone to socialize, have coffee at one of the retail places, or use the Wi-Fi to study or work. Also, there will be open public amenity space, including an accessible dog park space in the rear of the facility. McCandless Avenue will retain a residential character with two story walkup units at street level, each having its own small private patio and planting. Residential units will be on the second, third, and fourth floors, and on the fifth floor in the corner at the intersection there will be the residential amenities level and outdoor space. Vehicular access points through the building will be at approximately 53rd St and at Berlin Way, accessed from McCandless Ave. The two access points on McCandless Ave will be the primary access for residents with the main garage at the south end, shifting the majority of traffic activity to the less busy McCandless Ave. 53rd Street will be a private drive. All of the parking is stacked behind the building and is not viewable from the front. The loading dock is off Berlin Way. There were comments and concerns heard from a previous presentation about what the underpass will look like at McCandless Avenue. It is intended to continue the bike passage connecting the bike lanes both east and west of the site. The 20-foot wide Berlin Way will be well lit and maintained by the building for safety and security. At Butler St and McCandless Ave, the east end of the historic district, the restored fire station, maintained as an anchor in the design, will be incorporated into the Butler St façade. The restoration of the firehouse into retail space will use classical and historic building materials such as brick, glass and full restoration type windows with interior and exterior applied muntins to emulate the original window patterning, the original proportion of the garage entry doors, as well as the man door in the center. Directly behind the project there is a 90-foot maximum height for future construction. The rear elevations will have mechanical units mounted through the wall while the front facing units will have interior stand-up mechanical units to avoid exterior louvers facing the main streets. Shadow studies of the building, predominantly facing south, showed all of the building shadows falling on the property or on the property behind. No shadows were created on Butler Street. The performance points being pursued will be applied to the whole project except the Butler St height presented separately to Zoning. This project will adhere to the National Green Building Standard, save the existing historic structure on the site, use native and water efficient landscaping, use Albion's own internal building recycling program, adhere to dark sky compliance in all of the lighting fixtures, and use electric vehicle charging stations within the building. The team has been working with the city, different commissions, application meetings, and the neighborhood groups, making this a comprehensive project. The team will continue to work through logistics with DOMI to ensure the site is beneficial to all residents and neighbors in the community. Some of the agreements so far with the local stakeholders are following the Affordable Inclusionary Housing Guidelines, accepting the Housing Choice vouchers, complying with all the guidelines outlined in the Butler Street Design Plan, including a bus shelter, curb bump outs on Butler St, McCandless Ave, and 53rd St for pedestrian interaction, dedicated parking spaces, and slowing traffic on Butler St. Also, the team will continue to work with Lawrenceville United and Lawrenceville Corporation to establish a construction mitigation plan up through the beginning of construction. The Lawrenceville Streetscape Plan will introduce bench seating, the bus stop, a pedestrian and vehicular underpass at approximately 53rd St, and an area for public art created by local

artists. The best approach to stormwater catchment from the team's perspective on green infrastructure, the heat island effect, and different elements was to include green roofs on the structure, keeping a significant portion of the overall impermeable area related to the building in the green space. The storm water management, while still under review by DOMI, is an approach to keep the ground plane usable for residents. There will be some appropriate planting established for privacy. Motives to the design of the site were pedestrian access from the Butler Street Design Guidelines. The curb bump outs, the bus shelter, and usable seating areas within the space, and use of a combination of different types of pavement will accentuate different access zones. The pedestrian sidewalks will be plain concrete, meeting city standards. The parking zones or the tree verge area will have exposed aggregate. The main entrance to the building, the courtyard between the firehouse and the apartment building, and the plaza will be pavers. Also, tree grates will be installed, along with bike racks, trash receptacles using city standards, decorative bollards for protection at the alley, planters to activate the streetscape, bench seating, and soft movable furniture. The street trees, meeting city requirements, are not placed 30 feet on center from the overall linear footage of the entire streetscape on both sides of McCandless Ave and Butler St, but they actually exceed the number of trees required. DOMI may wish to open Berlin Way as two-way traffic for the entire length between McCandless and 54th Street, and the developer is willing to work with DOMI to reopen that portion of Berlin Way.

Acting Chair O'Neill opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker Recognized Andrew Moss, architect and area resident.

Mr Moss, representative of the adjacent property, stated the owner never received a letter informing them of the ZBA hearing that took place. Mr Moss stated it was only by accident that they learned this was up for Planning Commission review. Michael Johnson with Mr Moss attended November, 2022, community meeting and requested an opportunity to speak directly with the developer. There was no further communication. Currently, they feel the project is entirely out of scale and inappropriate for this site in this location and particularly how it will abut the neighboring property. There is no building that exists in Lawrenceville that is anywhere close to the scale of this proposed building. Mr Moss was personally concerned that this is going to set a precedent that will damage the Lawrenceville neighborhood and the look and feel of Butler Street. In the RIV Zoning District falls within the 40-foot maximum height limit, yet they are asking for 72 1/2 ft in height. The RIV District requires rear facades, have not done that on façade abutting this adjacent property. The building is described as five stories, but it is essentially a six-story building because of the mezzanine. It will be three times taller than the adjacent building and the buildings that make up this neighborhood on Butler Street.

Ms Rakus informed Mr Moss he was at the 3-minute time limit.

Mr Moss stated the co-owner of the property was also present and hoped to be granted six minutes. He reiterated this was the first time they had an opportunity to address this, and the adjacent property is clearly the most impacted by the project. Mr Moss stated the proposed height of 72 1/2 feet is 161 percent greater than what is permitted. He stated it seemed terribly irresponsible, and the impact it will have is tremendous. He stated the discussion about changing Berlin Way needs to be discussed with the adjacent property owner and how it impacts their use of their property, deliveries, parking, etc. Furthermore, units on the upper floors of the project have corner balconies that will have a direct impact and visual connection into the privacy of this adjacent property. Their own shadow studies show half of the direct sunlight will be cut off from this property from part of the afternoon through the rest of the day. Mr Moss asked for an opportunity for further discussion with the developer on the impact this project is going to have. He stated construction will remove approximately 15 street parking spaces as well as closing the sidewalk which will impact this business. He stated their concerns about access to the rear alley, the dust and noise, and the power lines running down the vacated Berlin Way today. He hoped the Planning Commission will take their concerns very seriously and either deny this project or, at a very minimum, consider a continuation to give them an opportunity to meet with the developer and discuss their concerns with him. Mr Fraker recognized the Executive Director of Lawrenceville Corporation.

Ms Sarah Tribovic stated she was there to express Lawrenceville Corporation and Lawrenceville United's support for Albion Developments located at 5303 Butler Street. Lawrenceville United's mission is to improve and protect the quality of life for all Lawrenceville residents, and Lawrenceville Corporation serves as the conduit for responsible and sustainable growth in the Lawrenceville Community. Together their community process provides a forum where proposed developments can be discussed, vetted, and measured against community plans and priorities. She stated the process enables LU and LC to identify priority issues that will help guide conversations with the developer through the planning and construction processes. LU and LC have met with Albion Development numerous times as well as in a community forum. Their development has been received quite positively, except for Mr Moss' testimony, mainly because it increases the density for an area of Lawrenceville that needs more residents and businesses. She appreciated Albion's willingness to listen to the public and include neighborhood agreements related to the inclusionary housing units and accepting House Choice vouchers, utilizing the Butler Street Design Guidelines' use of the dog park by the neighborhood, and developing construction mitigation plans to minimize the disruptions of the Prasad Center and other stakeholders in the area. Another item that was discussed during the public process was the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in the area. Many cyclists prefer to travel away from the busyness of Butler Street. LU and LC were proposing that Berlin Way could be this alternative route. Albion is committed to opening Berlin Way to pedestrians and cyclists and limiting vehicular traffic. She said it sounded like it was still under review, but wanted to raise that concern. She stated if it is considered like a neighbor way for the future, they could potentially view it as that.

Mr Fraker recognized Elizabeth Amato.

Ms Amato commented for herself and also on behalf of Pro Housing Pittsburgh which is a local non-profit that advocates for abundant and affordable housing. She stated they were definitely in favor of this development. Number one, it will provide more housing stock. Since both apartment and housing prices have gone up a lot due to increased demand, adding more market rate housing supply will help alleviate that upward pressure, keep prices from going up further, and keep Lawrenceville affordable. Number two, more designated affordable units will be added to the neighborhood. Number three, this is going to develop an empty lot and also renovate a historic building at the same time. Without detracting anything, it will add to the tax base, the vibrancy of the neighborhood without displacing anyone, or losing any historical buildings. Finally, regarding the height and the fit with the character of the neighborhood that Andrew Moss raised as a concern, Lawrenceville has always had a variety of buildings and styles which is what makes it architecturally interesting as a neighborhood. In Ms Amato's opinion, it will be different but not stand out in. Furthermore, taller buildings are needed for the high-density housing, and they are generally more affordable, as well as being more environmentally friendly. In more densely populated neighborhoods, residents are more likely to use public transit. There is a lower carbon footprint than in less dense neighborhoods. There are no lawns and things like that. They can afford green roofs like this one has.

Acting Chair O'Neill recognized Mr Broad.

Mr Broad, a resident and business owner, stated he was in favor of this for many of the same reasons as well. He understood Mr Andrew and Mr Johnson's concerns. But, at the same time there's going to be roughly 450 more people living in this neighborhood that will be availing themselves of all the businesses in this area. He said he is located directly across from where this building will be built, and will have the greatest potential, if not more, of a having a disruption of business. But, he believed the disruption will be minimal. He stated construction is construction, and we all know how it goes. He thought the developer was being very responsible with their planning. He thought it will be a great thing for upper Lawrenceville because there is no place to build except upward. So, I'm in favor 100 percent. Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked commissioners if they had questions, comments.

Ms Ngami asked if they could explain a little bit more the dynamic of the pricing for the properties that are being added.

Mr Ruel thought Ms Ngami was referring to the overall apartment home rental rates. He stated they will have 27 inclusionary units that will be accepting the Housing Choice vouchers

and will have a series of floor plans that range in size from studio apartments, the smallest units, as low as \$1,400 a month. As it goes up, a convertible unit, between a studio and a one bedroom, then a one-bedroom, and a two-bedroom will range from \$1400 to the mid-\$3000s, depending on size.

Mr Quintanilla asked if they could into a little more detail in terms of the ground floor and relationship with the sidewalk because some of the building will be commercial fronting Butler and some will be commercial on the other façade.

Mr Alessandro and Mr Ruel suggested thinking of it as an L-shaped building with four components, an east and a west building on Butler, the fire station at the corner, and then the McCandless building. The east Butler building, east of the underpass, will have one or two retail spaces, depending on how the tenancy works out. Also, facing Butler St at the far east end will be bike storage in the back and a bike repair station at the front retail space with see-through windows. A visual block will separate the storage in the back from the working part in the front. The west Butler building on the left side of the center access easement is the lobby. The fitness center will be not only for residents' use but also for public use during business hours. The public can come and use the seating, the Wi-Fi, grab something from one of the stores in the neighborhood, and just enjoy that space. Continuing west down the block, the next piece is the public plaza with public seating. Anybody using the retail piece in the historic fire station will also have access to the plaza. After the fire station there will be the dog park, then the Berlin Way passage, and then the first floor of the McCandless building, which is all residential units with small walkout front yards.

Mr Quintanilla asked about the plaza and fire station. He said it felt like they were trying to make it a small gem with just the lobby and no commercial space facing into the plaza except the commercial space in the fire station itself.

Mr Sittig clarified calling them individual buildings is how they look at the street, but this will be one building. The intent is to have it on one consolidated subdivided lot because of the private drive through the building at 53rd St and the other one at Berlin Way. It certainly is one building but there are segments at street level.

Mr Quintanilla asked about 53rd being terminated at the passageway under the building and if they will be doing anything special with the façade.

Mr Sittig stated they are not changing the existing street configuration. The private drive is not directly across from 53rd. The private street is and will remain the main ingress and egress to the office building to the rear. Fifty-third Street doesn't totally align, and DOMI has been working very closely with them at aligning it, but it is working now. Keeping the current alignment to that building was critical. The cars that are currently using it will continue to use it. Also, if that driveway were moved to the west, it will leave an undevelopable remnant there. It is a 40 ft wide right-of-way that will be strictly for local vehicles and bikes as compared to Berlin Way at 20 feet wide. The pedestrians will be on McCandless and Butler. There's a similar connection on 54th Street for bikes, keeping them off Butler Street.

Mr Quintanilla clarified his question stating a lot of people are going to be driving down 53rd Street with it terminating at the building and wondered if there was anything they will be doing architecturally to make that termination more inviting or grander.

Mr Ruel stated that the public art will be visible next to the underpass from 53rd as you're coming down Butler. It would be flanked on both sides as an inviting art way. The retail storefront is located on the righthand side, the fitness center is on the left hand at grade. The parking facilities tier actually sit above the first underpass, and then the units with balconies tier.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked if the affordable housing units were distributed across all types of units.

Mr Ruel stated they are evenly distributed and randomly placed throughout different areas of the building, having different views, different floors, and completely even based on the unit mix.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked if in accepting the Housing Choice vouchers, will they have an administrative agent assigned to monitor the affordable housing. How were they working through that selection process?

Mr Ruel stated their management company has an affordable housing division within it and will be able to perform the qualification process and recertification process, along with working with the Housing Authority of Pittsburgh.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked if they would respond to Mr Moss and Mr Johnson's comments.

She stated the commission encourages continued open communication moving forward.

Mr Sittig stated there is usually an exhaustion of community involvement and in representing Albion, that is the case here. He stated they were blindsided by Mr Johnson's testimony, who participated in the November 25 community meeting and everything else. All the communications were public. He stated Mr Ruel followed up individually and even went into his restaurant looking to contact somebody because nobody had reached out. He has also worked with Mr Ruel. Mr Sittig he is the applicant. He is easy to find. He stated there also was no referral through LC and LU. He asked Mr Ruel if he would respond to the efforts Mr Ruel had made.

Mr Ruel stated he was there to work cooperatively with their neighbor. He hoped their business will drive more business to their neighbor. He stated he personally was there about three weeks ago and actually went into to the kitchen trying to find Mr Johnson. Someone gave him the phone number of another person named Michael that works there. Mr Ruel called them, but it wasn't the right Michael. Michael said he would be giving Mr Johnson Mr Ruel's contact information. Maybe that happened. Before this meeting he was actually on a call with the rest of his team who decided they were going to book dinner there to try to get in front of them to talk about construction because they couldn't figure out another way. Mr Ruel stated they are a good neighbor who will be there for them and listen to their concerns. He understood their frustration and appreciated their comments. He stated at the Zoning Administration hearing for the height variants numerous people gave public testimony for that decision. He stated he will sit down with them at every turn and LU LC could be present. He met with Mr Broad across the street several times to show him they are a good neighbor. He said as a long-term holder they will make their best efforts to mitigate all types of noise and sound. They will not film but will take pictures of his building, put a vibration monitor on his building, and continue to clean up the dust and debris along the block every day. They will continue that dialogue, and if needed with LU and LC present, to make sure it continues through the construction period.

Acting Chair O'Neill encouraged LU and LLC to facilitate that, but to shortcut that even sooner. She asked City Planning staff to send an email with Mr Moss and Mr Sittig on the same chain so that they can keep this moving. She asked if that was an acceptable request.

Mr Sittig stated it was fine from the applicant's standpoint.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked Mr Sittig if he would coordinate that, and if LU and LC would help with that moving forward, and certainly with the use of the way at the rear, and the construction management. As part of the recommended conditions of approval, she said staff will be monitoring and working through those issues and encouraged continued communication as staff will be checking.

Mr Kunak stated, for the ZBA decision, there is the item that the development team is to work with community groups to establish a construction mitigation plan before construction commences to minimize disruptions to the Prasad Center and other stakeholders. He said they will be sure to enforce that.

Mr Sittig stated they already had that meeting with Prasad. It was very productive. He said there are any number of individual neighbors that are going to be impacted, and he very much welcomed Mr Johnson into that tent.

Acting Chair O'Neill clarified for the record the commission did hear some comments about density and height. The height was not before the commission. It was addressed before the ZBA and not within their discretion to review. She read the recommended motion into the record and then asked to propose a motion. She wanted to have the conditions of approval on the record so everybody can hear that.

MOTION:

1. The Planning Commission of the City Pittsburgh approve DCP-MPZC-2023-00634 filed by Carnegie Mellon University on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for amendments to the Hazelwood Green PDLP.

2. That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES DCP-ZDR-2022-13396 filed by Carnegie Mellon University on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for new construction at Hazelwood Green with the following conditions:

- a. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approves all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
- b. The final constructions documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA). And asked for a motion.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

No Director's Report.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:21 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Sabina Deitrick

Mel Ngami
 Peter Quintanilla
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Kevin Kunak

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. None	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2022-05441 – 2005 Wyandotte Street New addition and accessory parking area 2 Crawford-Roberts Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-03110 – Forbes Avenue at Craft Avenue New Construction of Multi-Unit Residential South Oakland Neighborhood 3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00755 and DCP-ZDR-2022-12563 – Beehive Street PLDP Amendment and New Construction for Lab/Research Use Hazelwood Neighborhood	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of July 25, 2023 minutes.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Dick, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

ABSTAINED: Ms Deitrick, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2022-13832 - 5303 Butler Street

- Nathaniel C. Hunter; Rothman Gordon, P.C.
- William R. Sittig, Jr.; Sittig Cortese LLC

DCP-ZDR-2022-03110 - 3129 Forbes and 3133 Forbes

- Dave Panasiuk, Oakcliffe Community Organization, President

No active ZDR application - Relocation of Heliport to Hemlock Street

- David Cercone

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2022-05441 – 2005 Wyandotte Street New addition and accessory parking area 2 Crawford-Roberts Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for DCP staff. The Project Development Plan was for exterior alterations, new construction of a two-story addition, and associated site work. The proposed addition of approximately 1,500 square foot was for building circulation and second floor staff offices. Accessory uses included off-street loading space, a dumpster enclosure, and eight surface parking spaces. The Registered Community Organization at this location included Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh, Hill District Collaborative and Hill District CDC. A Development Activities Meeting report was submitted. This application was reviewed at Staff Design Review. An additional review by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel (CDAP) was not recommended. The applicant worked with staff to address comments. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure was reviewing DOMI site plan and curb cut permits. The applicants submitted a statement of compliance per the review criteria. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve this PDP with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure approve all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction documents reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mark Latterner presented the project. The Jubilee Kitchen has served as the social service organization for people experiencing homelessness or living in poverty since 1979. The kitchen had been in the same building since then, and the building was at the point where it was no longer fit for its purpose. There had been a significant increase in demand for services such as hot food, clothing, showers, financial assistance to prevent homelessness, and referrals to various other social service organizations. The renovation and addition would allow updating the kitchen space, larger food pantry, larger clothing room, a laundry facility for guests, enhanced social service offices, as well as providing ADA access to the second floor of the building.

Mr Dario McPhee stated the site is located in the Crawford Roberts neighborhood near Uptown. Directly adjacent to it is an existing park or greenway owned by Jubilee. The proposed project was to renovate the existing building on the first level and add on to the building primarily for accessibility by adding a new elevator, stairs, and program space. Views, elevations, and site plans showed the existing exterior of the building, exposed service entrances, blocked in windows, a dumpster at the street, streets in disrepair, and the surrounding residential development, Center for Hearing and Deaf Services, and the John Heinz Early Child Development Center. The maximum building height allowed in the UPR-C zone is 40 feet based on the adjacent residential planned unit development and multi-unit residential zone. Including the renovated building and new addition, the building will be 26 feet 6 inches with just under 10,000 square feet. The primary uses will be a community center, eight surface parking spaces with one van accessible space, retaining walls under 10 feet high, 4 bike parking spaces, and one loading space. Storm water management will consist of an underground detention system, and screening with landscaping. The natural topography high point of the site is east of the property, and it drains southwest towards Fifth Ave. The dumpster will be relocated back into the property with an adjacent loading zone and the underground retention system directly beneath. The eight parking spaces will be off the street closest to the building with a safe pedestrian crossing and new sidewalk along the street. The first floor will contain the kitchen with a cold storage support space relocated behind the existing dining area. At the front will be a social services office and the new entrance to the soup kitchen. In the new addition to the right will be the new administrator/accessible entrance with elevators and accessible restrooms. The second floor will remain as is with the new access to the second floor, an office/meeting room, and another social services area in the new addition. The vertical architectural embellishments will be removed from the front of the building. New exterior materials will be existing painted brick, high density fiber cement panels, glass and some exposed block. The geotechnical engineer did not believe, based on applicant's design, it will cause any landslides.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had any comments.

Ms O'Neill wanted to thank the presenter for providing some additional talking points and for the detailed presentation.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2022-05441 filed by Indovina Associates on behalf of JUBILEE ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED, property owner, for exterior alterations and new construction of two-story addition, with the following conditions:

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The final construction documents reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-03110 – Forbes Avenue at Craft Avenue New Construction of Multi-Unit Residential South Oakland Neighborhood

Mr Kunak presented the project for DCP staff. The Project Development Plan was for new construction of a six-story development approximately 70 feet tall with approximately 5,600 gross square feet for use as multi-unit residential with 48 dwelling units, 24 off street parking spaces, and 22 bicycle parking spaces. The subject property is currently located in the UCE Zoning District. At the time of application, the zoning district was the OPR-D, Oakland Public Realm sub-district D, and this project was reviewed under the OPR-D standards. The application appeared before the Zoning Board of Adjustment as Case 114 of 2022. At time of application there were two Registered Community Organizations at this location, Oakland Planning and Development Corporation and Oakland Business Improvement District. Oak Cliff Community Organization was approved as an RCO after the application was reviewed. A Development Activities Meeting report was submitted. The application was reviewed at Staff Design Review and by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel. The design review summary and applicant responses to CDAP comments were submitted in a report to the Planning Commission. A transportation memo was still under review by the DOMI. A statement of compliance and part of the review criteria were submitted by the applicant. As a note to the commission, the presentation showed artwork within the right-of-way at the corner of Forbes and Craft Avenues. This artwork was for reference and was not under review by the Planning Commission. If it is submitted for approval, the artwork will come under review by the Public Art and Civic Design Commission. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approved this PDP with the following conditions: 1. DOMI approved all applicable permits, and 2. final construction documents reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Jim Pfeiffer stated this new project was done in partnership with many service organizations representing the LGBTQ community over the past five years. It will have special programming for the LGBTQ community, but will not be exclusively dedicated. It will be open to all seniors over 62 who meet the low-income guidelines as well.

Mr Jim Rothschild presented a fact sheet about the need for LGBTQ friendly housing, the severe discrimination this group is experiencing, and how this is a much-needed type of housing for this region. He presented a slide depicting the history of the pride flag, showing a very colorful, diverse community flowing over time as the flags have progressed. He presented views of the site and surroundings, showing its prominence serving as a gateway to the Oakland district. The site rises about 30 feet from the bottom on Forbes Ave to the top

edge on Craft Ave, rising an additional 10 feet up to Fifth Avenue. In total, there is a 40-foot change from the lower corner of the site up to Fifth Avenue at the top with a large green sloped embankment viewable from the Boulevard of the Allies.

Mr Donnley presented slides and views of surroundings, landscaping, accessibility, and lighting on the site. Several parcels were involved in this project. Two parcels, 28-J-180 and 28-J-184 were consolidated into one parcel. Also, two parcels at the corner of Forbes and Craft Avenues will be used for access. Another parcel will become a 75-year lease area to maintain access from Craft Ave into the project site. Another slide showed access to the building parking area off Craft Ave, the loading area in front of the building, two access points for pedestrians on Forbes Avenue, and an outdoor courtyard in the rear protected by the building. Accessibility requirements will be met for both pedestrian entrances. The southern entrance into the parking garage situated below the building and the building entrance to the left of that will be accessible from Forbes Avenue. Lighting will be a mix of parking lot appropriate lighting, bollard lighting for pedestrian paths, and courtyard lighting to open up the space for outdoor use. Materials used will be stamped concrete and pavers.

Mr Rothschild spoke about the design influences taken from the surrounding architecture. Elevated brick panels two stories above the street and a transparent tower were influenced by the research center across the street. A balcony near the main entrance on the third floor was influenced from the SkyVue Apts. The two entrances on Forbes Ave and near Craft Ave were designed from the OPR-D zoning district requirement to have entrances face the Boulevard of the Allies. Also, the side yard designed as if an adjacent building was next door was influenced by possible future development in the former Oakland Portal project. The front building façade with triangular embellishments that gently change color from green to blue-green to blue as one moves past it was influenced by the demographic of the intended occupants. Further, the upper three floors at the corner of the building will be communal spaces with a social activity area and communal lounges on each, collectively nicknamed "The Lantern" by the team, with an outside roof terrace above. Exterior materials to be used were gray brick, colorful panels, high density fiber cement, aluminum panels, and metal siding. The team added into their presentation a proposed future artwork at the corner of Craft Ave, in the right-of-way but behind the sidewalk. This artwork would be created by an artist chosen from the local LGBTQ artists and approved by the office for public art. The team was committed to sustainability with the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency and will be accredited with the Enterprise Green Communities, meeting the Department of Energy, Zero Energy Ready Home requirements.

Mr Donnelly stated stormwater sustainability will collect the water from the building, parking areas, and rear pathways into a retention facility that will control rate and volume before discharging it into the system on Forbes Avenue. Because of the limitations of the steep slopes and the other properties nearby, this will be a more traditional system rather than an infiltration system. He detailed the traffic report by Trans Associates, showing the parking analysis and a circulation plan along Craft and Forbes Avenues, the parking and pathways down Forbes, the accessibility routes into the building, the rear courtyard, surface parking spaces, and garage and bike parking.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had any comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2022-03110 filed by Rothschild Doyno Collaborative on behalf of PITTSBURGH NMR INSTITUTE, property owner, for new construction of a multi-unit residential building with 48 dwelling units, with the following conditions:

1. The DOMI approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The final construction documents reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00755 and DCP-ZDR-2022-12563 – Beehive Street PLDP Amendment and New Construction for Lab/Research Use Hazelwood Neighborhood

Ms Deitrick and Vice Chair O'Neill recused from this hearing item.

Ms Rakus presented the project for DCP staff. This was an amendment to the Preliminary Land Development Plan (PLDP) and also a Final Land Development Plan (FLDP).

Ms Rakus presented the FLDP and the applicant presented the PLDP. The FLDP was for a two-story structure of approximately 180,000 square feet for research and laboratory uses along with accessory parking. A Development Activities Meeting was held July 11, 2023. A memo summarizing that meeting was attached to the Planning Commission report. A conceptual stormwater management plan was submitted and was under review by city staff. The project was reviewed in Staff Design Review and the Contextual Design Advisory Panel (CDAP). A memo was attached to the Planning Commission Report. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure was reviewing the transportation memo, the streets and ways design site plan, and curb cuts. A compliance letter to the Hazelwood Neighborhood Plan was submitted as well. The recommended motions were 1. to approve the amended PLDP, and as part of that approval, to change Street D to a flexible shared way, and 2. to approve the FLDP for new construction with the following conditions: 1. that DOMI approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. that final construction documents reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr John Kamin presented the minor amendment to the PLDP to change Street D to a shared way. The Bioforge development is surrounded on all sides by streets and is located within the Mill District of the Hazelwood Green Master Plan, which was specifically tailored for this type of use. It was critical in designing the site to have a back of house function. Switching Street D to a shared way, was the best location for the loading and back of house functions in terms of the PLDP. Reshaping the street to a way enabled better turning radius and better access for vehicles and other functions. Mr Kamin presented views of the surrounding existing conditions from 2nd Avenue, through the mill, and from Lytle Street. PLDP Section 4.1.1 allows for a street to be designated as a shared way, subject to the approval the Planning Commission, by submitting an amendment to the PLDP in conjunction with an FLDP. Working with staff, it is reviewed on a case-by-case basis, giving the commission and staff appropriate input to ensure compliance with the spirit of the PLDP. Mr Kamin presented slides listing all the changes necessary to the corresponding figures in the PLDP to designate Street D as shared Way D. The corresponding figures are Figures 3.4, 4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8, 4.9, 5.2, 5.9, 5.10, and 6.1. Meetings were held with the GHCC executive committee in May and June, 2023, along with a Development Activities Meeting July 20, 2023. Mr Kamin thanked the staff for their hard work on this and for getting this whole project together.

Mr Chuck Alcorn presented the Final Land Development Plan for the Hazelwood Green Bioforge project located in Block 18 of the Special Planned District 10 (SP-10). One hundred acres of the 178-acre site was once part of a former Jones and Laughlin steel mill. The PLDP identified the site as a light industrial and production area. Proposed was a new two-story structure used by the university and a tenant, Elevate Bio. The site will officially be known as a Bioforge Biomanufacturing Center and will be used for cell and gene therapy innovation under the use classifications of Research and Development and Light Manufacturing. The conceptual design meets the PLDP and the zoning code requirements, and any refinements or adjustments will also comply. Mr Alcorn presented several slides showing the site context and surroundings.

Ms Jamilah Ducar stated the applicants engaged in seven meetings with community leaders in the spring of 2023. The University of Pittsburgh partnership with the Hazelwood community to bring the life sciences to residents of all ages is a primary goal along with broad economic inclusion. The university has worked diligently to ensure that workforce development is

central to their commitment through outreach targeting underrepresented business for subcontracting and procurement, offering construction and trade pre-apprenticeship support to connect Hazelwood residents directly with labor unions, and work to reduce barriers to participation. Elevate Bio has committed to a paid training opportunity ahead of the facility's opening with the intention of preparing Hazelwood residents for the coming new jobs. A dedicated workforce counselor is focused on four neighborhoods including Hazelwood, and has been extremely successful in getting folks into full-time jobs with family sustaining wages. The Bioforge facility represents what is truly an early phase to the next two decades of collaboration.

Mr Vance Cheatham stated the PLDP requirements impacted the design of Type D buildings which house light industrial research and development uses. Architecture, layout, and character were derived from the functional requirements of these specialized products. There will be two pocket parks, one on the corner of Lytle Street and the shared way and one on the corner of Blair Street and the shared way. The buildings for this type of manufacturing are very simple, very straightforward buildings in order to accommodate flexibility as things change within the building. The building will be made up of two rectangles that converge onto one at Beehive St. This will create a very prominent main pedestrian entrance at the corner of Beehive and Lytle Street that will be ADA accessible with two parking spaces each on the corners at Blair Street and at Lytle Street. Also, directly across from the main entrance on Beehive Street will be spaces set aside for Ada parking. To come into compliance, ADA accessibility will be matched to existing conditions with rollover portions on the curbs and texture to accommodate not only wheelchairs but also people using a cane so they can detect when they have come to the end of the sidewalk. Mr Cheatham presented slides showing the building orientation, massing, elevations, and materials. The building will have 185,000 square feet, two stories plus a penthouse, will be 68 feet tall, have the two pocket parks, areas for opportunities for integrated public art, and the service dock. The office work areas will have as much glass as feasible to let daylight into the building. A slight balcony type terrace on the second floor will allow people to step out. The slides showed a future bus drop-off canopy along Blair Street, street and pocket parks plantings, trees where feasible and required, a surface parking lot. Also, across Blair Street will be the greenway, bike lane, next to the railroad easement, and the Monongahela River. The penthouse located on top of the building will house mechanical spaces. Along Lytle Street the glass will be an articulation of a structural bay to contextually tie this building to the Mill 19 building. Building materials will be brick, two metal panel systems, and tinted glass. Mr Cheatham presented a slide showing the building step backs along Lytle Street, Blair Street, and Beehive Street required by the PLDP and zoning. There is a 10-foot step back required at 85 feet. The building is actually less than 85 feet. The minimum ground floor height is 14 feet. The proposed height is a minimum of 18 feet. The minimum Upper floor height is 10 feet. The proposed height is 24 feet. This falls within the minimum height of 32 feet and the maximum height of 85 feet. With the penthouse as proposed, fitting within those two heights, the building will be at 68 feet. The roof equipment will also be set back 10 feet on the roof. The building frontage PLDP requirements are a minimum of 70% frontage within the build to zone. The Beehive Street side is 70%, the Lytle Street side is 71%, the Blair Street side is 70%, and the shared way is not applicable. The minimum pervious and impervious lot coverage required is 65% or 3.24 acres. Approximately 94% is proposed. A maximum of 20 percent of the developed lot, or approximately 0.4 acres, is required for surface parking. The proposed parking is 6%, 0.21 acres. SRI requirements will be compliant with 38% of the building footprint at or above SRI of 82%. The parking lot will be at or above SRI of 82. The storm water will be managed by two existing ponds, one on lot 15 and one on lot 17. The piping will work within these areas. Transparency complies with the required ground floor and second floor transparency of 30%. The transparency will be 51% and 31%. The required ground floor articulation is a maximum of 30 linear feet between the bays. An average of 16 feet 4 inches is proposed. Because of the convergence of the building rectangles coming together at the front entrance, it will allow approximately 36 feet for an entry facing Beehive Street, and approximately 38 feet facing Lytle Street, which accentuates this as a main entry and also complies with the maximum 50-foot width required for the ground floor lobby.

Ms Papacharalambas presented the urban open space for the Mill District as required by the PLDP. It included the stormwater retention area between Blair Street and the railroad tracks, the open space across Beehive Street directly to the west of the site, which will provide seating, bicycle parking, and additional landscaping. The two pocket parks and entry plaza will serve as public amenities even though they are not classified as urban open space under the PLDP. The street trees along Beehive, Blair, and Lytle Streets, and in the pocket parks will meet or exceed the required number of 27. The equipment yard walls and landscaping in the loading dock area will screen the mechanical equipment from the street as required by the PLDP. The tables, chairs, and benches, which are consistent with the Hazelwood Green Master Plan providing continuity in the character of the public realm, along with the planters and the water bottle filling station, will be consistent with the PLDP's goal to encourage outdoor living spaces in the build to Zone. The unit pavers in the pocket parks and entry plaza will likely be replaced with exposed aggregate concrete, which exposes river rock in the paving surface. Since the presentation was submitted, the parking area material will be a continuation of the asphalt paving in the adjacent loading dock area. There was some comment previously about the sidewalk path from Blair Street to the shared way. It will be continuous, and the trees will be located in a planting bed to the side of the sidewalk. Native plants are part of the larger Hazelwood Green Master Plan, which supports biodiversity while providing year-round visual interest. The bike parking area will have 10 outdoor parking spots, exceeding the four required, charging stations for five e-bikes, a fix-it station, a dedicated bike room providing 16 indoor bicycle parking spots, exceeding the 10 required, and two shower rooms as required, all accessed from Lytle Street around the corner from the main building entrance. In terms of sustainability, the team was pursuing LEED Gold, which the PLDP requires gold or better. Ms Papacharalambas presented a slide depicting the sustainability strategies required by the PLDP, such as optimization of the building energy performance, indoor and outdoor water use reduction, enhanced indoor air quality, and waste receptacles containing both trash and recycling.

Mr Alcorn presented slides showing public art along the Blair Street screening wall, and how it will relate to the surrounding context. The artist in the proposal phase would determine the materials and how it would be integrated into the screening. The university will be going through a public art selection process for the screening area. The exact size and design has yet to be determined. More details will be known during a two-stage selection process. Artists will submit qualifications. A short list of qualified artists will create art proposals. Once they are received, the artists will receive a modest stipend for their submission. The final selection will be based on community participation and the design integration into the building. A second potential location for public art will be in the lobby of the building. If this location is finalized, it would go through a similar selection process.

Ms Jampole talked about the traffic study. The parking requirement for the site based on the zoning will be between 164 and 360 spaces with 29 spaces provided on site and the remainder provided in the off-site parking lot. A curb cut off the shared way will lead into the loading area as well as the on-site parking. Additional parking will be provided in the off-site lot accessed from Beehive Street. The walking distance between the main entrance and the off-site parking lot will be 230 feet. The number of indoor and outdoor bicycle spaces will exceed the requirements of the zoning code. The loading area, accessed off the shared way, will contain six required loading spaces, two for tractor trailers, and four for single unit trucks. All truck movements can be made within the proposed design. Ms Jampole presented a slide showing many possible elements of a Transportation Demand Management Plan. Pitt's TDM coordinator will supervise expanding or changing services, with the goal of minimizing single occupant vehicles destined for the site, and encouraging several modes of transportation. The TDM will also coordinate the strategies selected with periodic reports to DOMI. Bicycle parking was discussed earlier in the presentation. There is a two-way cycle track along Blair Street that is part of the Hazelwood Green development. Some people from the university may be able to park remotely on the Pitt campus and take the Pitt shuttle system to the site, as well as other locations connected to Pitt's main campus. There will be an information board in the building lobby to provide updates in real time to multi-modal options such as the Pitt shuttle, Uber and Lyft pickup and drop off locations, pickup and drop off with priority for

carpools and van pools, and consideration of other measures as well. A system of wayfinding strategies will also be part of the development.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker Saw no hands raised.

Acting Chair O'Neill asked commissioners if they had questions, comments.

Ms Dick asked Ms Jampole if there was sufficient space at the Uber and Lyft designated drop-off place for the Access vans to drop off and pick up people.

Ms Jampole stated she didn't know if it had been finalized yet, but it was their goal, along with one of the two ADA accessible paths.

Mr Quintanilla stated a concern about the brick facade of the building becoming quite hot for pedestrians walking along that side of the building and asked if it was addressed.

Mr Cheatham stated particular attention was paid to the brick, changing it to a lighter color palette to prevent that sort of heat gain that comes from darker brick. Attention was paid to the mortar joints as well to ensure they did not create a hot spot. The use of glass was used where feasible. However, the area was associated with mechanical and storage which limited the use of glass. It was being located in such a way to break that up. He said the site is actually curved slightly while the building will be straight. There was also going to be an area with some potential planting at grade next to the sidewalk. If that becomes apparent they would try to take advantage of that.

Mr Quintanilla suggested installing something like eyebrows over windows to create shade on the brick, especially considering that this will be quite a long horizontal building.

Mr Cheatham said that was an interesting idea. The building will be right up next to the property line and they would have to look at how much wiggle room they will have.

Chair Burton-Faulk recognized Mr Murray who was having a challenge with the raise hand function.

Mr stated he has a real integral emotional connection to that site as his dad worked at and retired from the mill. He was happy to see the dynamics of the design and trying to connect to Mill 19. He agreed there wasn't much room between the property line and the curb line and the type of embellishment in between other than what was shown for common space or bike space. I would have liked to see more room as well. He liked the segue among the entrances and things coming off the different portions of Blair Street and the alleyway. He stated, as a community, they were very interested in seeing the dynamics of how everything is choreographed because they don't want to lose the genuineness of it on Hazelwood green.

Mr Murray was very grateful as one of 5,000 residents to be invited. He said he thought he heard accessibility space for 29 parking spaces. He questioned how many of those would be handicapped accessible and also the grading for ADA accessibility coming to the building. He had a concern about the white striping across the road, especially for those using canes, and if the striping will be nonskid. He stated he has seen people take tumbles over and over.

Other than that, he like the presentation.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for three separate motions. 1. DCP-MPZC-2023-00755, 2. change of Street D to a flexible Shared Way, and 3. DCP-ZDR-2022-12563 with conditions.

MOTION:

1. That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved DCP-MPZC-2023-00755 filed by Goldberg, Kamin, and Garvin LLP on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for an amendment to the Hazelwood Green PDLP.

MOTION #1:

MOVED BY: Mr Quintanilla

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill, Ms Deitrick

CARRIED

2. That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh Approved the change of Street D to a flexible Shared Way.

MOTION #2:
 MOVED BY: Mr Quintanilla
 SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla
 RECUSED: Ms O'Neill, Ms Deitrick
 CARRIED

3. That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved DCP-ZDR-2022-12563 filed by Langan Engineering on behalf of ALMONO, property owner, for new construction at Hazelwood Green with the following conditions:

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) approved all applicable permits prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOTION #3:
 MOVED BY: Ms Dick
 SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Ngami, Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla
 RECUSED: Ms O'Neill, Ms Deitrick
 CARRIED

D. Director's Report
 No Director's Report.

E. Adjournment
 The meeting adjourned at 3:52 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

October 3, 2023 at 2:11 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Sabina Deitrick

Mel Ngami
 Peter Quintanilla
 Monica Ruiz
 Dina Blackwell

Not Present

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Kevin Kunak

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. None	
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-05441 – 220 North Shore Drive – High wall signage, North Shore Lot 10, North Shore Neighborhood 2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04882 – 129 Anderson Street - New installation of high wall signage 3. DCP-ZDR-2023-07159 – 3440 Forbes Avenue -	2

A. Approval of Minutes

None.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

None.

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-05441 – 220 North Shore Drive – North Shore Lot 10, High Wall Signage, North Shore Neighborhood

Ms Moradian presented the project for DCP staff. The proposed request was for two new highwall signs each 61 sq ft, one on the north façade and one on the south facade of an existing multistory, multi-unit residence. The proposed signs met zoning code criteria per section 919.03.M.7(c) for the building name mounted higher than 40 feet above ground. The two sign did not exceed 2% of exposed facade area of the building. No Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting was required. Design staff conducted a review of the proposed signs on June 6, 2023. Staff was supportive of the design and had no recommendations. There was no Registered Community Organization at this location. Therefore, no Development Activities Meeting was required. A high wall sign in the North Shore District is required to be reviewed and approved as a Project Development Plan before the Planning Commission.

Mr William Kolano presented the project. The project is in the RIV-NS District, Riverfront Northshore. The building is across the street from PNC Park, north of the Allegheny River. The two signs are identical. One sign will face to the north and one to the South. Both signs are 61 square feet. The signs comply with everything in the zoning code section. Four signs are allowed. The team proposed only two. The signs are well under 2% of the exposed facade area. A site plan and a letter of compliance that the sign will be within the city's lighting standards forthcoming were forthcoming. Mr Kolano presented views of scale and context, north and south facing views, a site plan, and elevations showing the size of the signs meant for people immediately near the building. The north elevation is almost 12,000 square feet. At 2% that would allow a sign of about 240 square foot sign. The south facing facade is even larger at 328 square feet. The 61 square-foot signs are about a quarter of what the sign size could be. The sign will be 2 feet high and slightly over 30 feet wide. The letter type used will give it a jewelry like look on the building. The front face of the letter will be illuminated and pin mounted from the brick façade. There will be a very subtle halo around the perimeter of the letter. By day, it will revert to a nonilluminated look. The viewing distance of the signs will be 840 feet for readability in the immediate neighborhood. The sign will not be readable when viewed from the top deck of I-279, or from behind the ramp that leads to the Fort Pitt Bridge. The team was asked to show the sign from across the river, and it is really insignificant.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-05441 based on the application filed by KOLANO DESIGN on behalf of STADIUM AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PGH, the property owners, for installation High□wall Signage—two new high wall signs of 61 sq. ft.—in the RIV-NS; NORTH SHORE, zoning district on existing multi-story multi-unit residence.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2022-04882 – 129 Anderson Street - New installation of high wall signage, North Shore Neighborhood

Mr Gregory presented the project for DCP staff. The project was for two high wall signs located at 129 Anderson Street, which is located in the Riverfront NorthShore, or RIV-NS, zoning District. This district permits highwall signs subject to Planning Commission review and approval. The application proposes two new high wall signs for Central Outreach on the parapet of an existing three-story structure facing Anderson and East General Robinson Streets. The application also includes some signage under the 40-foot high wall sign threshold, which were reviewed administratively by staff. The project went before the Zoning Board of Adjustment in April as ZBA Case 19 of 2023. A variance was requested to allow a 252-foot high wall sign on the building's Anderson Street facade and a 248-foot high wall side on the build's East General Robinson Street façade. The ZBA denied the variance. Following the Case 19 of 2023 decision, the applicant team revised the project to comply with the RIV-NS maximum sign face restrictions. The

current proposal before the planning commission fully complies with the RIV-NS maximum sign face restriction under Section 919.03.M.7(c) which limits the face area of high wall signs to 40 square feet or 2% per linear foot of the exposed facade area, whichever is greater. The two reduced high wall signs were reviewed by design staff in July, 2023. The design staff accepted the signs' design and placement as presented. The North Shore does not have a Registered Community Organization. Therefore, no Development Activities Meeting was required. Since this was a high wall sign no storm

water management or Department of Mobility Infrastructure (DOMI) review was required. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2022-04882 with the following conditions: 1. the final construction plans including site plans and elevations be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Debbie Fossick presented the project for the Central Outreach Wellness Center, an LGBTQ inclusive medical facility, at 127 Anderson Street. She presented slides showing the two high wall signs and context. The General Robinson Street sign will be seen from the Parkway and also from Rte 28. The Anderson Street sign will also be seen from Rte 28 as one enters and leaves the city. Another slide showed all the different areas in which the signs would be seen. The Anderson Street logo sign is the LGBTQ community's inclusivity symbol. Along General Robinson Street the limited area on the building would not allow the entire wording Central Outreach Wellness Center. The sign was revised to Central Outreach with the logo on either side. There will be two other signs lower on the building. One on the Anderson Street side as an identifier for people walking by, and another sign on the building tower viewed from the parking lot as an identifier for people who are looking to pull into the lot and for location purposes.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners questions, comments, or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2022-04882 based on the application filed by 412 Signs on behalf of BORBORYGMUS LLC, the property owners, with the following condition: the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2023-07159 – 3440 Forbes Avenue - Demolition of existing two-story structure
Mr Fraker presented the project for DCP staff. The project was for the demolition of a two-story commercial structure in the Central Oakland neighborhood per Section 904.09.D.2, demolition of any primary structure of 15,000 sq ft or greater requires a Project Development Plan reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. A Development Activities Meeting was held May 8 with the Oakland Planning and Development Corporation and the Oakland Business Improvement District. This application was still under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure for the maintenance and protection of traffic and the construction management plan for demolition, staging, and street closures. Per Section 904.09.D.2, Project Development Plans that are filed for building demolitions not part of an application for new construction shall include a report, study, or statement of the property's future use that meets the review criteria of Section 922.10.E.2, and that is attached to the commissioners' report. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission approve the Project Development Plan with the following condition: the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve the maintenance and protection of traffic and construction management plan for demolition staging and street closures prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Andrea Geraughty presented slides of the location in context with the area on Forbes Avenue in Oakland. This was formerly the CVS which has relocated, and this building has been vacant for more than a year. A notice of intention to demolish was posted on the property. The intent was to demolish the former CVS building. The parking lot will remain until construction commences on the project. Turner Construction is the construction manager.

Mr Will Masters presented slides showing the construction and some different scenarios working through the demolition. The parking lot will be utilized to contain nearly all of the work that needs to occur in order to remove this building. During this phase the activity will be contained within the parking lot during the demolition beginning from Iroquois Way towards Forbes Avenue. The demolition along Iroquois Way will take about a week and will be coordinated with UPMC and Hilton Garden Inn. During this phase of construction, the sidewalks will remain open and unobstructed as they currently are now along Coltart Street and Forbes Avenue. The site fence would be located along that edge to prevent pedestrians from wandering into the parking lot. The sidewalk and one lane of Forbes Avenue will be closed for one week so the structure can be safely demolished to grade. As discussed at a previous meeting, a crosswalk to direct traffic across the street at the appropriate location will be provided along with signage for those who are visually impaired and with a sign base that would not obstruct the sidewalk, reduce tripping hazards. The sidewalk at Coltart would remain unobstructed and open. After demolition the parking area will be reopened with a site fence with scrim or screening around what was the existing building, retaining the existing slab on grade. There would not be any kind of exposed soil which would eliminate dirt and mud.

Mr Mike Dembert talked about the anticipated schedule for the project. The total duration would be about six weeks from mid-October to December, 2023, to prepare the site for lab office project. They plan to return to Planning Commission next year once they have final design, planning to break ground towards the end of next year. It is about an 18 to 20 month duration, delivering the completed project in mid-2026.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had questions, comments or a motion.

Ms Deitrick commented that at her building on Halket Street, which also has major construction, there was a sign that was totally blocking the sidewalk so that someone in a wheelchair would have no chance of getting through. She appreciated the redesign and hoped they were very careful about where the signage was placed, envisioning multiple ways around it for people with different forms of mobility disability.

Mr Masters agreed.

Ms Dick seconded Ms Deitrick's comments and moved for approval.

MOTION:

APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-07159 based on the application filed by Brittany Bloam on behalf of Murland Associates Limited Partnership, the property owners, with the following condition:

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) shall be review and approve the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) and Construction Management Plan (CMP) for demolition, staging and street closures prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

Mr Christopher Corbett presented an update on the housing needs assessment, showing demographics then and now, reviewing some of the key findings from the most current housing needs assessment, some strategies, and then a discussion with any questions and next steps. From a study in 2016 the Department of City Planning found a huge gap in producing affordable housing. City Planning along with Commissioner Deitrick and former Commissioner Mingo performed another study in 2022 as an update that included strategies that could be implemented and root causes of the loss of affordable units. The new assessment was to provide a

comprehensive understanding of housing needs and conditions across household incomes and establish an objective data driven resource on the housing market to guide future policy decisions. Pittsburgh is gaining mostly upper income households and has outpaced the statistical area in receiving renters and households with higher incomes. On the other hand, low-income renters are leaving. Opposite things are happening at the same time. The greatest housing need is for low-income renters that are 30% or below AMI. Black home ownership is falling in the city and rising elsewhere in the county and in the MSA. There is a shrinking supply gap caused by few low-income renters and higher regional incomes. In 2012 and 2013 there were larger three to four-person households. Now there are one and two-person households, and they are usually higher income renters. The majority of those renters have influenced the market with more multi-family units being built. As well, low income renters are leaving Pittsburgh. Those renters are being displaced and pushed elsewhere in the county, or leaving the area. It is worth taking a deeper dive into finding out exactly where we are losing the low-income renters and making sure that we are finding policy and producing more affordable housing that touches on the 30% or below AMI. For every two qualifying families there is only one unit that is subsidized or qualifying. In the future it is projected to add probably 9,700 households over the next 10 years. Around 5,400 of those will be renters looking for multi-family housing. A few other things to point out from the housing needs assessment are the majority of single-family investment activity is house flipping; there is not a lot of new construction for single-family housing; market related vacancy is at the lowest since 1980; and multi-family rentals dominate the future need, resulting in 90% of new housing being multi-family. A decrease in the small plex created the missing middle after the updated 1999 zoning code. By the early 2000s there was almost no missing middle. In 2020 multi-family housing was being marketed and geared towards higher income and higher rents causing a huge displacement as well. Finding strong policies that will make it more affordable for the developer to build will in turn bring more affordable units available for renters and incomes across the board. Rentals dominate the future, projected to add just under 10,000 new households. Three fourths of those being multi-family with the missing middle around 600 units of the two to four-plex, including single-family housing in the mix also. Sixty percent of the entire housing stock is 60 years or older. With less new construction of single-family or small plex, two to four units, that percentage will continue to grow. It becomes an energy burden for low-income renters to heat and cool their home. The last category was to find out what is happening in city neighborhoods and where to find places for affordable housing. Due to increasing rents, areas of 25% displacement of low-income households earning under \$25,000 are concentrated mostly in Lawrenceville, Brookline, Mount Washington, and the Hill District. Those four neighborhoods are also applying pressure on surrounding neighborhoods. It is important to take a look at citywide initiatives and policies to put in place, ensuring that affordability is more equitable throughout the city. Home prices increased throughout the city. Poor housing conditions, concentrated poor conditions associated with vulnerable populations, and the lack of income restricted affordable housing programs are displacing residents. Income restricted programs are designated in only a few neighborhoods. Inclusionary zoning is being used only in Lawrenceville, Bloomfield, and Polish Hill. The research showed four stark challenges ahead if we really want to take affordable housing seriously, accommodating for growth, more reinvestment in neighborhoods and in existing homes to preserve affordability, and taking care of our long-term owner-occupied units, expanding first time home buyer programs, funding for home repair and rehabilitation, and protecting tenants' rights. Some of the recommendations that came out of the housing needs assessment are to take a look at the zoning code and find ways to encourage more multi-family development, accessory dwelling units, incorporating anti-displacement review, finding ways to remove barriers for development in the zoning code, and ensuring the missing middle housing is included.

Chair Burton-Faulk commented that the housing needs assessment was definitely a critical assessment. It was appreciated to see the deep dive with a comprehensive understanding of where we were and where we are to help inform where we're going.

Ms Blackwell asked, did it include the homeless situation especially downtown. She stated what a detailed and very informative report and asked if it included the homelessness situation especially downtown around First Avenue. People are encamped right by the parkway

which is dangerous. She asked if this was brought up during the meetings and the surveys, and if housing would be geared towards the homeless.

Mr Corbet stated other departments throughout the city are taking on that need. He thought the future plan would be to understand the roofs that we have throughout the city, coming up with a housing plan, and taking consideration the unhoused population, and looking at what barriers are in place that cause people to go unhoused. He also mentioned the importance of having a conversation about the unhoused population, taking a look at the Housing Authority, and that 75% of those vouchers going unused contribute to our unhoused population. He stated they will probably use a platform like this to continue those endeavors.

Mr Quintanilla asked about the number of kitchens being looked at in the future. He was curious if Mr Corbet has looked at the issue of the number of kitchens that drives a lot of the issues with affordable housing, the sizes of the units, and the question of a duplex, triplex, or quadplex. Some of those are not allowed because of two exits and all. He asked if that was something to be looked at in the future.

Mr Corbet stated they were embarking upon a comprehensive plan that hopefully would signal a lot of those code amendments that may need to be implemented such as the missing middle and duplexes, and what required by PLI, what triggers commercial grade, and fire standards, as well. Mr Layman stated Planning is actively looking at those typologies and a different system of typology based zoning for the city for residential districts.

Ms O'Neill asked what the status of the overall report was, when will it be available to the public Mr Corbet said it is a public document. It is listed on our website and he will provide the link.

Ms Burton-Faulk stated all the numbers are in basically. In terms of the work in progress how are we going to use a multipronged approach to figure out the path forward? Is it multi-unit? Are there financial resources that are allocated towards projects? She stated she had some ideas of her own and would like to have some additional voice. She wanted to make sure they got the link for a review.

Ms Ruiz offered to have a conversation and exchange ideas for whatever use she can be, echoing what everyone has said

Mr Corbet said they would definitely be in contact with commissioners.

Ms Dick stated in recent years they have been throwing around the figure of total needs of affordable units and the figure has been from 17,000 to 20,000 affordable housing units needed in the city. She asked if this substantially increased as a result of this study.

Mr Corbet said they took a look at the supply gap and a total number was around 11,000 units, 8,000 of them for very low income or 30% or below AMI. We were using 2019 numbers. Today is 2023 and we should take another look at the housing needs. The only reason that number has decreased is because those who could not find housing left or became unhoused. He said they probably need to dive a little deeper into that and make sure that they are coming up with policies where housing is not as vulnerable as it is today.

Chair Burton-Faulk just to confirm you're saying we feel like that number has decreased because people have left the city.

Mr Corbet Yes, that is correct.

E. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

October 17, 2023 at 2:40 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Sabina Deitrick

Mel Ngami
 Dina Blackwell
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Peter Quintanilla

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. None	
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-06360 – 214 6 th Street Exterior renovations to install new ground floor storefront Central Business District 2. DCP-HN-2023-01135 – 327 N Negley Avenue Nomination of former B'nai Israel Synagogue Garfield Neighborhood	1

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of September 5, 2023 minutes.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED: Ms Ngami

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2023-01386 - Sandusky Street

- East Allegheny Community Council
- Northside Leadership Conference
- Riverlife

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-06360 – 214 6th Street Exterior renovations to install new ground floor storefront Central Business District

Vice Chair O'Neill recused herself from this hearing item.

Mr Fraker presented the project for DCP staff. The development was for storefront renovations to an existing multilevel parking garage and interior renovations for a new trash room. Per Section 910.1.C.1, structures involving exterior alterations of more than \$250,000 require project development plan review subject to review by the Planning Commission. A Development Activities Meeting for the project was held August 10, 2023, with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership. The facade improvements were reviewed by design staff who were pleased with the improvements to the façade. An additional review by CDAP was not recommended. The applicant has agreed to an alternative compliance agreement to provide a fee in lieu of the equivalent of four street trees along Liberty Avenue where the sidewalk vaults will not allow for planting. The applicant will also be providing one bike rack in the sidewalk right-of-way along Liberty Avenue. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023 -06360 with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve the encroachment permit prior to issuing of the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Alex Takacs presented the project for exterior renovations of the 6th & Penn Garage located in the downtown Golden Triangle-Subdistrict A zone, parcel number 0001-D-00098. Its main address is 214 6th Street. The owner and holder of the garage is Interpark, LLC. The scope of work consisted of a new trash room and exterior ground level façade renovations to four existing, vacant, mixed-use tenant spaces with all main entrances facing Liberty Avenue. The work will involve the Liberty Avenue spaces and a partial ground floor section along 6th Street. Mr Takacs presented slides of existing conditions and the new renovations. The garage is an entirely concrete structure Type 1A. The building is over 60 years old. Over the years the storefront designs have been altered with the changing tenants causing a disjointed aesthetic. The main goal of the new design was to create a cohesive look to the ground floor. The renovations included a Cortan signage band along the top perimeter that dropped down at the corners to create an area for future signage not included in this scope of work. Mr Takacs presented vicinity and location maps of the project site downtown, adjacent contexts including the Highmark Tower, and elevations. The scope of work encompassed the entire 135-foot length of Liberty Avenue and 105 feet of 6th Street, about ¾ of the way through the Pittsburgh Pennsylvania mural. It was proposed that the mural be redesigned and repainted accordingly, based on the trash room doors. It was in discussion with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership who commissioned the original mural. Mr Takacs stated they would work with the artist again to either make it in that defined zone or to encompass the whole area including the doors of the trash room. Only 1,200 square feet of the interior will be affected by the trash room alteration and around 250 linear feet of street frontage will be affected by the exterior renovations. No change of use was proposed to the existing occupancies. No signage was proposed under this scope of work. New tenants will apply for signage and any branding. There were no proposed street trees in this project because of the vaults underneath the sidewalk along Liberty Avenue. Four street trees would have been required. An alternative compliance agreement was approved by the city forester and proposed to enhance the pedestrian level with awnings above the storefronts projecting into the public way as well as up and down highlight lighting at the columns to create an engagement on the side along Liberty Avenue. Fees needed to be paid on the ownership end. Materials proposed for the exterior renovation were Tile Cortan finish Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) panels, which will not rust, aluminum framed entrance and storefront systems with black powder coat finish, Portland cement plaster columns to repair any of the existing stucco columns and to introduce two or three false columns to create a better repetition of the storefronts, and lastly, the fabric stretched awnings above the storefronts to engage the public street level. Trash pickup on the street has been discussed to transport the trash from inside the trash room to outside on pickup day with an approved smaller size dumpster with rubber wheels to protect the sidewalk and curb cut on 6th Street. Mr Takacs discussed a preliminary project schedule. A GC had not been selected yet, the bidding phase was scheduled after zoning approval, and they expected another four weeks for

building permit approval in November. The three-month construction timeline for exterior renovation would demolish all the existing storefronts so this construction timeline would probably move into a warmer spring weather time frame, although the length of it should roughly be the same. There will be a partial sidewalk closure along 6th Street and Liberty Avenue for this construction. Construction parking will be provided by InterPark inside the garage so no street parking would be affected by this project.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had any comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approved the Project Development Plan, DCP-ZDR-2023-06360, based on the application filed by Alexander Takacs on behalf of Stabile & Associates, the property owners, with the following conditions:

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve the Encroachment Permit prior to issuance of the Record of Zoning Approval.
2. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Deitrick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami Ms Ruiz

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-HN-2023-01135 – 327 N Negley Avenue Nomination of former B'nai Israel Synagogue Garfield Neighborhood

Ms Quinn presented the historic nomination for DCP staff. This was the historic nomination for the B'nai Israel Synagogue located at 327 North Negley Avenue. It was built in phases generally starting from 1923 up through 2022. The Historic Review Commission decided this property was worthy of a positive recommendation to City Council under four criteria. The first one was for its architectural design. This structure is of Byzantine design, which is very unique for the City of Pittsburgh. It is also known for its glittering mosaics above the main door and reliefs linking the addition to the main building creating a unified appearance. The most recent addition was built in 2022 which is a compatible design but very clearly is a new build. The Historic Review Commission felt this property was also significant as the work of famous architect engineer Henry Hornbostel. He was the designer of both Carnegie Mellon University and the University of Pittsburgh campuses as well as the historic Rodef Shalom Synagogue, which he designed in New York before he moved to Pittsburgh. Along with Henry Hornbostel, the B'nai Israel Synagogue was designed by Alexander Sharove who was raised as an Orthodox Jew and understood the importance of each of the aspects of the synagogue. He also designed the Tree of Life Synagogue as well as synagogues in Johnstown, Monessen, Kittanning, and the City of Washington, PA. Probably most significantly this property was found to be noteworthy under criteria 7. Briefly, it represents social history in the City of Pittsburgh, reflecting the development of the Jewish community in East Liberty. Early Jewish settlers inhabited the Hill District, and as their community grew and became more affluent they chose to move to the suburbs, which was East Liberty at the time. To support the Jewish community this synagogue was built in the 1920s. The Jewish community continued to increase until 1969 when the synagogue was closed and no longer used. Finally, the Historic Review Commission felt this property was significant under criteria 10, which is for visual landmarks. Driving up North Negley Avenue one really notices and remembers seeing this building. The building integrity maintains its character defining features that were put together by the original architect. For those reasons the Historic Review Commission felt that this property should have a positive recommendation to City Council.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized Angelique Bamberg, Historic Preservation Consultant to the owners of this property, Beacon Communities.

Ms Bamberg wanted to give the commission some context about why this nomination was coming before them. In addition to being nominated for city historic designation the synagogue is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. A couple of years ago when the housing conversion of the 1950s wings got underway, it received HUD funding and that triggered a review of that project under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The owners of the building consulted with community stakeholders including representatives from the city, from preservation organizations, Jewish organizations, and surrounding area community organizations and came up with a plan to provide some preservation outcomes to this project. In addition to the housing rehabilitation one of the things the owners agreed to do was to nominate the synagogue to be a city designated historic landmark. She stated that was why this came before the commission, and the owners were in full support and initiated this nomination under their memorandum of agreement with the state and with HUD. Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners if they had any comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh deliver a positive recommendation for approval to Pittsburgh City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, , Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami ,Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz

CARRIED

- D. Director's Report
No Director's Report.

- E. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:52 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

October 31, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Sabina Deitrick
 Peter Quintanilla
 Dina Blackwell

Not Present

Mel Ngami

Monica Ruiz

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaneyuhhhnnnn

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. None	
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-08351 – 500 Ross Street Façade improvements and interior renovations Central Business District 2. DCP-ZDR-2023-01386 – 200 Sandusky Street New construction of four-story event venue North Shore 3. APPLICATION CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 14 DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 – W. General Robinson St. and Mazeroski Way Major Public Destination Facility Electronic Sign – Large Video Display North Shore -	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for October 3, 2023.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

Approval of minutes for October 17, 2023

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Historic Nomination of Frick Park – 3710 Terrace Street

- Patricia Clarke
- Yvonne Bukstein
- Victoria Yann
- Margaret Trautz
- Catherine Raphael
- Sabina Rosenfeld
- Leonard Lucas
- Laura and Michael Horowitz
- The Squirrel Hill Historical Society
- James Hammond, President, SHHS
- Helen Wilson, Vice-President, SHHS
- Dr. Christina Cerkevich, Research Assistant Professor
- Venetia Pimley
- Carmela Rizzo
- Suzanne Staggenborg
- Patricia H Sims
- Erika Freiburger
- Andrea Nelken
- Michele Feingold
- Rebecca Weiss
- Geri Smith
- Nigel P Belshaw and Cindy H Kerr
- Linda Lewis
- Steve Zupcic
- Mark Reardon, Esq., and MaryAnne Reardon
- Aviva Lubowsky
- Mark Reardon, Esq., and MaryAnne Reardon (duplicate)
- Zylphia Ford
- Marcie G Hayhurst

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-08351 – 500 Ross Street Façade improvements and interior renovations
Central Business District

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing item.

Mr Fraker presented the project for DCP staff. This was a Project Development Plan application for facade improvements and interior renovations to the lobby and future tenant spaces at 500 Ross Street. Per Section 910.01.C.1(c), structures involving exterior alterations in excess of \$250,000 are subject to Project Development Plan review and approval by the Planning Commission. A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership September 14, 2023. The application was also reviewed at a Staff Design Review meeting. Staff appreciated the improvements to the façade. A review by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel was not recommended. The applicant agreed to provide a fee equivalent to \$1,200 in lieu of providing two street trees along Ross Street. The applicant also agreed to providing one bike rack at the northerly side of the building next to Melon Green. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve the project development plan DCP-ZDR-2023-08351 with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve all DOMI permits in the construction management plan prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Travis Kreidler presented the project with slides giving symbolic data on zoning information, a vicinity map, location map, site plan, aerial perspective, existing conditions and surrounding

context, and elevations showing existing and proposed work. The project is located in the central downtown business district, Golden Triangle Subdistrict B (GT-B). The goal was to reposition the building as a front-facing strategic location in the region and to modernize the entire building, bringing it up to their current design standards. This project was the first phase of an overall project consisting of 11 floors including the lobby, and exterior features including Mellon Green Park and landscaping. The project was renovations to the existing first and second floor lobby space as well as adding a Starbucks coffee shop to the lower level. The team was pursuing LEED Gold certification for the project. The overall building is a 735,000 sq ft, 14 story facility currently housing the BNY Operation Center with a 200,000 sq ft garage. Overall the square footage of the improvements was about 24,500 square feet. Exterior work consisted of a 40 linear square foot facade renovation. The project replaced the existing dark reflective mirrored glass curtain wall system, revolving doors, and swinging doors with a transparent clear glass curtain wall system, and upgraded the lobby in general from the outside in. The ramp is to remain. The lobby is open to the public 24/7. All accessibility points into the building were maintained with improvements on some of them. Accessibility will also be provided to the upper and lower levels of the lobby at the front, and through the Sixth Street BNY Mellon Client Service Center/Steel Plaza T entrance. Part of the existing granite monolith that projects horizontally toward Ross St will be removed and the stairs will be wrapped around that corner to create better access and flow to Mellon Green Park. Some handrails will be replaced, a new translucent glass canopy will be added over the doors. New linear LED lighting will be added in the stair nosing, along the edges of the canopy, and along the granite base to create more safety for egress and ingress. The new Starbucks location will be accessed from the main lobby as well as a secondary entrance using a class storefront system created from a recess to the building along Ross St. Proposed signage will be under future ZDR applications. Most of the construction activity, the loading areas, and the lay down space, will be within the existing loading dock of the facility. There will be some potential sidewalk closures around the immediate area of construction. Direction was given to ensure that all City requirements for sidewalks and street closures would be followed. The team took some comments from their community process in hand and looked at some additional lighting, and investigated some bird-safe glass for the front façade, weighing that with the appearance as well as the budget.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments or a motion.

Mr Quintanilla asked if there had been any thought given to putting some benches or other type of amenities outside, bike parking, or landscaping, and planters at the entrance, especially with a Starbucks. He imagined it could be a really great place to sit.

Mr Kreidler stated they were proposing a new granite clad bench next to the new granite corner steps. He also stated there were plans to look at the landscaping of the nearby park and potential for benches along Ross St. There are existing benches and tables next to the park which will remain. Mr Kreidler stated they were adding two bike parking spaces at the monolith. He also said they talked with city staff about Mellon Green for additional parking. Bike parking was reviewed with the LEED Gold certification. There are 20 bike parking spaces in the garage. Mr Kreidler stated planters had not been discussed but was something to take back for discussion.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for additional comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-08351 based on the application filed by Jake Heaton on behalf of Mellon Bank NA, the property owners, with the following conditions.

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve all DOMI Permits and the Construction Management Plan prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.
2. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Deitrick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2023-01386 – 200 Sandusky Street New construction of four-story event venue North Shore

Ms O'Neill and Chair Burton-Faulk both recused from this hearing item.

Ms Deitrick read in the hearing item.

Mr Gregory presented the project for DCP staff. The site at 200 Sandusky Street is in the Riverfront-Northshore, or RIV-NS, zoning district. The application included site improvements and new construction of a multi-story event venue with a rooftop amenity space for the Warhol Center. The site design included a plaza at the front on East General Robinson Street and a loading space at the rear access off Sandusky Street. The site was a surface parking lot. New construction over 15,000 square feet in the RIV-NS zoning district requires review and approval by the Planning Commission as a Project Development Plan or PDP. The project went before the Zoning Board of Adjustment as ZBA Case 38 of 2023 in June of 2023, requesting a variance for step backs over 65 ft in height; a variance to the build-to zone on East General Robinson Street; a variance to allow bicycle parking at an off-site lot; and a special exception for off-site parking at a couple of parking garages in the NorthShore. The ZBA approved the variances, and special exception with the condition that the project complied with the conditions listed on the letter for the George Wilson Company and that the project provided a written parking agreement. The bicycle parking which was approved under the off-site bicycle parking from the ZBA decision, will be located at 108 East General Robinson Street opposite Sandusky Street on a lot that is also owned by the Carnegie Institute. The project required two bonus points to exceed 60 feet in height. The project was automatically eligible for one bonus point under Section 915.07.D.11.a for the site's location within a half mile of the North Side T Station. The project was pursuing one bonus point for zero energy building design under Section 915.07.D.1.a, which requires compliance with the International Energy Conservation Code Section C407. The applicants needed to provide a model showing how the project would actually exhibit those standards as part of the final zoning review. The proposed structure and site design were reviewed by Design Review staff and CDAP in July of 2023. The panel was pleased with the overall building and site design. The panel encouraged the design explanation to incorporate a bit more "Warhol-y whimsiness", particularly the bird and the cage concept. The storm water management plan for this project was approved conceptually. The development project removed 33 inches of tree caliper which must be replaced in-kind as part of the project. The applicant team was working with DPW forestry staff, DOMI staff, and Zoning staff to develop a landscape plan to plant trees in the right-of-way on other sites and on other sites in the vicinity owned by the Carnegie Institute, which required an alternative landscape compliance agreement as part of the final zoning approval. No transportation impact study was required as the project was not creating any new parking. There was no Registered Community Organization, or RCO, in the North Side neighborhood. As a result, no Development Activities Meeting, or DAM, was required. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the PDP with two conditions: 1. that an alternative landscape compliance agreement for the caliper replacement be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Dan Law presented an explanation of the Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh. The Pop District entertainment venue is part of a larger programming and physical expansion of the Andy Warhol Museum. There are three core strategies within The Pop District. The first is a youth focused creative economy workforce development program, the second is a public art initiative, and the third is a campus expansion which includes this event venue. The Andy

Warhol Museum is a component of the Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh. The legal name of the museum system itself is Carnegie Institute, but the DBA is the Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh. The Pop District is an initiative and also a brand deployed as a strategic initiative with the design team led by Desmone, including a cohort of supporters and collaborators that are helping to make this a reality. There have been multiple community engagement sessions and community outreach efforts. Three primary examples were the Northside Leadership Conference, River Life, and the East Allegheny Community Council.

Mr Eric Booth presented slides and contextual views and a 3D massing study of the site. To answer a question from a previous meeting, the site is located west of the George Wilson & Co. building, which is five stories and 86 feet; north across the street from the SMS Group Inc. building, which is five stories and 70 feet; and northeast of the Andy Warhol Museum itself, which is seven stories and 103 feet. There is a small parklet and new artist installation west of the site. The structure is proposed to be four stories and 75 ft permitted by right with the bonus point. The building will be standalone, but will anchor and operate in conjunction with the programming and other types of facilities that will exist within the larger Pop District context. The glass features very prominently on the two major facades. The glazing works to create the illusion of depth within the flat surface, like the old cast iron facades, that can't be achieved easily in modern ways. For the new building façade, elements and materials of the existing museum were chosen for their high-quality resilience and stately appearance relevant to the museum, anchoring the new building firmly within the Pop District. At CDAP's request for more design explanation drawn from Warhol's sketch of a bird in the cage, a metaphorical parallel of this project is the venue box where the actual performances are simultaneously bound by, and free from, the exterior grid of the building. The venue box on the inside will be treated with special surfaces and lighting to be visible during the day and toward the evening. At night the venue box will come alive with a glow using any color of choice. From the exterior of the building, the light will interact with the reflective surfaces to accentuate the lobbies and the venue box. The facade was modified after comments from CDAP, and others from the community, to have a deliberately understated appearance during the daytime. The building design is a four-story building with the base of the first two floors being double height. The level between the second and third floors is not a full floor, just the control booth level. There is an elevator providing accessibility to all levels, including the control booth level. The venue box itself occupies the first three visual levels. The external frame is primarily a grid using an ultracompact Dekton surface which is a modern, almost porcelain type of material on the two primary facades. There are two primary styles of windows. The upper floors especially the fourth level will have more traditional black framed windows like the traditional windows seen in most of the structures in the area, including the Warhol Museum. Around the double or triple high public spaces of the lobby, there will be a second type of butt glazed window with the appearance of a solid surface. These windows respond to a comment from CDAP and others who wanted to see more of the venue box from the outside, accentuating the location of the venue box within the structure. The venue box is actually separate inside this overall frame allowing for acoustical separation, thus preventing prohibitively expensive acoustically rated glazing. There will eventually be an art installation inside the building. It has not been designed yet, but will likely be done locally. At the top fourth floor level, an exterior deck has a roof and skylights for all season use and provides views directly back to the Warhol Museum for a direct visual connection. A site plan showed the building filling out the entire site with the exception of the loading dock in the rear; the main entry with the lobby portion extending in front; and a secondary front entrance allowing direct access to the upper floors. The landscaping will be primarily street trees. The plaza will have a planter and seating area that can be used during the day, and when there is no performance. The plaza was designed for queuing for shows next to the building. A large number of people standing outside against the building was not anticipated since the doors usually open prior to performances for drinks and so forth. Everything was sized accordingly, and the team worked with DOMI to provide bollards as far outward as possible to prevent conflict between the people waiting in line and those walking on the sidewalk. Access from the rear of the building will be through the loading dock, using a man door for artists, deliveries, and behind the scenes access, along with the loading doors. The loading dock area, will be screened with a masonry curb wall according to

standards. One of the comments from CDAP was to provide some additional articulation to the rear two facades. Recesses done with a split face smooth ground masonry on the back two facades were added to bring in the rhythm of the grid expressed on the primary facades. A cornice detail along the top portion will be consistent with the kind of cornice detailing seen on other structures. The rear loading area will have a canopy over it. Potential signage on the rear façade would go through a separate process. The overall form, massing, and articulation is consistent with the height and massing of the existing structures. The building will incorporate universal design criteria for accessibility, and will have three elevators. There will be a freight elevator in the rear which can also act as a passenger elevator and access to the control booth level. Also, two elevators near the secondary entry will be accessible to all the floors as well as the dressing rooms, restrooms and showers, etc. The team was seeking LEED Silver certification. The storm water management plan will be achieved by underground storage in the rear underneath the loading area. All rain leaders will be directed towards that storage because the site is entirely paved with asphalt.

Mr Chris Droznek presented slides showing tables and a map summarizing the parking calculations based on zoning code requirements. The daytime demand was expected to be 38 spaces plus 22 spaces for the displaced parking from the surface lot. Therefore, a total parking demand of 60 spaces was projected for the daytime. During events the demand was calculated to be between 144 and 222 spaces. The development expected to secure an agreement with the adjacent North Shore Garage and/or Blue surface lots to accommodate the daytime demand. All event parking was expected to be handled within the existing North Shore parking. Parking demand for evening event times were both summarized. The two locations expected to secure parking agreements on a first come, first served basis were the North Shore Garage and the Blue surface lot next to the venue. In addition, there will be bicycle parking adjacent to the site across from Sandusky Street. There is a total of six bicycle racks provided. Each rack can accommodate up to two bicycles. Therefore, a total of 12 bicycle parking spaces will be provided on this adjacent land. Finally, the locations of the North Side T stop as well as the dedicated ride share pickup spot on the North Shore is used by multiple locations when including PNC Park for events. A map provided by Alco showing the existing parking locations within the North Shore showed the abundance of parking available that could be utilized during events. The Alco map also showed the locations immediately adjacent within approximately 1,000 ft of the site. These lots have more than 5,000 parking spaces expected to be available for event times. As requested by DOMI, traffic impacts to the intersections of General Robinson, Sandusky, and Federal Streets were evaluated and no significant impacts to the operations of those intersections were anticipated during the evening event times.

Ms Deitrick opened floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Ms Deitrick asked commissioners questions, comments, or a motion.

Mr Quintanilla asked the staff to reread the recommendations written by CDAP and Planning Commission on this project.

Mr Gregory read a summarized version from the CDAP letter which referenced four broad things. First, they commented favorably towards the overall massing and scale. Then they noted three things specifically. The panel appreciated the thoughtfulness of the design programming and presentation, noting the facade depth to detailing; the panel thought the bird in the cage concept was exciting; and the panel appreciated the site planning which appropriately located the entrance and expressed levels of activity on the ground floor. For areas of opportunities they noted three things. The first was the bird in the cage concept. The panel thought this concept could be expanded and strengthened. The panel suggested considering a piece or monument which breaks out from the façade, providing an example of the interior hall breaking out from the cage. And finally, the panel noted the strength of the grid and the illusion of depth, but commented that it broke down as it turned the corner and changed materials. They had a couple other comments around site planning and the Parkway North, but Mr Gregory thought the bird in the cage was the main thrust of the comments.

Mr Quintanilla stated at first, he was very excited when they talked about the bird in the cage, and he could just imagine how that could be brought forward. He was also really interested in

seeing how that was tied to the façade. But, in presenting the façade, it was a bit of a letdown because he felt with all those columns he couldn't tell what the bird of the cage was actually like. He stated unless it is lighted from the inside, the outside of the facade actually looks almost contiguous. He understood the effect from the different windows, but it was such a subtle move during the daytime when looking at the whole entire building, it is almost lost. It would have been more interesting to play a little bit more with that concept because, even though the facade does try to get the really fine columns as shown on some of the facades in New York, it didn't really connect very well. He also commented on the south facade tower where the elevator will be housed. He applauded the glass fenestration, but the column being half glass and half mass, considering it is such a prominent façade, could have had a little bit more oomph to it.

Mr Booth stated something they wrestled with a lot in design was whether it was going to be very prominent or not. Ultimately, the team decided overall to go with a deliberately understated option. Even though this is something that would be visible to the outside, it is done in a subtle expression, going back to the idea that this is a multi-purpose building. The venue itself is only one function. There are offices on the third floor and an event space on the top level. The thought that drawing too much attention to one section may go against the nature of this being a multi-purpose building. Looking back at where these venues actually were, they were always in buildings with other types of uses. The tower actually was a deliberate thing at the end of the district. The primary material is a matte finish to be articulated in the infills with a slightly glossier finish, taking the grid concept above it. He stated Mr Quintanilla's comment was very well taken and was something they did consider.

Mr Quintanilla stated considering this should be like taking the building to what Andy Warhol 2.0 could be like. The first time he saw it, he thought the things the team were grappling with ended up feeling more like an office building than something celebrating Andy Warhol and could have been more powerful.

Ms Deitrick commented there wasn't a straight on view of the facade from across General Robinson St and Arbuckle Way. She commented on the blank wall having an office feel and not being more whimsical. The building is not anything extraordinary and by not showing that view, she imagined it being worse because it will look very flat from the other side of the street. She thought about how the sign or something else could break it up or create some kind of delineation instead of looking like a white space.

Mr Booth stated their thought was that the activities really focus more to the corner. There is not a lot of pedestrian traffic heading that way, but they could take a closer look at it.

Ms Deitrick commented things could change in the next 10 years so you never know if that becomes more pedestrianized or how that articulation is with the building over time.

Hopefully, the Pop District generates other things that spring up and walking traffic changes over time.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-01386 based on the application filed by Desmone Architects on behalf of the Carnegie Institute, the property owners, with the following conditions:

1. An Alternative Landscape Compliance Agreement for the caliper replacement be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval; and
2. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Deitrick, Ms Dick

ABSTAINED: Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

The commissioners and staff expressed a special message of thanks and gratitude to Ms Deitrick for her service to the City of Pittsburgh since 2015. She has been an important voice in really pushing for all of us as a commission and staff to raise the standard from prior procedures and Processes. She has been a vocal advocate around issues in Oakland and certainly has brought her expertise as an academic with the University of Pittsburgh for many years. The commission and staff appreciated having her and she certainly will be missed.

E. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

November 14, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Monica Ruiz
 Peter Quintanilla

Not Present

Mel Ngami

Dina Blackwell

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. None	
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-05221 – 831 E Warrington Ave New Neighborhood Gateway Sign Allentown 2. Continued to November 28, 2023, requested DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 – W. General Robinson St. and Mazeroski Way Major Public Destination Facility Electronic Sign – Large Video Display North Shore	1

A. Approval of Minutes

No minutes for approval.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Historic Nomination of Frick Park

- Barbara Villanova

C. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-05221 – 831 E Warrington Ave New Neighborhood Gateway Sign Allentown
 Mr Gregory presented the project for DCP staff. This project is located at 831 East Warrington Street in the Allentown neighborhood. It proposed a new neighborhood gateway sign for the Allentown neighborhood with the directional arrow pointing toward Mount Oliver Borough. A similar sign was installed in Mount Oliver Borough with a directional arrow pointing toward Allentown. However, since Mount Oliver Borough is outside the City of Pittsburgh there is no planning commission review for that sign. Existing on the site is a large mural that will remain. Section 919.03.R(6) of the zoning code states neighborhood gateway signs are subject to approval by the Planning Commission. A Development Activities Meeting or DAM for the project was held August 14, 2023, with the Allentown Community Development Corporation, the RCO for the Allentown neighborhood. A Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing approved a variance as ZBA Case 160 of 2023. The maximum sign size permitted for a neighbor gateway sign is 40 square feet; the proposed sign was 70.9 square feet. A staff design review of the project was held July,

2023, and an additional review by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel or CDAP was not recommended. Staff recommended additional study to see how a better fit with the existing mural could be accommodated. Staff also asked whether any consideration had been given to working with the mural artist to incorporate the gateway signage with the mural. At the briefing presentation October 31, the Planning Commission asked the applicants to provide renderings showing some different options for the sign, specifically one moving the sign up and one on the roof. The sign presentation incorporated those renderings. The sign option with a white backing behind it would require a variance since the sign would be larger than the 1.9 square feet approved under the ZBA Case 116 of 2023 decision. Also, a location on the roof would require a different variance per Section 919.01.E.6 which prohibits signs above the roof line or parapet wall of a building. The applicants provided written responses to the review criteria of Section 922.10.E.2. Staff recommended the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-05221 based on the application filed by Fast Signs on behalf of property owners Hilltop Redevelopment, LLC with the standard condition that the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms Meg O'Brien, Director of Economic Development, Hilltop Alliance presented the project. Wayfinding signage between the Allentown and Mt Oliver Borough business districts would join the two areas to raise awareness of the small businesses there. In 2014 economic development support was started in Allentown's business district on East Warrington Avenue. There was a 40% vacancy rate. Through different incentive programs vacancy rate is now 5%. There are now 40 new businesses, and 70 grants have been offered to new and existing businesses in the past few years. Mount Oliver Borough reached out and started working with the Hilltop Alliance on Brownsville Road as well. This wayfinding signage was to help Allentown and Mount Oliver Borough's business districts join to raise awareness about small businesses along East Warrington Ave and Brownsville Rd. The sign for review was the one at the Allentown business district at East Warrington and Arlington Avenues. The other sign was already approved in the Mount Oliver Borough business district at Brownsville Road and Arlington Avenue. Both signs were designed to direct residents and visitors to the nearby business districts.

Ms Barb Plutko, Fast Signs Banksville Road presented slides showing the original proposed placement of the sign on the wall. When it was presented to the board there were concerns with it overlapping the mural. A white backer was added and the sign was moved higher. It could not be moved very far left because wires prevented safe installation with a bucket truck. Slides showed the sign with the backer and without it. Installing the sign on the roof was also proposed but that would require a variance because rooftop signs are not allowed. That ledge is also not very safe, did not have a lot of support, and would have to be refurbished. There were concerns to drilling through the roof to support the sign, voiding the warranty, and possible leaking.

Ms O'Brien presented an example of a recent report with recommendations from 2019 for East Warrington Avenue in Allentown. It specifically stated that neighborhoods reinforce their branding through wayfinding signage. Ms O'Brien showed examples of things to improve branding and the businesses, and also an example of some of the things for community support. Allentown CDC, Hilltop Economic Development Corporation, and property owner RE360 have all approved the design and the placement. It was mentioned at the DAM meeting August 14, and it was shared at the Allentown Business District Committee meeting, as well as the Allentown CDC community meeting in August where there was public support and no opposition. The different depictions came out of some concerns with the muralist. As a result, the variance hearing was scheduled. Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Mr Rick Hopkinson, Mt Oliver Borough Manager & Hilltop Economic Development Corp board member.

Mr Rick Hopkinson expressed his support for the sign. The sign has been approved in Mount Oliver because they started branding these two districts as one big Hilltop business area. The buying power is limited in both neighborhoods. In order for these businesses to be successful it was really important to cross promote because there is something for everyone between these two districts. People from Mount Oliver support Allentown and Allentown supports Mount Oliver. It is much better for the businesses and the districts. He thought the signs provide that branding. He stated they also have quarterly businessowner meetups with Mount Oliver and Allentown. They have mirrored their business support and development programs to be similar across the district. To him this is just the next step.

Mr Fraker recognized Nancy Lomasney, Vice President of Allentown CDC & Hilltop Alliance Board.

Ms Lomasney expressed support for the signage. This location is a perfect place for the signage. Referring to the slide shown by Place Consulting one of their key takeaways from the report was to create a four-hour experience in the Hilltop. That is one of the reasons they felt it is so instrumental to combine branding with Mount Oliver Borough where these two signs create bookends to the Hilltop. Although technically Allentown divides Arlington Avenue, you are not really aware that you're in Allentown until you crest the street at that parking lot where the signage is proposed. That is when you know you are truly in Allentown, if you're lucky enough to know where Allentown is. There is no gateway signage there to identify the neighborhood. It is frequently seen as a drive-thru neighborhood without really being a place to shop and live. It really is a perfect place for the signage that is lacking and has never been able to get off the ground. She strongly supported some signage and bookending the community with Mount Oliver Borough.

Mr Fraker recognized Jen Walzer, part owner of Inner Groove Brewing.

Ms Jen Walzer expressed support for the signage. She stated Inner Groove Brewing is actually located in the building where the sign is proposed, along with the adjacent parking lot. She agreed with the placement on the wall of 831 East Warrington Ave. She also stated she agreed with the previous caller that most folks don't know that Allentown exists on the hill, and that this sign is a great way to get that started and partner with Mount Oliver. The businesses and the borough see a lot of customers from both locations, and she felt it is a great way to connect the two and build awareness for both business districts.

Mr Fraker recognized Kayla Huerbin, RE360, Commercial Leasing Mgr.

Ms Huerbin expressed her support. She fills the commercial vacancies for RE360 in the business district. She stated that talking with prospects in the Hilltop, adding signage is a huge selling point, adding a focal point to where they are in Allentown as well as in Mount Oliver. She couldn't foresee it taking away from the mural at such a high point on the mural.

Mr Fraker recognized Miah Dunkleberger, RE360, Residential Leasing.

Ms Miah Dunkleberger expressed her support for the signage. She heard the plans for this at the last Allentown CDC meeting where she expressed her support. She stated she was aware that this was a call and just wanted to say that from a residential homeowner standpoint in Allentown, it is definitely a top priority and something that the residents would love to see to help make them feel safe. When they have people come to visit it will have that presence that our community can stand behind and say, we are Allentown, we are Mount Oliver. There are plenty of people there that are very proud to live in this community and want it to be more than just a drive-thru community as somebody touched on previously.

Mr Fraker recognized Tyler Abbott, Pres Allentown CDC.

Mr Abbott expressed his support for the sign and stated the CDC has been doing a lot of work in the area over the past five to 10 years to enhance the look and feel of the community's business district on Warrington Avenue. The gateway sign would tie the their previous work and the Mount Oliver and Hilltop feel they are trying to create with the four-hour experience mentioned earlier. He emphasized the importance of this and how great it would make the community.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments or a motion.

Ms O'Neill thanked the team for coming back with the explanation regarding the alternate locations of the signs. She would have liked to see the sign a little higher to the left so as not to interfere with a mural, but understood that because of the placement of the wires that was not possible.

Ms Ruiz stated she drives through this neighborhood, and it would be really nice to see the distinction.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for additional comments for a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-05221 based on the application filed by Barb Plutko of Fast Signs on behalf of Hilltop Redevelopment LLC, the property owners, with the following conditions:

1. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

No Report.

E. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

November 28, 2023 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Dina Blackwell
 Peter Quintanilla
 Mel Ngami
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots	
1. DCP-LOT-2023-01597 – 5301 Butler Street Major Subdivision 1 Upper Lawrenceville	
Hearing & Action	2
1. DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 – W. General Robinson St. and Mazeroski Way Major Public Destination Facility Electronic Sign – Large Video Display North Shore	
2. Council Bill 2023-2089 Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding residential Childcare uses, standards, and parking requirements Citywide	
3. DCP-HN-2023-01071 – Frick Park Historic Nomination Swisshelm Park; Squirrel Hill South; Regent Square; Point Breeze	
4. DCP-ZDR-2023-06473 – 605 Forbes Ave Neighborhood Gateway Sign Bluff	

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for November 14, 2023.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Historic Designation for Frick Park

- Casey Brown

SHPO's Statewide Historic Preservation Plan Survey

- Kevin Mock | Archaeology Group Leader; Department of Transportation, Highway Administration

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2023-01597 – 5301 Butler Street Major Subdivision 1 Upper Lawrenceville
Mr Scheppeke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve the subdivision and schedule a final review on December 12, 2023.

MOTION: The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to preliminarily approve the 5301 Butler Street Major Subdivision and schedule a final review at Planning Commission December 12, 2023.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 – W. General Robinson St. and Mazeroski Way Major Public Destination Facility Electronic Sign – Large Video Display North Shore

Mr Fraker presented the project for DCP staff. This was a conditional use application for the installation of a roughly 22 ft x 40 ft large video display. All major public destination facility large video displays shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and city council as conditional uses. According to the conditional use standards and procedures of the zoning code, the video display is to be part of a new public plaza space opposite the main entryway to PNC Park at the southwest corner of West General Robinson Street and Mazeroski Way. There is no Registered Community Organization in the neighborhood, and a Development Activities Meeting was not required. The applicant has submitted written responses to the zoning code specific zoning code specific conditional use requirements for major public destination facility electronic sign uses. In viewing the application, the video display may be viewable from Interstate 279 which has a speed limit over 35 miles hour. Section 919.03.P.5.c of the zoning code states that video displays shall not be visible from roadways or ramps associated with such roadways with speed limits exceeding 35 miles per hour. The applicant contends that the previous zoning code section should say readily visible to match the code language in Section 919.03.Q.2 DOA, which states video display shall not be readily visible from roadways or ramps associated with such roadways with speed limits exceeding 35 miles per hour. The Zoning Administrator has determined the discrepancy in the code language could be due to a scrivener's error, and the readily visible language is potentially valid and may apply to the code section in question. The Zoning Administrator has asked the applicant to demonstrate that they have explored all reasonably feasible options to minimize the visibility of the screen from drivers traveling westbound on the elevated I-279 roadway. The applicant has addressed concerns about views from I-279 by changing the orientation and the location of the screen within the structure and by providing additional landscaping on site and within a parking lot across the street that will act to screen the video display utilizing a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees. The application is currently under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure for impacts in the right-of-way. The motion before you is that the Planning Commission approves conditional use application DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 with the following conditions: 1. the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve all DOMI permits and the construction management plan prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval, and 2. the final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning and Administrator prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Shawn Gallagher stated since they were before the planning commission a month ago for a briefing, the team has done a lot of work meeting with Mr Layman and staff to ensure the application was appropriate and ready for the commission's recommendation to city council. They believed it was ready for that recommendation.

Mr Joe Luzio gave the revised presentation. The presentation had been adjusted to the design updates highlighted by Mr Luzio and Mr Gallagher. From an aerial view of the plaza the general operation of the plaza was the same. There is a food stand, a plaza open space that is centered on the video screen, a platform that can serve as a hardscape and stage if the operation of the

day or the event requires it. The video board is within the steel structure that is generally the same. Key details to point out that are not clear from this vantage point are the video board is angled downward toward the plaza and set back six feet into the steel structure. That does a number of things to the visibility of it. There are also additional trees between the sight line of the video board and the I-279 highway. The current condition as it stands is an onsite eye level view of the video board. The video board has been moved six feet deep into the steel structure, creating a natural shroud around it with the steel components of that structure. The other element that has been updated is the screen has been cantilevered downward so that it had less light emission toward the I-279 highway. Anything that is above the video board same size and the steel structure on the East facade of the Champions garage is a standalone steel structure. Ms Nina Chase talked about the landscaping diagram showing the full tree plan for the plaza and the parking lot across General Robinson St. White pine trees have been added along the edge of the parking lot distributed across that edge along General Robinson St with a few grouped together to provide the most visual barrier. The white pines will reach a height of about 30 feet from day one so they can obstruct the view as much as possible between I-279 and the video board. Between I-279 and the screen a variety of other species have been selected for the full plaza.

Mr Luzio pointed out the team added five- and 10-year height to the white pines. At install they will be around 30 feet, and as they extend in life five to ten years, the top the video board at about 40 or 42 feet would be theoretically covered. That was a point of discussion during the briefing presentation and in the interim discussions. More context was added to a slide depicting the view from I-279 with the video board recessed into the steel structure. Visibility of the screen and I-279 would be about 150 ft or 125 linear feet of roadway. All of the 125 ft will be obstructed view with the landscaping plan the team have in place. There are also a couple other utilities that get in the way. The 125 ft at the 50 mile per hour speed limit will give a driver about a 1.6 second snapshot of the video board. At the 35 mile per hour speed limit the 125 ft will give a driver a 2.4 second snapshot of the video board. It is quite short. The key here is really just one and a half seconds or two and a half seconds. It really is limited visibility. One of the other points the team were challenged with that they exhaustively investigated and discussed with multiple parties and the city experts in the field were a number of options that could provide additional coverage further reducing the visibility. A sun study was included that had been in a previous presentation in their extended design process.

Mr Gallagher stated even though there is no RCO in this area, since the briefing there has been a significant community outreach by the team. They met with the North Side Leadership Conference, with every single major stakeholder in the North Shore, and received letters of support from the SEA, The Stadium Authority, the Steelers, the Casino, Continental, the science center, and the Warhol Museum. Everyone on the North Shore is in support of this application and recognizes this is a very important piece that will further bolster the North Shore as the premier entertainment destination of the region.

Mr Chris Prisk summarized a memo identifying what potential impacts by the video display board with attachments and some graphics, illustrating that this video display board will not cause any detrimental operational or vehicular/pedestrian safety concerns to vehicles traveling on the roadway. It is essentially designed to serve the plaza and the people in the plaza. Their opinion was any kind of limited peripheral viewing from other drivers wouldn't have a negative impact.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked Vice Chair O'Neill to proceed with the hearing.

Vice Chair O'Neill opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked commissioners for comments.

Ms Ngami asked about the content shown on the electronic sign and there will be any kind of regulation in place to ensure nothing will distract drivers on the roadway when there is an exciting event such as a game.

Mr Gallagher replied they will comply with the zoning code. There will be content that is allowed through the zoning ordinance.

Ms Dick asked if there will be other kinds of events that will be shown on the screen for the public besides baseball or other sports in PNC Park.

Mr Gallagher replied yes. The content was still being developed but whatever is allowed will be shown during the appropriate times.

Vice Chair O'Neill commented there are limitations on the times and what can be displayed in the zoning code. She was sure it will comply with the code. She thanked the team for thinking this through and coming back with more information addressing their concerns. The updated renderings and studies gave them a better understanding of the impact on the nearby highway. Ms O'Neill asked about the discussion in the presentation involving the extension of the steel structure perpendicular to the parking garage and asked them to explain what they did.

Mr Luzio stated with the screen depressed into the steel structure, it creates a natural shroud around it which restricts the amount of visibility to it. By adding another extension perpendicular to the steel structure, it further enhances that shield, blocking the visibility. With that comes an elevated sense of how much wind it will take and how far it needs to come off the steel structure. The screen will be cantilevered, and in order to block the screen at that height, it would have to be covered in some way. It basically becomes a giant sail. At that height it becomes cumbersome to make it safe enough to be effective while not becoming a giant blank board hovering above the plaza.

Mr Gallagher stated that option would also block the view from most of the area within the plaza, becoming problematic.

Vice Chair O'Neill stated that was her understanding, especially the extension going beyond would defeat the purpose of having the screen in the plaza. She also wanted to confirm what the a greige color material was underneath the steel structure the purpose of it. She asked if they explored extending that upwards within the steel structure so that cantilevering or blocking outward wouldn't be necessary, only blocking to the side.

Mr Luzio explained there is a creatively placed restroom beneath with storage to the north nestled within the steel structure to try to minimize them.

Vice Chair O'Neill stated that was what she was understanding but didn't know if that kind of exterior panel could extend upwards you know adjacent to the screen was what Mr Luzio talking about in evaluating the video display.

Mr Luzio explained it would be something like a steel structure that would come off perpendicular to the video board creating a T but it adds a number of issues on its own.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if there was a possibility that there would be signs or banners hung from the steel structure that would impact or further block this view.

Mr Luzio stated there is a separate signage zoning application to be reviewed in its entirety not something to impact or block the video board. There will be some level of signage on the steel structure. There is a placeholder for visibility or evaluations. Theoretically, It would flat and not something protruding off of the steel structure.

Chair Burton-Faulk recused from this application.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked if there was a recommendation for approval.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES Conditional Use Application DCP-ZDR-2023-08177 based on the application filed by Shawn Gallagher on behalf of the the property owners, with the following conditions.

1. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall review and approve all DOMI Permits and the Construction Management Plan prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval.
2. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOVED BY: Ms Quintanilla

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

RECUSED: Chair Burton-Faulk

CARRIED

2. Council Bill 2023-2089 Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding residential Childcare uses, standards, and parking requirements Citywide
 Ms Rakus presented the text amendment. This was legislation introduced by Councilman Wilson's office. He worked with City Planning staff to look at the current zoning related to childcare with the goal of reducing barriers to entry for childcare businesses. We also wanted to remove any duplicative standards with the State Childcare standards because there would be no reason for a city review if the state was already reviewing it. Staff also reached out to local childcare advocates and educators to discuss the changes and ensure they were in support, and there wasn't anything else that was missing. Councilman Wilson, also co-sponsored by Council member Gross, introduced this legislation. A quick run through of the current zoning process. Currently, in-home childcare with three or less children is permitted by right as a home occupation, which has the same standards as any home occupation. In a lot of instances, it is a different type of use than a regular home occupation. There are limits to vehicle trips and limits to employees that aren't residents of the home. The current zoning process for Childcare (Limited), which is for four to six children, is permitted by right in in multifamily residential districts, commercial districts, and mixed-use zoning districts. But, it is a special exception in single-unit attached and detached zoning districts, which means requires Zoning Board hearing which can take up to 45 days to make a decision, and 21 days for mailed notices, making the whole process for the special exception three months or more. Then, there is a parking requirement associated with that currently. There are the special exception standards for childcare in the single-family zoning districts. The current zoning process for Childcare (General), which is defined as seven or more children is permitted by right in multi-unit residential zoning districts, commercial and mixed-use zoning districts, and parking is required. Ms Rakus presented a slide of the proposed zoning process as currently outlined in the Council Bill. It would make Childcare (Limited), which is four to six children, permitted by right in all residential zoning districts. There wouldn't be any special exception criteria, and parking wouldn't be required. For Childcare (General), which is seven or more children, it would be permitted by right in multi-unit residential zoning districts, commercial and mixed-use zoning districts. It would be a special exception in single-unit attached and detached zoning districts. It would still require a Zoning Board hearing for this larger childcare use. When this legislation was first put on the agenda, Commissioner O'Neill asked why the Hillside and the RIV-RM districts were excluded. Staff proposed that Childcare (Limited) be permitted by right in the Hillside zoning district, and Childcare (General) be permitted by right in the Riverfront Mixed Residential zoning district. It would be a special exception in the Hillside district, which is consistent with the other zoning districts as part of the legislation. For three or more children in a home, it is still permitted by right. It is still a home occupation, but it won't require a Record of Zoning Approval. Licensure from the State won't be required, matching state requirements. It is exempted from the other home occupation standards. Staff recommended the Planning Commission make a positive recommendation on this Council Bill with the following changes: 1. Childcare (Limited) be

permitted by right in the Hillside district and be a special exception in the Hillside district and 2. Childcare (General) be permitted by right in the Riverfront Mixed Residential district. Mr Mohammed Burny, Chief of Staff from Cn Wilson's office was not in attendance. Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised. Chair Burton-Faulk asked for questions or comments from commissioners. Ms Dick commented this is a wonderful start for improvement of the community and for the for the welfare of our children and our parents in the economic milieu of the whole community, was highly am in favor of it, and proposed a motion to approve it.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh makes a positive recommendation on Council Bill 2023-2089, amending the Pittsburgh Code, Title Nine, Zoning, regarding Child Care standards with the following changes:

1. In the Hillside Zoning District (H) – Childcare (Limited) is permitted by right and Child Care (General) is a Special Exception.
2. In the Riverfront Mixed Residential (RIV-RM) – Child Care (General) is permitted by right.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

3. DCP-HN-2023-01071 – Frick Park Historic Nomination Swisshelm Park; Squirrel Hill South; Regent Square; Point Breeze

Ms Quinn presented the historic nomination. The Frick Park historic nomination located in the eastern portion of the city was originally founded in 1919 with the death of Henry Clay Frick. He bequeathed 151 acres of land as well as a home to the city. Since that time the city has purchased and amalgamated additional land to the park, currently totaling 644 acres. As requested from a previous meeting, Ms Quinn provided a map showing the city owned parcel to the north of Homewood Cemetery that is included within the historic nomination. Sometimes the cemetery shows up as park although, obviously, it is not. Several adjacent parcels owned by the URA to the south and east of this park are not included in the nomination. Frick Park is adjacent to four neighborhoods in the city of Pittsburgh, Swisshelm Park, Squirrel Hill South, Regent Square, and Point Breeze. Its earliest remaining legacy is the four gateways to the park which were built in 1935. Ms Quinn presented some views of the park including one of the gateways built in 1931. The nominator as well as the Historic Review Commission felt this property was significant under planning and design criteria five. The park represents a series of designed landscapes in the form playgrounds, and wooded areas that were developed as the park was added on to. The Historic Review Commission also felt this property was significant under criteria seven as part of the social history of the city of Pittsburgh. The city of Pittsburgh has a very deep history of philanthropy, and Frick Park was formed as part of that philanthropy. It is a good representation of how that history of philanthropy continues today with folks like the Parks Conservancy, etc., working with the city to manage Frick Park. Criteria 10 under visual landscape is the last criteria the Historic Review Commission felt was significant about this property.

Frick Park is one of those places where driving near it and through it, one is immediately taken back to an earlier time and century. Overall the property has what is known as integrity that conveys its original character. Its Integrity is through amalgamation in the design of the part that changed as pieces were added on, and that in itself is what makes it significant under the criteria five.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized Matthew Falcone, Head of Preservation Pittsburgh.

Mr Falcone thanked Council person Warwick, the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy, Upstream Pittsburgh, the North Point Breeze Community Organization, Frick Park Friends, and Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition who co-nominated the park. He understood the commission's purview is focused on the plan for the neighborhood and the park, and its historic designation would tie into that. There are so many different neighborhoods involved and connected to Frick Park. In the city's own cultural heritage plan that was adopted in 2012, it specifically called for the historic designation of all its regional parks, Frick Park, Highland Park, and Shenley Park. This is the first opportunity to work with so many different community groups to bring the city's own recommendation to fruition. Mr Falcone hoped the commission would consider that moving forward.

Chair Burton-Faulk recognized Christina Cerkevich, founding member of Frick Park Friends. Ms Cerkevich stated she lived in Swiss Helm Park and I'm a founding member of the Frick Park Friends. They are a group of Frick Park's neighbors who came together to protect Frick Park. Giving it a local historic designation will do this and is in line with the city's cultural heritage plan. Frick Park has been and will continue to be a place where members of the greater Pittsburgh community can come to interact with nature and each other. The protections provided by historic recognition and the centering of the park's histories will not only protect Frick Park now but will also help preserve it for the future and may even inspire the next generation's Henry Clay Frick or Rachel Carson. Ms Cerkevich expressed strong support for the historic nomination on behalf of the members of the Frick Park Friends, and asked that the commission recommend the historic recognition to the city council.

Ms McElhaney recognized Geri Smith, founding member of Frick Park Friends.

Ms Smith stated he lived right by Frick Park, supported everything that Ms Cerkevich stated, and also called out the large number of letters that were sent to the Historic Review Commission and the Planning Commission in support of making this a historic landmark.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh make a positive recommendation for nomination of Frick Park as a city designated historic property.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

4. DCP-ZDR-2023-06473 – 605 Forbes Ave Neighborhood Gateway Sign Bluff

Ms Moradian presented the project for DCP staff. The project development plan (PDP) application DCP-ZDR-2023-06473 was for a 420 square foot wall pane as an Uptown neighborhood gateway sign on the Duquesne Light Company substation located in the EMI zoning district. The proposed signage met zoning code Section 919.03.R per zoning appeal request DCP-PAP-2023-00024. The applicant appealed zoning issue CF-PLI-2023-001951, a violation of city code 919.03.R, Neighborhood Gateway Signs. On May 25th, 2023, in ZBA Case 33 of 2023, the Zoning Board of Adjustment approved an alternative request for a variance from the requirements of section 919.03.R.5 to allow the existing mural to remain on the subject property without alternation, subject to the condition that the applicant shall submit a zoning development and review application to review the mural as a neighborhood gateway sign. Design Review staff recommended no review was required as it was already in place. There was no recommendation from a Development Activities Meeting held October 16, 2023. This location has three Registered Community Organizations. The painted wall sign in the EMI zoning district must be reviewed and approved as a project development plan (PDP). Staff recommended approval of PDP application DCP-ZDR-2023-06473 for a 420 square-foot wall pane as an Uptown neighborhood gateway sign on the DLC substation in the EMI zoning district.

Dr Brittany McDonald, Executive Director of Uptown Partners, gave a brief overview about the Uptown Partners organization. She stated public art is a staple in the Uptown community. In 2020 there were plans to commission a large-scale mural to bring energy and vibrancy to the community. Duquesne Light graciously agreed to permission to use the curved wall of their substation located at the corner of Forbes Avenue and Boyd Street. In 2021 Uptown Partners was able to secure the funding from the PNC Charitable Trust in the amount of \$18,500 to commission this art. Uptown Partners and the Uptown Arts Committee commissioned the mural by Shane Pilster and Max Gonzalez. In early 2023 Uptown Partners and Duquesne Light Company received a compliance notice regarding the mural as a gateway sign. Dr McDonald gave a brief background of the Uptown Arts Committee put in place to establish art as a visible and accessible part of Uptown's identity. There were three meetings to request submissions from local artists that had large scale mural experience and to select the finalist based on experience, portfolio, and budget. Dr McDonald presented a timeline of the artist selection and approval, slides of initial concepts of the mural, previous works of artists Max Gonzalez and Shane Pilster, and the curved wall of the substation where the mural sits. Stamped elevations and a site plan of the location were presented.

Mr Chris Clauson, Duquesne Light Co, stated he was available to support Dr McDonald's presentation and answer any questions that he could.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony. Hearing none she asked for questions, comments or a motion from commissioners.

Mr Quintanilla asked about lighting the mural so it could be seen at night.

Dr McDonald stated no lighting was installed because it would have to be affixed to the building. Only the mural was intended to be painted on the building wall.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES Project Development Plan Application DCP-ZDR-2023-06473 for a 14' X 30' Wall- Paint as an Uptown Neighborhood Gateway Sign on the DLC substation in the EDUCATIONAL/MEDICAL INSTITUTION (EMI), zoning district.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

No report.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

December 12, 2023 at 2:25 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
Vice Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary, Holly Dick

Dina Blackwell
Peter Quintanilla

Not Present

Monica Ruiz

Mel Ngami

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-01597 – 5301 Butler Street Subdivision 2 Upper Lawrenceville 2. DCP-LOT-2023-01656 – 707 Grant Street Lot Line Revision Central Business District	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-07751, DCP-ZDR-2023-10034, DCP-ZDR-2023-10036, DCPZDR-2023-10037 – 209 1st Avenue, 100 Market Street, 104 Market Street, 106 Market Street Demolition of Five Existing Structures Central Business District 2. DCP-HN-2023-01248 – 712 Brookline Boulevard Sal's Barbershop Historic Nomination Brookline	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for October 31, 2023

Motion

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

Approval of minutes for November 28, 2023

Motion

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-ZDR-2023-07751, DCP-ZDR-2023-10034, DCP-ZDR-2023-10036, DCP-ZDR-2023-10037 – 209 1st Avenue, 100 Market Street, 104 Market Street, 106 Market Street

- Christopher Emery
- Rebecca Senneway

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-01597 – 5301 Butler Street Subdivision 2 Upper Lawrenceville

Mr Scheppke presented plan of lots Item 1, which was first reviewed by the Planning Commission on November 28, 2023. The recommended motion from staff was to approve the 5301 Butler Street subdivision.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there were any other hands raised.

Ms McElhaney recognized Bill Sittig.

Mr Sittig was representing the developer of an apartment project that has already been before the Zoning Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission. The 5301 Butler Street subdivision was of a piece of a lot on McCandless Street, which would then be consolidated with existing lots on Butler Street to create a single development lot that he hoped would come before the Planning Commission shortly. He stated this is the first part of that development and asked the Planning Commission to approve the subdivision of this parcel in order to get to closing and, hopefully, build the apartment project.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion for approval of Item 1.

Motion

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. DCP-LOT-2023-01656 – 707 Grant Street Lot Line Revision Central Business District

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony to Item 2, the 707 Grant Street lot line revision, which was a preliminary approval to be brought back January 9, 2024. Seeing none she asked for a motion for preliminary approval of Item 2.

Motion

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-07751, DCP-ZDR-2023-10034, DCP-ZDR-2023-10036, DCPZDR-2023-10037 – 209 1st Avenue, 100 Market Street, 104 Market Street, 106 Market Street Demolition of Five Existing Structures Central Business District

Chair Burton-Faulk read in the four items in this first hearing and action.

Mr Fraker presented the project for DCP staff. The application for Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-07751 was for the proposed demolition of five existing structures. In the Golden Triangle District, development including demolition requires review and approval by the Planning Commission as a project development plan under Section 910.01.C.1(c). The site is located within the Firstside Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but is not within a local historic district. Review and approval by the Historic Review Commission was not required. A separate application under DCP-ZDR-2023-09633 proposes site improvements and new construction of a bocce court complex with four courts enclosed by a 4-foot fence on site. The proposed redevelopment is under the PDP review threshold and does not require planning commission review and approval. In 2020, the Planning Commission previously heard an application to demolish the structures under 18-PDP-00049 and 18-PDP-00050. At the July 14, 2020, hearing and action meeting the Planning Commission denied without prejudice their request to demolish the structures without a redevelopment plan. In Planning Commission

decisions 18-PDP-00049 and 18-PDP-00050, the Planning Commission encouraged the applicant to bring the applications for demolition before the Planning Commission with a complete project development application for redevelopment of the wider site. There were no requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for this case; no storm water management plan was required for this review; and no Department of Mobility and Infrastructure review was required. A Development Activities Meeting was held virtually on October 12, 2023, with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh approve the project development plan based on the application filed by Steven Regan on behalf of Troy Development Associates, the property owners, with the following condition: The Zoning Administrator shall not approve any demolition permit application until the application for DCP-ZDR-2023-09633, redevelopment of the site, has received its Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr Steve Regan stated the PLI Board of Appeals approved an emergency demolition of for 209 1st Avenue in application DCP-ZDR-2023-07751 2020 under case number PLI-BAP-2020-00482. He stated they thought they already had the right to demolish that one. He stated they attached each one of the four applications' several documents and wanted to make sure all were made part of the record, including their existing conditions, demolition plan, site plan with updated landscape plan, the phase one plan with the bocce courts which shows a potential phase two pickle ball court, a letter of recommendation from 51 First Condominium Association dated September 29, 2023, and a letter of recommendation from the Downtown Neighbors Alliance which followed a meeting with Mr Troiani and them on October 12, 2023. The team commissioned a traffic and parking study from Wooster and Associates dated September 15, 2023. They also submitted an estimate of probable construction cost for both the demolition and the construction installation of the bocce project dated August 30, 2023, and documents responsive to a zoning review of the plans including a new address application, tentatively called Hunter Market Street, and the tree planting request form, all to be incorporated into and made part of the record. The subject properties are in the Golden Triangle Subdistrict C. The proposed use was Outdoor Recreation and Entertainment (Limited), which is permitted by right in all of the GT districts. That use is defined as an establishment offering recreation, entertainment, or games of skill to the general public for a fee or charge wherein any portion of the activity takes place in the open. Bocce is an outdoor recreation or entertainment use and is permitted by right in the district. With the buildings in place, the site could not be improved with the bocce courts. That was the basis for seeking demolition. In a number of community process meetings Mr Troiani met with Councilman Lavelle on August 31, and with 151 Firstside Condominium Association on September 13, resulting in a letter of support in favor of the bocce proposal. Mr Troiani met with Senator Wayne Fontana on September 14. The pre-development meeting with the city was held October 5, resulting in the five demolition applications and one for the project development plan. A virtual meeting was held with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, and finally, Mr Troiani met with the Downtown Neighbors Association on that same day, the 12th, which resulted in a letter of recommendation and support from that association. Mr Regan showed slides of a location map and existing conditions. 209 First Avenue, parcel 0001-H-00046, is a six-story red brick building which has the 2020 emergency demolition approval from the Board of Appeals. The three Market Street buildings, 101 and 102 are essentially one building, 104 is a separate building, and 106 and 108 are essentially one building. There are four buildings rather than five. The slide depicting existing conditions of the 209 First Avenue building with the wall that faces the Market Street property showed the layers of brick, called wythes, which have fallen off the building resulting in a significant deterioration in the condition and strength of the building. Their structural engineer estimated that because of that condition the building has probably lost about 40% of its capacity to maintain itself in an upright position. Mr Regan noted all of these buildings have been condemned by the city of Pittsburgh. There are notices of condemnation on each one of them dated April 22, 2021. On the four-story 104 Market Street building, the façade is not original. It was replaced at some point during the 20th century to match 101-102 First Avenue. 100-102 Market Street, the former Froggy's building, and all of them on the west wall of 209 1st Ave, are at risk of 209 1st Avenue collapsing on them. Mr Regan stated they have structural engineer reports that support all of that. 106-108 Market Street has some fairly significant structural issues. It is mostly wood and glass. The brick wall that faces the

parking lot severely bows both inward and outward. Most of these buildings have brick that wasn't fired properly and were not of sufficient strength to support these buildings long term. He then showed slides of the proposed development, existing conditions, and demo plan, depicting the four buildings they intended to demolish. He stated there was one update to this slide not appearing in the presentation which was sent by email the day of the hearing and action. At a previous briefing hearing there were some comments about the fencing around the property. He stated they were open to other fencing suggestion and would deal with that at the ROSA and CDAP level.

Mr Stephen Victor presented a site plan showing three bocce courts perpendicular to Market Street and a fourth court perpendicular to First Avenue. The four courts would be surrounded by concrete paving, and outside of that a pervious area where storm water could recharge into the ground. Originally proposed on the four sides around the concrete was a black vinyl coated chain link fence four feet high. In response to a comment at the last meeting, they modified the fence along First Avenue and along Market Street to a more ornamental black painted aluminum picket-type fence. The detail was on the revised plan submitted earlier that day. The chain link fence would remain on the interior of the site as a better material for maintenance in that particular area. The site plan also showed the landscaping plan with seven street trees at the back of the curb along First Avenue and Market Street and five additional shade trees on the perimeter of the two interior sides. The slide depicted areas representing umbrellas over picnic bench type seating and small cube boxes representing informal seating between the bocce courts for viewers and spectators to enjoy the facility.

Mr Michael Troiani stated the four courts will be available during work days by reservation through an online reservation system. The control points will be managed by the adjacent parking lot operator who is already on site through those periods. On the weekends he proposed there would be league play and whatever could be ultimately created.

Mr Regan stated they were asked to submit a construction management plan after the previous briefing a couple of weeks ago which they emailed two or three days after the briefing. He asked if staff could confirm receipt and that it was part of the record.

Mr Troiani stated he looked forward to working with DOMI and Public Works regarding accessibility and would ensure that the public would be safe during the transition of the demolition. He asked for understanding that they were managing an emergency condition at this site.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized Jay Green.

Mr Jay Green stated he owns the building adjacent to these properties at 216 Boulevard of the Allies. He bought the building as his retirement 15 years ago. He stated Mr Troiani's plan was really to find a developer to build an office tower. He did not care anything about bocce courts or the community. When last allowed to demolish a building at 212 and 214 Boulevard of the Allies, Mr Troiani damaged, and continues to damage, his property daily with improper water shielding as well as defaulting on obligations he made to the city to provide proper grading, asphalt, and a fence around the newly vacant lots. Mr Green stated nobody has held him to those promises, continuing to cause him damage daily. The buildings seen in the presentation were condemned by the city, meaning that they were in a state of neglect and he was ordered to repair them, which does not mean they were to be torn down. He continued to allow them to degrade and degrade. Mr Green stated Mr Troiani put up fences and placards and boarded up the windows and had to rely on his paid engineer to say whether they were structurally sound or not. Mr Green refused to accept that they were as much in decline as Mr Troiani suggested. Mr Green also stated pickle ball has caused headaches and lawsuits for communities all over the country. Doing a tiny bit of research would tell that nationally pickle ball is recognized as a public nuisance for communities everywhere. Mr Green also disputed the property line in his original submission and submitted a depiction of the true property line on page two of the Rebecca Seneway images submission. Mr Green stated 209 First Avenue was not in danger of falling down. He asked if he was afraid the buildings were going to fall down why would he allow his employees to park cars and walk next to them multiple times a day? Mr Green asked if this will be a precedent in the city for anyone who wants to tear down a building and doesn't have a viable development plan to say they're going to build a bocce court or pickle ball court. He urged the city to deny the sham and enforce the fines

that obliged Mr Troiani to repair his properties. He also urged the city to put in a rider that does not allow pickle ball, ever.

Ms McElhaney recognized Melissa McSwigan on behalf of Preservation Pittsburgh.

Ms McSwigan previously stated their opposition to the demolition of the properties on Market Street and First Avenue in 2020. At the time their concerns echoed the planning commission who didn't grant permission for demolition.

Additionally, the PLI Board of Appeals rejected the application for demolition of the Market Street properties in 2021. Though as noted, the 209 First Avenue building was granted permission by PLI. These buildings on Market and First are part of the First Side historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Due to the district's wharf trade significance these buildings also caught the attention of Preservation Pennsylvania and were placed on their 2020 Pennsylvania At Risk. In 2009 they also expressed concern regarding the Boulevard of the Allies demolitions mentioned by Jay Green, but were granted. Taken together this represents a large swath of historic buildings that contribute to a district as well as to a sense of place. Ms McSwigan stated with the Boulevard of the Allies buildings gone and permission granted for 209 First Avenue it makes saving the remaining buildings on Market all the more important. The current plans have not been altered and potentially they could even possibly have bocce while keeping some or part of the historic buildings. There is enough expertise and creativity in Pittsburgh. With some dialogue and thought they could arrive at a plan to incorporate the existing buildings and possibly the bocce court plans, making for an attraction of note. She stated this possibility should be explored before rushing into demolition. She pointed out the national register listing provides financial incentive for income producing properties that could be used to offset some of the renovation costs. It would be a shame to see a historic downtown block erased because there hasn't been the stewardship or creative approach taken. Ms McSwigan stated First Side is truly unique and a special part of our downtown and appreciated the commission's consideration.

Ms McElhaney recognized Karamagi Rujumba, Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation.

Mr Rujumba stated they were fundamentally opposed to the demolition of these buildings. They are significant because they are part of the First Side national register historic district because of the nature and building scale in that area. They are brick buildings that represent the historic scale of that street, and the demolition would be a crying shame given the dent it would create in First Side. Mr Rujumba stated they have been involved from the beginning and tried to work with the Troiani group to help show them how these buildings could be adapted for reuse when they wanted to do a signature tower. He stated they thought the buildings were structurally sound and could be saved at the time. He said they fundamentally disagreed with their proposition that the buildings were not structurally sound. He stated they got a fast demolition permit for 209 on an emergency basis. That emergency basis has lasted three years. That building as you can see is still strong and sound. He stated they fundamentally believed that if this planning commission wanted to approve a demolition for these buildings they may approve it for other grounds, but not on structural integrity. He said they have gone farther and offered to buy the buildings from the Troiani group if they were interested, but they have not been interested in that discussion and haven't gotten back to them. He stated they believed these buildings could and should be saved to maintain the architectural and aesthetic integrity of that part of downtown. They believed this was not a time for those buildings to be demolished for a bocce ball court. That could be done with those buildings existing. He stated if there was contention that those buildings are a public nuisance. It was because their owner allowed them to become a public nuisance. Mr Rujumba stated they fundamentally thought this commission ought to turn down this demolition request.

Ms McElhaney recognized James Moritz, President of the 151 First Side HOA.

Mr Moritz stated he was troubled by two things regarding these buildings relating to the health and safety of the people in the neighborhood and those who walk by these buildings. There are pieces of these buildings that fall off like bricks, glass, roofing material that are a danger to people. These buildings are occupied by vermin like rats and pigeons that create health issues. He stated he, the people in his building, and the people who walk by have to live with this. It was his understanding that Planning had a responsibility for public health, safety, and welfare of the people. He said one could see the buildings' structural integrity is gone and that is why they are

falling apart. He stated it's easy to submit opinions that aren't based on technical expertise. He questioned why there has been such resistance. He was also concerned about people being personally attacked in these kinds of hearings and stated the commission members should not put up with that. He stated this is a health and safety issue that these buildings represent a danger, and someone is either going to get hurt or killed or have property damage. He stated he is a preservationist but these buildings are well beyond that.

Ms McElhaney saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments or a motion.

Ms O'Neill asked about the prior emergency demolition that was authorized. She asked if that building was still standing and was that part of that application. She asked the applicant to clarify which building they were talking about and what the current status of it was.

Mr Troiani stated the demolition narrative for 209 First Avenue compels 100 to 108 Market Street to be torn down first. Though we had approval to conduct that demolition based on the structural engineers prescribed method to reduce hazard to public safety, PLI would not authorize it. That is why we are in front of the planning commission to ask them to authorize the conventional demolition of the three parcels on Market Street. The narrative for 209 First Avenue is the parent superior narrative for the demolition of all of these four buildings. Because of its hazardous, structurally unsafe condition there is no way to separate the narrative from 209 First Avenue to the narratives for 100, 104, and 106. 100, 104, and 106 need to be torn down first. There is a very specific process to raze 209 to eliminate public hazard.

Ms O'Neill confirmed the building that was previously authorized for demolition is still standing.

Mr Regan stated that was correct.

Ms O'Neill asked about their talking about a phase two for pickle ball and if that was being contemplated now on these sites.

Mr Regan replied it was not. He stated it was something we may do in the future once the bocce courts were up and running and successful. The parcels where those were being contemplated at some point in the future are the two parcels next to Mr Green's building where the former Papa J's used stand on the Boulevard of the Allies.

Mr Troiani stated there were three separate applications for demolitions in front of the commission, one for 100 Market, one for 104 Market, and one for 106 Market Street.

The zoning lot for bocce use was not being contemplated at that time. That was something they looked forward to considering in future processes as determined by City Planning.

Ms O'Neill thanked you Mr Troiani, but was asking about something that they all brought up in their presentation and moved on to the next question. She asked to go to the last two slides of the presentation and about a question whether they included construction management slides. She didn't see them up on the screen, but they were in the presentation that was posted online. She asked if they could share those slides 15 and 16.

Mr Regan confirmed it is a three-page construction management plan. There was a narrative followed by two plans.

Mr Troiani stated the narrative calls for two different acts of road and sidewalk closure during different levels of hazard. The goal is not to disrupt the right-of-way as much as possible, but to protect both the pedestrians and the property on the surrounding sidewalks and public roadways based on the hazard of the event described in the demolition narrative for 209 First Avenue.

Ms O'Neill asked him to describe what phase one and phase two are versus phase three, which is a the the third slide in the submitted construction management plan.

Mr Troiani there is a period when we're worried about heavy masonry material, structure, and glass falling into the public right of way that will affect closure on Market Street and First Avenue. Then, there is a period when the roadways can be open. Those are the two distinct conditions with provided mapping of both of those two public right-of-way conditions. The goal is to facilitate the demolition contractor as a licensed, insured professional in the city to responsibly conduct the demo, limiting public disturbance while keeping the people safe.

Ms O'Neill read two phase three titles called Phase Three Traffic Control Plan for Sidewalk Routing and Partial Street Closure During Interim Site Plan Improvements. She asked what those interim site plan improvements were.

Mr Troiani stated that was where, in operating some equipment, they might need to make repairs to vault conditions, understanding that damage to the vault conditions could be likely in the public right-of-way. He stated he would like to plan to do a proper replacement of the sidewalk in kind with existing curb cuts to the parcels fronting on First Avenue and Market Street. The phase three interim period would be when repairs would be made to the sidewalks and any vault conditions while retaining access to garages of adjacent neighbors.

Ms O'Neill asked if staff could read in the conditions of approval so they could be understood more clearly.

Mr Fraker the condition is that the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh approves the project development plan with the condition that the zoning administrator shall not approve any demolition permit application until the application for DCP-ZDR-2023-9633, redevelopment of the site, has received its Record of Zoning Approval.

Ms O'Neill thought she should address some of the concerns from the public, stating they can't force somebody to proceed with a ROZA, but it is conditioning our demolition on issuance of that ROZA. From another technical standpoint there were some questions raised about the lot line. City permitting doesn't permit somebody to cross a lot line. That is not what is being authorized here. Without taking a position on what that lot line is, not having studied it, that is not really within the commission's purview. But, to the extent this project is approved, it is not approving somebody to cross a lot line into somebody else's property.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for any other comments or questions from commissioners.

Mr Quintanilla asked about the issue with the fence and that Mr Troiani had some ideas for the fence that he was going to show them. He asked if there was a way to pull those out from an email sent earlier in the day.

Mr Troiani stated he updated the slides and provided them to City Planning. He understood they were looking for something more aesthetically pleasing fronting on First and Market as a part of the zoning lot review, the development review, and CDAP review, and with the Zoning Administrator. He stated he would like to work out the use condition because there is a wall on the interior lot lines that is going to be tapped by vehicles from time to time. He stated they have been repairing walls that have been tapped by vehicles for decades and asked if they could consider a fence on the interior lot lines that is either breakaway or that bends. Practically, they would like the fence to be pretty, want people to be on the streets, and as people are playing bocce, to ensure bocce balls don't fall into the street, and to work through these processes to create the highest possible outcome.

Mr Quintanilla asked if it could be displayed on the screen.

Mr Layman stated they were working on displaying the slide.

Mr Troiani explained it was a detail of a picket style fence similar to the one installed on Penn Avenue by the Cultural Trust.

Mr Layman commented this was outside the normal window of having something ready to be updating things online, but they would do their best.

Ms O'Neill clarified staff would not have it included in the presentation because the deadline was a week ago, but they would share it at this meeting, also being clear this was not a staff error.

Mr Victor explained the slide showing an aluminum fence that would be utilized along Market and First with the interior fencing being the traditional chain link type fence using black Vinyl. Both are black, one more of a picket style fence and the other a traditional chain link fence. If planning had an alternative style, they would be happy to work with them as they progress to the next step.

This was just to show the general character of the fence.

Mr Quintanilla commented if this was the general character it meant the final detail would probably be down the line, whatever fence is actually chosen. He said his main concern with the fence was the relationship to the street, encountering a park that is going to be driven by market rate and not a park that is actually being utilized by a lot of people. A bigger question was he didn't know what purview the commission had on whether to approve the fence or not. He thought it would probably be the minimum that one could imagine.

Mr Layman addressed any lack of clarity in terms of purview of the commission. The demolition application is within the purview of the planning commission and something they would consider. The particular application filed concurrently for the bocce program was below the threshold for planning commission review. Staff have recommended that CDAP review with a condition to

continue to work with staff as part of planning commission approval. If there are any other conditions that staff can work on them together with you. Staff believed the questions around the proposed redevelopment were very relevant.

Mr Regan pointed out they received correspondence from CDAP. One of the issues that they wanted to discuss with us was the fencing. He said they fully expected to further discuss the fencing issue with them and also with city planning as they went through the ROZA process.

Ms Dick realized they were just voting on the demolition proposal, but for future consideration of the whole matter, she asked if Mr Troiani could tell her how many years or what length of time he proposed to utilize the bocce court before he considered some other type of development for the property.

Mr Troiani said he didn't have an answer to that. He hoped it has a long and successful run.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for additional comments or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-07751 based on the application filed by Steven Regan on behalf of TROY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, the property owners, with the following condition:

The Zoning Administrator shall not approve any Demolition Permit application until the application for the DCP-ZDR-2023-09633 redevelopment of the site has received its Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA).

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

2. DCP-HN-2023-01248 – 712 Brookline Boulevard Sal's Barbershop Historic Nomination Brookline

Ms Quinn presented the historic nomination of Sal's Barber Shop located at 712 Brookline Boulevard along the local business district. The Sal's Barber Shop building was constructed in 1928 and was originally built by the Garofalo family who are Sal's wife's family. Her family ran businesses from a fruit stand to a shoe repair shop. Sal's Barber Shop moved in in 1947. The Historic Review Commission felt this property was significant and voted to provide a positive recommendation to city council based on criteria seven, which relates to significance in local history. This building is unique because it represents small business run by an immigrant. It's unique as an Italian business located in Brookline when the Italian neighborhoods were Bloomfield and Panther Hollow. It also shows in a way the development of the Italian-American immigrant over the years. The HRC also felt this property was significant under criteria seven as a visible landmark because everybody in Brookline knows where Sal's is. Ms Quinn presented interior views of Sal's Barber Shop and a billboard sign showing Sal in an ad for St Clair Hospital, attesting to how famous Sal is. Sal's has also inspired artwork. It is a little brick square building with not a lot of character, but It is a gem of its own, having inspired artists to do watercolor paintings. Cn Coghill and Brookline together wrote a letter of support. And, a petition with over 250 signatures from folks who just love Sal was included with the nomination. For that reason, Ms Quinn recommended that the planning commission provide a positive recommendation to city council. She commented that, hopefully, there will be more cultural landmarks like this rather than architectural.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhancy recognized Mr Matthew Falcone.

Mr Falcone, the head of Preservation Pittsburgh and one that has been working with the community and working with Sal and Lynn to landmark this property. Mr Falcone commented that the community support has been absolutely tremendous, and wanted to thank all of them for being so involved and bringing attention to such a unique landmark. He

stated there isn't a lot that comes before us like this. He thought that we are all a little too accustomed to seeing more grand buildings and high design. But there is very much something to be said for the culture and people that make up Pittsburgh. He stated it is wonderful to see something like this have protection. He stated because it is a part of the business district and a beloved institution this will make sure it is something that is celebrated. There isn't a tremendous amount of change planned for the neighborhood itself that would impact this and he looked forward to a positive recommendation for city council.

Ms McElhaney saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for comments or a motion.

Ms Dick moved that planning commission gave a positive recommendation and stated it's a wonderful precedent.

Chair Burton-Faulk stated cultural landmarks are equally important, it tells a story about the iterations of our city decades from now, and she definitely appreciated seeing this.

MOTION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission vote affirmatively to recommend the nomination to City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

No Report.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:58 PM.

Approved by: Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Jean Holland Dick. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.