

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

January 9, 2024 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Vice Chair
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Monica Ruiz
 Peter Quintanilla
 Phillip Wu

Not Present

Rachel O'Neill

Dina Blackwell

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-01656 – 707 Grant Street Lot Line Revision 2 Central Business District	1
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-01094 – 1609 FORBES AVE New construction of 82' tall, six-story structure for use as a multi-unit residential Bluff	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for September 19, 2023.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

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

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

- Aaron Clark
- Janis Baldwin

The zoning bill for a temporary managed community

- Brody Roberts and Isaac Sabo

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2023-01656 – 707 Grant Street Lot Line Revision 2 Central Business District

Mr Schepke presented the subdivision which was first reviewed by the Planning Commission on December 12, 2023.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

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

MOTION: The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh to approve the Grant Street Lot Line Revision, 2nd Ward, City of Pittsburgh.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

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

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-01094 – 1609 FORBES AVE New construction of 82' tall, six-story structure for use as a multi-unit residential Bluff

Mr Gregory presented the project for staff. The project is a project development plan (PDP) for the demolition of existing structures and the new construction of an apartment building located at 1609 Forbes Avenue along the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route through the Uptown neighborhood. The application included site improvements and the new six-story, multi-unit apartment building with 211 dwelling units, an integral parking garage and amenity space on the first floor, and service and parking access off Marion Street. There are three existing structures on the site that will be demolished as part of this application. There were no requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for this project. The proposed structure and site design was reviewed by design staff and by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel (CDAP) September 12, 2023, and again by CDAP October 24, 2023. After the second CDAP meeting design staff accepted the art murals and clarification on how the art panels are attached, maintained, and replaced as a major component of the building design based on additional details provided at the meeting. The storm water management plan for this project has been approved. Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI) staff have reviewed a memo summarizing the mobility plan for this development in lieu a full transportation impact study (TIS). The Zoning Administrator determined that the Forbes Avenue sidewalk as designed in concert with DOMI and Pittsburgh Regional Transit (PRT) meets the Uptown Public Realm requirement for a 10-foot sidewalk. Even though the actual walkable area is around 9 ft, it was determined that it is compliant because the overall sidewalk area is larger than 10 ft. This project will require two bonus points to exceed 60 ft in height and is pursuing two bonus points for affordable housing for individuals earning less than 60% AMI under Section 915.07.D.4.b. A Development Activities Meeting (DAM) was held virtually May 15, 2023, with the area's three registered community organizations, the Hill Community Development Cooperative, the Hill District Collaborative, and Uptown Partners. The site is in the Uptown/West Oakland Ecoinnovation District Plan area, and planning staff determined this project complies with the neighborhood's adopted plan. The recommended motion was the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh approve PDP, DCP-ZDR-2023-01094 based on the application filed by Buchanan, Ingersol and Rooney on behalf of the property owners with three conditions: 1. The future replacements to the art panels shall be subject to courtesy review and recommendations by the Public Art and Civic Design Commission prior to installation. 2. The applicant shall provide documentation demonstrating the project eligibility for the two identified affordable housing bonus points under Section 915.07.D.4.b prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval. 3. The standard condition of approval of 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 Shawn Gallagher presented plans and some renderings requested from a previous briefing specifically dealing with street level coordination with the new bus line as well as access for Marion Street. In the previous briefing Commissioner Burton-Faulk had questions about how the art was going to be reviewed and approved. Mr Gallagher stated they had not yet determined

how the art was going to be finalized and who the artist was going to be. He stated whenever they have one or more options with respect to the art panels that they will bring to the Public Art and Civic Design Commission. The site is very close to PPG Paints Arena, Duquesne University's campus, as well as the UPMC Mercy campus. Mr Gallagher presented a slide showing the site, which takes up almost the entire block, and showing structures to be demolished and other structures that will remain. The location is along the BRT route and has a significant public transportation component. He presented a site plan showing access in and out of the site at Marion Street.

Mr Jon Grant presented slides pointing out the access points and site orientation bounded by Forbes Avenue to the south, Van Braam Street on the east side, Watson Street behind to north and Marion Street on the west side. Marion Street is the access point for vehicles into the parking garage, a loading dock, recycling area, and space for a screened generator and trash pickup. There is a wooden wall screening the receiving dock across from the wooden walls that enclose the recycling and waste areas. Two new trees and a green space for a bit of a street yard at the back was also added in that area. There is a large bike parking area in the garage with handicapped spaces and elevators. The entire building is accessible and is state-of-the-art in terms of high-efficiency mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems. The first-floor plan contains a number of community spaces including a fitness center, a community clubhouse, leasing offices, office space for residents' daytime offices and printing, etc., and a 1,200 to 1,500 square-foot retail space to be used by a food service tenant or a small grocery store that would benefit the community as well as the residents of the apartment building. The floor plan is essentially the same above the first floor with two indented courtyards. One courtyard contains a pool and outdoor area. The other courtyard is a green outdoor space and has space for dog walking in the evening. The overall plan has 211 units ranging from efficiency units to two-bedroom units. They are arranged floor by floor in a stack and upper floors step back away from Forbes Avenue to provide more daylight down to the street. They step back from Van Braam Street so the scale of the building gets smaller as the building gets taller. The concept also integrates a couple of existing buildings with this new structure that comfortably work into each other. The elevation on Forbes Avenue features three glass exit towers down to the street which are also lanterns that light up the street at night and throw some additional light across Forbes Avenue. At the first floor a glass elevation of windows allows light from the public areas, the gymnasium, the activities areas in the clubhouse, as well as a retail space to give the street a little bit of animation and to allow activity on it during the day. The rear elevation on Watson Street on the first floor is the ventilated space for the garage and upper floors above that are apartment units. The building is mainly constructed using cement board panels that are regulated and create some distinctive patterns with some color on the rear panels. On the front elevation there will be artwork on the panels. The process for now is to put together a commission to select artwork that could be changed every five years as part of a program in which the artwork remains dynamic changing the elevation on the building over the years. Previously, a councilmember asked the team to show what the building would look like without the artwork. Mr Grant presented an elevation showing the regulated cement board panels behind the artwork above a stone base that goes all the way around the building, providing a resilient base at street level. A significant number of new street trees were provided around the building as part of the initial design and planting. There is also a sidewalk on Watson Street at the rear and planting on Marion Street. Mr Grant presented two end elevations. The Van Braam elevation showed the building step backs giving the proper setback for the code requirement. The Marion Street elevation showed access to the loading dock and the garage entrance and screening. Another slide showed indentations for the pool and the greenspace courtyards on the south elevation to maximize the amount of sunlight in those courtyards during daytime, maintaining the green space. The roof is covered with solar panels. There is also an outdoor green space on the roof that increases the amount of water pour space on the site and helps with the storm water management plan. Another slide of the south elevation showed the courtyard trees in the indentations from the upper floors at the intersection of Forbes Avenue and Van Braam Street. Instead of being a big massive building the elevations are broken into three components cutting back the scale of the building and setting back the upper floors 10 feet allowing more light deeper into the building cavity and creating a much nicer private outdoor space for the residents. The

slide also showed pullover space for street parking and the bike lane on the sidewalk. Mr Grant also showed a slide of the architectural panels without the art work. The next slide showed Forbes Avenue closer to Marion Street with the remaining existing buildings keeping some original architecture from the block involved in this overall project concept. The street level elevation is very transparent with glass shoji screen panel windows that allow views into the building fitness center, club rooms, office space, and retail. The lighted stair towers down through the building help very effectively to break up the scale by slicing it into smaller sections, creating the feel of a community residential block with walking space and a place for bikes, etc. rather than a massive office block. The entry of the building has the Phoenix on Forbes name above with electronically activated, self-sliding, accessible entry doors. Two other doors are the door from the stair tower and the door from the bicycle storage area to the street. Within that area in the garage is a bike washing area and a dog washing area. The retail space to the left of the entry would be oriented to food from either a restaurant or a combination deli with pre-made foods for purchase by residents or neighbors. The street actually slopes up, and as one walks along the sidewalk one rises up and looks down into the space. Valet parking is provided inside, allowing a higher density of cars and providing more parking with less area. A significant challenge was how to provide a state-of-the-art, energy efficient building. High energy HVAC systems will be used with very high-efficiency windows, insulation in the skin of the building, solar panels on the roof used to light the hallways and common spaces, utilizing the green roof element of storm water management, as well as the green space in the courtyards. This will add more pervious surface than was existing previously on this site, becoming a much better neighbor and much greener space. The team is utilizing green label plus materials, and as mentioned previously, the building is on the BRT line to promote to the residents the use of public transportation, Uber, and other ways of commuting. Every portion of the building is directly accessible from street level with not only elevators to the residential areas but also a service elevator by the loading dock allowing anyone to load items directly into an elevator and take them up to their floor, freeing up the public elevators. All the bathrooms, kitchens in the requisite share of units are made to be handicapped convertible and the appropriate number of units are made handicapped accessible. Also, a valet will be there to assist anyone who has special needs from their car. The BRT at the front door will provide another level of accessibility for everyone. The site is located in an ecoinnovation district. Many deciduous trees and replanted shade trees have been used. The sidewalk is more residentially scaled with park benches for people to sit and enjoy. The bike lanes and indented parking and the area of sidewalk allows interaction on the street. All demolition work will be done with ASTM requirements for recycling. Affordable housing accounts for 10% of units across all unit types as affordable to 60% of the AML. Their construction partner, Franjo, works with MWBS ensuring there is an appropriate number of minority and woman run businesses on the job site. They also worked with Councilman Lavelle's office to ensure any of the businesses working in the Civic Arena site have priority to work here as well. There was a lot of interest in the art banners and how they would be installed on the skin of the building.

Mr Bill Kolano presented slides showing how the artwork will be attached and removed from the skin of the building. The concept of the building grew out of the fact that many of the buildings popping up around Pittsburgh and around the country are all starting to look the same. The desire was to make a building a bit different than others and that can actually evolve over time rather than remain static. The concept of adding artwork to the building is forward thinking. There are 10 banners along the front façade and 4 panels on the side of the building. The materials are made large enough to be able to cover these surfaces and of durability to last between five and 10 years. A second component is inks that can last that long and equipment that is large enough to be able to print the banners. A third component is a framing system that looks somewhat like a metal box frame and allows these flex faced, fabric-based banners to clip very seamlessly into the frame with no grommets or other type of attachment. It is a very clean architectural surface box that is put onto the front facade. The top set of banners is set back from the street a bit more, and from the street the view will be filtered through the trees. The goal is to have something that is an outgrowth of the community feel and of museum quality. The panel being put together will be selected by some of Pittsburgh's best artistic eyes and will be presented to the Public Art and Civic Design Commission before anything is fabricated.

Mr Grant stated it is important to realize that the panels will be selected in a public process and reviewed before they are allowed to be put up.

Mr Gallagher presented slides to address the transportation and parking impacts. There is not going to be a significant transportation or traffic impact here. This is a very bikeable and walkable community very close to the Duquesne University campus, the medical schools, and the hospitals. The need for vehicles is not as great here as it may be other places. The site is in a parking exempt area. There are a number of parking spaces. There are more bicycle parking spaces. The team believed this is more than sufficient for the development because of how close it is to the BRT line and how walkable it is. There was a very robust community outreach process. This area has a lot of Registered Community Organizations. The team met with all of them, but specifically with the Uptown Partners since the site is located in the Uptown Public Realm, meeting with them probably six or seven times over the past year. They have been very supportive of the project.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions or comments. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-01094 based on the application filed by Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney on behalf of the property owners with the following conditions:

1. The future replacements to the art panels shall be subject to Courtesy Review and recommendations by the Public Art and Civic Design Commission prior to installation;
2. The applicant shall provide documentation demonstrating the project's eligibility for the two identified Affordable Housing points under 915.07.D.4.b prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval; and
3. 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 Dick, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu, Ms Burton-Faulk

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

No report. Chair announced next meeting, 01/23/2024, will cover term limits for officers.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 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

January 23, 2024 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
Monica Ruiz
Peter Quintanilla
Phillip Wu

Not Present

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2023-01706, Butler Street and McCandless Avenue, Major Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville	1
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2023-10458 – 444 Liberty Avenue Install High Wall Signage Central Business District 2. DCP-ZDR-2023-07553 – 500 Liberty Avenue Interior and exterior renovations to convert vacant structure into bank Central Business District	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for January 9, 2024.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

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

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

None

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-01706, Butler Street and McCandless Avenue, Major Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville

Mr Schepke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve the lot consolidation and schedule final approval on 02/06/2024.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for commissioners' motion?

MOTION: That the 54th and McCandless Consolidation, 10th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on January 23, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on February 6th, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu,
CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2023-10458 – 444 Liberty Avenue Install High Wall Signage Central Business District

Vice Chair O'Neill recused from this application.

Mr Fraker presented the project for staff. The project was for installation of two high wall signs for Citizens Bank. Per Section 919.03.M.7 of the zoning code, signs over 40 feet above grade in the GT District require review by the Planning Commission. The proposed signs will be 268 feet above grade at the top of the easterly and westerly facing facades. Signs above 40 feet above grade must not exceed a face area of 40 square feet or 2% of the exposed façade area, whichever is larger. The requirement would allow for a sign up to 1,568 square feet. The proposed signs are each 421 square feet. The applicant has provided a written agreement to not exceed a luminance of 2,500 nits during daylight hours and illuminance of 250 nits at all other times. A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership on December 14, 2023. There were no design review comments nor Zoning Board of Adjustment requests for the proposal. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh approve the PDP based on the application filed by Kolano Design 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 Record of Zoning Approval.

Mr William Kolano presented slides, views, and site plans of the proposed signage in the GT-D zoning district at 444 Liberty Avenue, also known as Gateway 4. Gateway Health was the former anchor tenant. The new anchor tenant is Citizens Bank and their signs will be in the same place, using the same structure as the Gateway Health signs. The building is facing Liberty Avenue and the Point to the west and Mellon Square to the east. Mr Kolano showed renderings of the signs on the building facing west and facing east. He also showed a diagram depicting the circumference of vision where the signs can be seen. The building façade is about 78,000 square feet and 2% yields a sign allowance of about 1,500 square feet. The proposed signs are about a third of that size with 8 ft 6 in high letters totaling about 50 feet wide, which is well within the code. The signs will have color changing capability with no animation. The signs will have a white face during the day with a green brand color at night most days. On special occasions the signs might be a featured color for a holiday.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

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

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVE the Project Development Plan, DCP-ZDR-2023-10458, based on the application filed by Kolano Design on behalf of Hertz Gateway Center LP, the property owners, 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.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2023-07553 – 500 Liberty Avenue Interior and exterior renovations to convert vacant structure into bank Central Business District

Vice Chair O'Neill recused from this application.

Ms Moradian presented the project for staff. The proposed project was to redevelop the former McDonald's restaurant located at 500 Liberty Avenue to a bank and financial institution in the Golden Triangle district. The proposed request was for interior and exterior renovations to convert the vacant building into a Bank and Financial Institution (General). The proposed change of use meets the use regulation in zoning code Section 910.01.C.1 and in Section 911.02, Use Table. The use is permitted by right in the GT-A zoning district. The proposed change of use does not meet the zoning code Section 910.01.F.2 to allow direct street access to the bank. Therefore, a Development Activities Meeting and Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing were required. The DAM meeting was held September 14, 2023, with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership. The applicant requested a variance from the ZBA under Section 910.01.F.2 to allow a bank with direct street access, which was approved Thursday December 28, 2023. Design review staff did not review or provide any recommendations. The Historic Review Commission reviewed and approved the proposed design November 1, 2023. Signage and other exterior attachments, including security cameras and decorative metal screens, were not included in this application and will be submitted separately. A project development plan review by the planning commission was required for structures involving exterior alternations exceeding \$250,000 in the GT-A district per Section 910.01. C.1.c1. The city planning staff recommended approval of interior and exterior renovations to convert the vacant building into a Bank and Financial Institution (General) at 500 Liberty Avenue based on the application DCP-ZDR-2023-07553.

Ms Laura Trendler briefly exhibited the same presentation for approval of the proposed redevelopment at 500 Liberty Avenue from a previous briefing. The property is in the Golden Triangle Subdistrict A and is located a block west of Market Square. The team gained approvals from the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, the Historic Review Commission, and the Zoning Board of Adjustment to change the use. She showed slides depiction the existing conditions of the building and a rendering of the proposed redevelopment. Other views showed the surrounding area from from the north on Liberty Avenue and Stanwick Street and from Forbes Avenue and Stanwick Street. The scope of work generally includes repainting, the existing roof, and the same brown color, installation of fabric awnings over seven of the windows. replacement and reconfiguration of the building entrances, and installation of landscape planners at the street level and on the two rooftop terraces, and new exterior light fixtures. The proposed interior on the ground level of the building showed the main entrances on Stanwick Street at the corner and two additional entrances located on Liberty Avenue and Forbes Avenue. There is an interior ATM vestibule on the north side of the building, four office spaces, a common area, a conference room, the teller desks, restrooms, and a stairwell leading up to the second floor. At this point nothing was proposed

on the second floor. It was being shown for reference that Huntington Bank could potentially use this space in the future.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

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

MOTION:

Based on the information in the application and analysis of the facts of record, the City Planning Staff recommends the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVE interior and exterior renovation to convert the vacant building into a Bank and Financial Institution (general) in the former McDonald's building at 500 Liberty Avenue.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

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

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Commission housekeeping: according to Bylaws every two year require nominations. To reconfirm the commission officers and Nominations officers for Commission Chair, Vice Chair, and Commission Secretary for 2024-2025 calendar year.

Vice Chair O'Neill chaired the nomination for Chairperson for two-year terms. Members terms expire before than. Will open the floor for nomination. Will serve as officrt imyo; the earlier of the two year or their commission expires. JAfter their term expires will go through process again.

Vice Chair O'Neill asked for a motion for recommendation for commission chairperson.

MOTION: Ms Dick nominated Ms Burton-Faulk.

SECOND: Ms Blackwell.

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

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for nominations for vice chair.

MOTION: Ms Blackwell nominated Ms O'Neill as commission vice chair.

SECOND: Mr Wu

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

CARRIED

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for nominations for commission secretary.

MOTION: Vice Chair O'Neill nominated Ms Dick as Secretary.

SECOND: Mr Blackwell.

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

CARRIED

Director's Report: Proposed Planning Commission Process Changes.

Ms Rakus presented current processes and proposed process changes to make the review process more efficient, clear and consistent for staff and applicants, and to timely ensure clear and consistent information to the public. The current process involves completing the agenda the week prior to the planning commission meeting. Applicants are asked to provide their presentations that same morning. The presentations and agenda are posted to the website. Projects are first presented to Planning Commission in a briefing, coming back to Planning Commission two weeks later for hearing and action regardless of the size pr impact of the project.

To give the public enough time to review and comment after the agenda and presentations are posted, staff asks for correspondence due by noon the business day prior to the meeting. This also gives staff time to organize the correspondence and get it to the commissioners for review before the meeting. On occasion, hearing and action meetings can last longer than necessary when applicants include material that isn't specifically related to the zoning code criteria used by Planning Commission to review and approve a project. Staff considered smaller and less impactful projects that wouldn't necessarily require a briefing such as high wall signs, projects with exterior renovations only, historic nominations, neighborhood gateway signs, single family homes. Also, other smaller projects won't necessarily require a briefing as long as staff and commissioners do not have any questions or concerns. If commissioners have concerns or questions, the project would be continued two weeks later as a hearing and action item. This would functionally be the same amount of time as projects under the current process of briefing, then hearing and action two weeks later. The process would only be faster for projects when commissioners have no concerns. In the event there were small concerns about a project coming for hearing and action only, the commission could approve the project with conditions that state clear direction to staff and the applicant how to address those specific issues. In the proposed process the agenda and presentations would still be posted on the website the week before the planning commission meeting, but applicants will be asked to provide their material the Friday before the meeting with the idea that staff could go through and remove any unnecessarily materials, such as marketing materials or interior drawings. The applicants would then be asked to slim down their presentations, focusing on the items that were relevant to planning commission criteria. Currently, most of the development projects seen by commissioners are project development plans or final land development plans. Applicants will no longer make these presentations. Staff will read the reports and then walk through the presentations. Afterward, commissioners will be encouraged to ask questions of both the applicants and staff. The idea is to generally have a shorter presentation with an opportunity for robust discussion. For larger development projects applicants may request to give the presentations. For plan development and zoning changes, preliminary land development plans for SP districts or other planned development districts, zoning map amendments, or required master development plans on three or more acres, the applicants would still make the presentations.

After Ms Rakus' presentation, staff requested feedback and discussion from commissioners on their likes and dislikes, on things to be changed or made better, or any questions. Based on that feedback, Commissioner O'Neal offered to draft the updated bylaws. The updated bylaws would be made available for public review and comment online. Depending on the schedule, the updated bylaws would be reviewed and approved in a meeting February 20, one month from the current meeting, depending on how many comments were received, the time it takes to update the bylaws, and for commissioners and the public to review and comment.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for discussion, questions, or comments.

Ms O'Neill stated city planning staff's attempt to streamline the process and make it more open to the public will be a lot easier moving forward and will make some meaningful input into these projects. The bylaws set a high outline of how the commission works and have not been updated since 1982. Even with updated bylaws, there will be an ongoing dialogue with flexibility for adapting some of these standard procedures and for further discussion if something is not working efficiently. She stated they would love to hear any input into the process at this point. She commented, having previously worked in city planning, the law department, and planning commission, her concern was the briefings are technically not part of the record, but it's where most of the information is heard. People come back for their hearing having also represented applicants ready to get their approval. The commissioners are somewhat past the point where there's a lot of meaningful input, but there is opportunity to change projects without denial. This gives the applicant, the commission, and the community more opportunity to have that actual discussion become part of the record, hopefully without extending the timeline. It also helps cut down the time for those things that need to come before the commission under the current zoning code but usually don't get a lot of public or commissioner comments, such as windows in downtown that are not necessarily controversial. Ms O'Neill stated they don't want to cause people to wait unnecessarily for something that is typically approved, but they still want to give everybody the opportunity to weigh in. She said they were open to any comments on the record

or comments in email, knowing that introducing this today may be something commissioners need to digest and discuss at future meetings. She stated that once she inputs everything into updated bylaws she has zero pride of authorship. She encouraged all comments, including if sections they hated and should be changed.

Chair Burton-Faulk commented she appreciated the behind the scenes work digging deep to ensure that the process for the public and the commission is fair, able to have dialogue, and understand what is going on as it relates to projects. There is a lot that goes on behind the scenes. The bylaws, practices, and process make it easier for people to understand what is coming and for us to function as a commission. Chair Burton-Faulk thanked Ms O'Neal for the amount of work and time she volunteered to put this process together. Recognizing that staff will still have the same amount of work, she thought this will be efficient and much better when complete. She also noted the current meeting won't be the only time for questions or input. Commissioners can always speak out as we move along. Chair Burton-Faulk then asked for any additional comments or questions.

Mr Wu asked if the applicants who won't have to present at briefing will also be those who won't have to present at hearing and action, and also who will have the city staff present on their behalf?

Ms Rakus stated the smaller projects will definitely be present by staff. Projects that will bypass briefing and go directly to hearing in action tend to be the smaller projects. Also, project development plans and final land development plans will be presented by staff at briefing and at hearing and action. She thought they were roughly 50-50 between smaller projects and bigger projects but would have to take a deeper dive into that.

Ms O'Neill added that in her notes she was envisioning the briefing operating as a working session similar to some other planning commissions. The presentation may not be as detailed, or it may be focusing on high level issues that they want to work through with commissioners. It won't necessarily demonstrate full compliance at that time but will be an opportunity to work with commissioners and present to the community those big items that they think they need to work through. She stated this was similar to how this planning commission operated a few administrations ago, and is where they got some of their inspiration for more dialogue. An applicant could meet for briefing, at an earlier stage in their project than they are currently. The process would be about proclaiming the project, having discussions, and hopefully coming back for a hearing, and less a situation where applicants at the hearing are anticipating getting approved that day. It makes it less automatic but it won't extend the process, letting people come to briefing maybe slightly earlier than they had in the past. She stated she liked working sessions at other planning commissions and being able to talk on behalf of applicants about what they liked or didn't like because sometimes there is really great input from this commission about design or how things operate. Under the current timeline, if you are a developer, you have one week to get your new presentation and new design finalized and submitted in order to come back two weeks later. This will give a bit more lead time for those substantial changes.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for any additional thoughts.

Commissioner Dick was generally happy with the proposed changes and thought, on first run, the changes were positive. She stated commissioners would look them over in more detail.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if it was fair and reasonable that, after having an opportunity to talk about things and digest the changes, commissioners might have more questions to work through over time.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 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

February 6, 2024 at 2:15 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

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

Mel Ngami
 Monica Ruiz
 Peter Quintanilla

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Phillip Wu

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots	2
1. DCP-LOT-2023-01706, 5301 Butler Street and McCandless Avenue, Major Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville	
2. DCP-LOT-2024-00080 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 1 Homewood South	

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

B. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for January 23, 2024.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Mr Quintanilla

SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami

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

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

C. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2024-0059 Single Unit Attached Residential

- Carolyn Ristau

Council Bill 2023-2197 Temporary Managed Communities

- Nick Kyriazi

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2023-01706, 5301 Butler Street, Major Consolidation, Upper Lawrenceville
Mr Scheppke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was to approve the lot consolidation which was preliminarily approved at a previous hearing and action.
2. DCP-LOT-2024-00080 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 1 Homewood South
Mr Scheppke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was to preliminarily approve the lot consolidation and schedule final approval on 02/20/2024.
Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony on Item 1.
Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.
Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for commissioners' motion.

MOTION: 5301 Butler Street Consolidation, 10th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on February 6, 2024, be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony on Item 2. Hearing none she asked commissioners for a motion for preliminary approval.

MOTION: To preliminarily approve the 7600 Susquehanna Street Consolidation, 13th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on February 6, 2024, and schedule final review for the next planning commission meeting 02/20/2024.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla
CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman spoke about the upcoming legislation previously heard during the briefing at this meeting, which is an update to the zoning code regarding the Fair Housing Act compliance and the institutional and group housing categories presently in the zoning code. They worked with the mayor's office, partnered with the county Department of Human Services, and talked to advocates very much interested in making changes to the code as expediently as possible to address any barriers. The recent case before the Zoning Board of Adjustment was the reuse of an existing former nursing home structure as a temporary housing use. The zoning code has a number of institutional use categories but doesn't specifically have one that fits that kind of structure, and doesn't have a clear direction for the board or the Zoning Administrator. They heard from their partners that a lack of clarity in the zoning code leads to potentially long and drawn out legal challenges. There are a lot of existing structures that could be reused for housing where services could be provided. This happened to align with prior work with the city's Law Department to review the zoning code for compliance with the Federal Fair Housing Act. There are some aspects in

particular where the code requirements for institutional housing categories may be more restricted for a class of individuals than the same use category for a nonprotected class of individuals. They actually do make accommodations for fair housing. It's not the city's intent to knowingly violate the Fair Housing Act. They want to remedy any deficiencies in the code and the Law Department has looked at some good precedents. A tiny home village will be going up in Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh will be adopting the same group housing categories that Philadelphia has. Simplifying creates more clarity. In the present zoning code there are too many narrowly defined districts with some that overlap, causing confusion. They will also look at the definition of a family in the zoning code and amend it to be less narrowly defined by blood relatives as it does not currently align with legal best practices. They will also look at the ADA or reasonable accommodations clause for disabilities, which the code currently doesn't have. Although there are some explicit exceptions for individuals such as a ramp and a setback, they would like to have a broader clause to align with best practices in the code. They planned to have this before planning commission as soon as possible as a responsible alternative to the proposal presently before them. Mr Layman stated they understood and agreed with the intent from the council person. They wanted to have a broader look at it with a larger number of zoning districts. Also, they didn't want to be exclusive of the different types of housing for this type of use. Mr Layman said they would be very open to working with council members to ensure this wasn't perceived to be in any way functionally exclusive of the types of opportunities they would like to see funded in the city.

Chair Burton-Faulk recognized Ms O'Neill for questions.

Ms O'Neill asked if the changes City Planning was proposing were limited to Council Bill 2004-59 or if there was a council bill yet.

Mr Layman commented they was not. This would be a city-initiated council bill that they would propose as an alternative.

Ms O'Neill stated it was then just coincidental that they received a letter about the council bill which she thought was related.

Mr Layman clarified the one that Ms O'Neill was referencing was not related.

The council bill in the letter was regarding attached and detached homes.

Ms O'Neill stated, under the Rehabilitation Act and under the ADA, They have to have, and want to have, an inclusive housing program within the city. Right now, there is a patch in the city code which means the Zoning Administrator is interpreting these issues on an ad hoc basis. She said they should be clearer about the things that are permitted such as the ramps previously mentioned.

She stated she was looking forward to hearing about the different definitions of a family and how they will work in the residential zones and seeing all the changes. She offered her help in reviewing and writing the draft.

Mr Layman said they would gladly work with her and other commissioners but couldn't take more than a quorum.

Chair Burton-Faulk and Mr Quintanilla also expressed interest in working on the draft.

Mr Layman stated they would follow up to schedule.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 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

February 20, 2024 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
Phillip Wu
Mel Ngami
Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00080, 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 2 Homewood South	1
Hearing & Action 1. Zoning Code Text Amendment Council Bill 2023-2197 - Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront General Industrial (RIV-GI) and Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts. 2. Zoning Code Text Amendment - Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment removing review of sidewalk cafes in the public right of way from the Zoning Code.	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for February 6, 2024.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Ms Blackwell

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2023-2197

- Erin Guay
- Katrina Woodworth
- Len Semplice
- Ann Powel

- Deborah Gross and Anthony Coghill
- Jermaine Cuyler
- Jonathan Nadle
- Dan McDowell
- Philip Hake
- Johanna Collins
- Leslie Hake
- Douglas Kamper (East Allegheny Community Council)
- Michelle Moore
- Jamie Moore
- Lynn Glorieux
- Adel Armann
- Arthur Perkins
- Erik Kath

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00080, 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 2 Homewood South

Mr Scheppke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was approval of the consolidation.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Mr Khalil.

Mr Khalil began his testimony for the council bill under hearing and action.

Chair Burton-Faulk interrupted Mr Khalil to let him know the item before the planning commission was for a plan of lots. The next item will be hearing and action for Council Bill 2023-2197.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for commissioners' motion.

Ms Blackwell asked if there was a plan for this consolidation.

Mr Scheppke stated as far as he was aware, there was no plan for this parcel.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion to approve.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

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

CARRIED.

D. Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2023-2197 Zoning Code Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront General Industrial (RIV-GI) and Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts.

Chair Burton-Faulk clarified at the onset of this hearing and action that Council had agreed to an 8-week extension. She read through the recommended motions and then introduced the text for this day's hearing and action. The recommended motions were:

Motion 1. The Planning Commission recommended that City Council place a hold on Bill 2023-24 while the Department of City Planning in collaboration with the city Law Department drafted legislation to address potential Fair Housing Act deficiencies, simplified the institutional housing categories of the zoning code, and improved access to those housing categories.

Motion 2. Planning Commission requested the Department of City Planning staff to convene a working group of stakeholders, city leaders, and subject area experts to provide guidance on the legislation to ensure that the types of temporary managed communities envisioned in Council Bill 2023-24 were not prohibited, and other hurdles and challenges within the zoning code regarding group housing and homelessness were adequately addressed.

Motion 3. The Planning Commission accepted the council members' request for an eight-week extension of the ninety-day timeline for Planning Commission to act and continued action regarding Council Bill 2023-2197 for eight weeks.

Cn Coghill presented the scope of work of Council Bill 2023-2197. He testified it was important to discuss the scope of work for the last two years which led to what was proposed at the hearing. A little less than two years ago then Council President Teresa Kail-Smith challenged council members to form a committee. The committee consisted of Cn Coghill, Cn Gross, Cn Wilson, and Cn Erika Strasberger. The committee set out to find a solution to the tents popping up all over the city and the increased amount of unhoused people descending on the city. They were determined to come up with a solution(s) and spent eight months holding many meetings, visiting other cities, and doing lots of research to come up with what they felt was very viable and very doable solutions in the past that could work today. The committee felt they actually needed all them. What the committee produced over that eight-month period started the meetings and discussion of this problem. They were determined to come up with solutions that they could move forward. They engaged with DSL Architects who designed Second Avenue Common. Out of the goodness of their hearts, DSL agreed to help with three different solutions. The first one was very workable but would require the same partners that were involved in Second Avenue Common, all the nonprofits, the administration, and the county. Second Avenue Common is where one turns when they are desperate, and where there are services. But, there are people waiting outside to get in. It filled up within a couple of days. The new concept was a building around the same size and same cost, about \$22 to \$24 million, but more geared toward single room occupancies. For example, once an individual graduated from Second Avenue Common, and the committee felt they were ready to get a place of their own, that is concept 1. At this current time the committee just didn't have the same partners on board, but felt this particular design could be very helpful in the long run with about 110 single room occupancies. The same services that are offered at Second Avenue Common would not be offered here. This building would have a full-service kitchen, services to help people find permanent housing, and help with any other challenges they may have. The city would supply the land and get them through permitting and the bureaucracy. The committee then hoped the county and nonprofits would come in and pay for it and service the needs of the people living there. It was not currently on the table because the nonprofits in the city and the county were not on the same page at that time. The committee hoped this would come to fruition as one piece of the pie. The second concept looked pretty familiar to the current offering being heard. It is designed around two of the many city lots (177,000 vacant lots) the city could provide. The nice thing about this concept was it didn't need the big footprint like Second Avenue Common. This could be put in pretty much any neighborhood. The concept presented is a spin-off of mini homes, and one big common area with services and everything that the folks would need. The price tag for this would probably be anywhere between \$2 million and \$4 million, which is much more cost effective. There would be 10 places that could probably house two people per residence, totaling 20 people at \$4 million compared to 110 people in the first concept at \$22 million. Anything that is done in this field is costly. Cn Coghill wanted to be clear with the commissioners and everybody at the hearing that they have never suggested the city foot the bill. They suggested the city foot the bill for the land and anything, such as public works, which would be a big part of the operation. He stated they need the partners they had at Second Avenue Common in order for something like this to go forward. The third concept was renovating empty office space, since there is plenty of empty office space downtown. He believed the county was also looking into something of this nature. The cost of this option would depend on the condition of the building to be renovated by the city or the county. The committee felt all three of these concepts should work to solve this problem. Cn Coghill stated they needed all of them to work. Sometime in October, Cn Gross and Cn Coghill originally developed an emergency effort for people to live in tents because they were worried about people freezing to death in the harsh winters in Pittsburgh. He stated, thankfully, Pittsburgh has had a mild winter, although suffering a couple of losses which have been well reported. They recommended putting at least a pilot program, the tents and the service providing tent, in one place where they could provide hygiene, luxury bathrooms and showers, garbage service, all the service providers that residents see. Many council members and service providers have been in the encampments. They felt the pilot site provided a better and safer

place for the residents and for the service providers who have had to cross four lane highways and crawl under bridges.

Cn Gross presented proposed council bills to provide a task force and trust fund for affordable housing, having conversations at community groups, advocacy organizations, and with responses on social media, emails, and phone calls to her office. One of the things that they were trying to communicate more clearly was that some people still need to understand why they don't just give people houses. She stated, "I was only on Council for a year when Cn Lavell put on the table a resolution in January of 2015 to form a task force about affordable housing. It was an 18-month project of City Council, and I really want the public to remember, involving nearly a hundred citizens. About a year and a half later in June of 2016, it put a set of recommendations on the table for City Council, including forming an affordable housing task force and forming a trust fund to fund affordable housing. It took a lot of work to not only figure out how to structure that fairly with a citizen advisory council, but also to come up with the extra funding for it, which we did when we passed a real estate transfer tax increase in 2017. By 2018, we started funding affordable housing, especially construction costs. And, at the time, we had many post agendas, many standing room only public hearings in these Chambers about these issues, and they were tough decisions that we made in support of affordable housing. We've been, since then, doing \$10 million a year allocation. So, that totals up to \$50 million a loan to fund affordable housing year after year of city taxpayer money. One of the other recommendations was to do inclusionary rezoning. We started that work in 2015/2016. The planning department helped us work on it for two straight years. We were in front of the Planning Commission in 2019, and we had a unanimous vote in support of inclusionary zoning just for Lawrenceville as a starting point, where we had a clear call to action from the residents. By 2020, we allocated another \$36 million of our federal covid relief funds toward affordable housing. In 2021, with the help of some city planning staff, we expanded inclusionary zoning to Bloomfield and Polish Hill. Later that year, it was incorporated into the revised Oakland plan after two years' work from the planning department. In 2021, we declared housing as a human right in front of this body with the support of the UN rapporteur. In 2022, this body sponsored with five co-sponsors a resolution calling on the city planning department, DPW, and the mayor's staff to identify parcels for transitional housing because we were clearly in a crisis of people living outdoors. By August, 2022, we held that resolution so the new Gainey administration could work with us. A final vote was passed in January of 2023, and continued the work on that committee. A press conference was held with those recommendations that the councilman just presented. From April, 2023, to date we count nearly \$200 million allocated from Pittsburgh taxpayer funds into permanent affordable housing. And, it is not enough. Those affordable housing units are full. There is a year-long waiting list for the people in tents on the list. Everyday there's a bulletin of empty shelter spaces, and there are none. We have worked for nearly 10 years to create more permanent indoor transitional housing. It is not enough. What is a temporary managed community? When you have no housing or shelter space for people, you need to add capacity. Temporary managed communities are needed now because providing housing first works for people. When the social workers are crawling up hillsides, crawling over railroad tracks, trying to get to the people who are camping wherever they can, that work is harder; the people are in less safe spaces. They are experiencing traumas that we don't even know about. Our work is easier when people are in safe, clean, warm spaces. We know that this is a strategy that's working. In other cities we know that. One hundred other cities have set up, basically, overflow transitional housing. In social service circles, I understand it's often called bridge housing. It's not meant to be your permanent home. It's meant to be a place where you get the services you need and get your life back. You get the treatment that you need to get over the trauma you've experienced, and you get ready for permanent housing. In the work we did on the committee, I visited a transitional housing facility for veterans in the city of Pittsburgh. It doesn't get a dime of county money or city money. It relies entirely on federal money and grants, and there's space for about 50 people. They permanently rehouse 100 people a year because the average stay is only six months. They find the affordable housing that those people can transition into, and their annual budget was less than \$2 million a year. If we had four or five more of those facilities, we wouldn't need to be talking about this one. When we say a temporary community, it is a managed community that is really, truly a community. They will have 24-hour wraparound services with people on the payroll

on site. Your basic services are provided. There will be hygiene units like luxury bathrooms and showers. In other communities these are shipping container facilities with a fancier than normal bathroom. She stated this would not be temporary structures not meant to become permanent. In the zoning legislation, they would be limited to four years at a specific site, and could not exist again at that site for at least four years. There would also be a size limit. A group of a hundred people in one site would not build a community. It is actually a safer, better living situation in smaller groups. The operators would also be the applicant for a location, and be licensed, non-profit government entities or quasi-government entities. There would be social services on site along with the licensed operators. The locations would be safe, visible, accessible sites with the kinds of city services residents' houses, such as garbage pickup and access to 911 service. She stated in every other city contacted with comparable weather, there was access to hygiene, food, and warm restrooms, bathing facilities, and food service areas. She stated if there was adequate shelter and transitional housing they wouldn't need build new ones. At the first planning commission meeting talking about permanent, affordable housing, the testimony emphasized that new construction was \$250,000 per apartment. They struggled with how to provide the funds. Those costs have doubled to \$500,000 in less than 10 years. Cn Gross said they were going to keep trying to build housing and find other permanent housing. The question is, what is cheaper, quicker, and lighter? What can be done in the meantime? She stated, community is really important in order to provide a safe space. Pittsburgh legislation requires a site design because it is important to have adequate lighting, and possibly fencing for privacy and for autonomy. She stated for years they have been providing just a cot in a church basement where people may not be safer. She noted people who were in homes three weeks ago are now in congregate shelter. Cn Gross recounted an example, stating if she found herself unhoused right now, she might not be safer in the overnight shelters. She might go in with belongings she might not have when she woke up in the morning. If she had something to protect myself, she would have to give that up when she went into the shelter. She noted what someone decides to do is not an easy, obvious choice, noting overnight shelters don't let people in until 3:00 PM or so, and then they must leave at 7:00 AM. People are outside all day. She noted if someone had belongings with them, would they be able to carry them around and back to stand in the line, unsure if they would get in or not? She noted the importance of understanding the need to be in a structure where one can lock their door, have staffing on site for physical safety, have a place where there is food, and have social service providers to help with needs necessary to get their lives back. In these communities, people can have mutual respect and support, and live with dignity and autonomy that each city resident expects. She stated the need to work out any language differences that would prolong and increase the number of people who are outside. Mr Layman presented his report about, working with the Law Department, to add a new primary use category, Temporary Managed Community (TMC), to grant flexibility in supporting the unhoused, and contrasting the differences among departments. Mr Layman read in the three recommended motions previously mentioned.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr William F Goodrich from Brighton Heights, North Side, stated, from what he could see, he did not think that establishing locations primarily on the NorthShore and the North Side was commendable to the North Side nor to the recreational activities in the city. He said he read the bill and felt it had many flaws. He stated, from his perspective, he thought they needed to be corrected to make it viable, which will not be beneficial to the city. He thought this bill established what he called plywood homes not much different than the ones he built as a kid. He asked about the outcome in the other cities that have established temporary housing for the homeless. Did it grow because now there was housing available? Why did the tent cities here grow? Was it because people gave tents to people? Where did all these people come from? Are they from Pittsburgh? He said he believed in helping people, but not becoming a mecca for homelessness in Pittsburgh. He asked who owned the property in the city. He stated pays taxes and wanted to make sure it's for Pittsburghers and not for everybody else from the adjoining states.

Ms Sam Schmidt, formerly a homeless person, an outreach worker with Food Not Bombs, Our Streets Collective, and on behalf of the Pittsburgh DSA, stated she was in favor of the TMC's. She stated, based on the responses, she believed this bill, if passed, could present a possible solution, one of many that are needed. She stated she was the person who handed out tents to

the homeless population in Pittsburgh. She confirmed all the homeless were from Pittsburgh. As part of the outreach community, she said every year in January they have a point-in-time count of the number of people living outside. She admitted it was highly unscientific, and that number is never accurate. She stated when people receive housing, there is a larger representation of those populations, which doesn't mean they are flocking here. She stated Pittsburgh is a relatively small city with a relatively small homelessness crisis as compared to other cities. She noted in the last two years the city's homeless population has grown about 19% as compared to the national average of 12%. Ms Schmidt asserted that if zero shelter beds every day wasn't issue enough (stating she herself was housing people in her living room or telling them there was nowhere for them to go for the night), it should be enough to think about homeless people that are coming. She noted she herself is not homeless anymore, but she is still a poor person. The cost of living is still rising and most people are very close to homelessness at any given time. She asked to think proactively about accommodating those people, noting it is hard to understand the urgency required if one has never slept on a sidewalk. Anyone who has knows we have waited far too long. She noted this was not the first solution proposed by council members who have been working for years to try to find solutions, nor will it be the last. She was very optimistic that something could be hashed out in the next eight weeks, and said she would be back to speak next time.

Ms Sharlene Saner, staff for Cn Coghill, stated her years of experience working with unhoused as an Operation Safety Net cold weather shelter volunteer. She stated if an unpaid person was not available to remain all night to give people a warm place to stay, it didn't happen. She won an award from the now defunct Bariums Place shelter, helping women who had no place to stay find jobs, write resumés, dress for success, etc. She also worked at Bethlehem Haven Medical Respite for those with no place to stay, and also did some stints in their shelter. She stated bounty houses are such a blessing for those people. She noted the frightening reality in a congregate setting where people who got into fights because someone passed gas or they snored. Many people who have experienced trauma preferred to stay on the street rather than in a congregate place because they didn't feel safe having someone six inches away from them. She stated quite honestly, a lot of times they were not safe. She also stated most people are one paycheck away from being homeless, and asked how it would feel if you had no place to go, were forced to stay a few inches from someone you didn't know, or who was dangerous, or experiencing difficult circumstances. She stated in a perfect world none of us would have to live in an area where there are unhoused people, but that is not reality. She asked the commissioners to consider the council members proposal.

Mr Jonathan Nadle from Beechview in Pittsburgh commented homelessness is a growing problem in Pittsburgh and elsewhere that needs to be addressed more effectively for the sake of the unhoused as well as the city. Few would argue that having growing numbers of tent encampments is desirable. The question is how to best do what works. He said other cities have successfully addressed homelessness. They can show what the best practices are in moving the unhoused out of tents and into a more stable living arrangement, with wraparound services that they need. He commented shelters and emergency warming centers play an important role but are insufficient by themselves. The creation of more affordable apartments and homes is necessary like this take years and millions of dollars. Creating temporary tiny home style small villages is what can be done successfully now. Mr Nadle encouraged commissioners to travel across a bridge, maybe even a river, to Beechview to see the model home for themselves. He stated those in opposition haven't presented any viable alternatives. He noted the tiny homes are the quickest, most cost-effective way to house the unhoused, all in a few consolidated locations, and to efficiently get them the services they need. Over the eight-week period, he requested commissioners neutrally and independently review the proposals and plans, and said they will be convinced of their merits.

Ms McElhaney recognized Rachel Nunes, Executive Director, Thomas Merton Center.

Ms Nunes of the Hill District, who has also lived with housing insecurity, was in support of the TMC's. She has also helped people acquire tents and emergency supplies after having the rug pulled out from under them, because it's the human thing to do. She has been working with unhoused neighbors and advocates who supply direct aid and advancement on their issues. She stated this legislation was one stop gap solution that has the potential to save lives in the short

term. She personally worked with Cn Gross and Cn Coghill in developing their plans and sharing their vision, values, and intent. In the next eight weeks, she hoped to reach out to community members and get their input as the legislation is refined. She said the tiny home plan is one example that would add diversity to existing shelter options. She said many unhoused and housing insecure neighbors, as well as those who serve them, have given positive feedback to this plan because the need is great. She stated Pittsburgh is in a housing crisis and, for the first time in their lives, more people are finding themselves in need of temporary or emergency shelter. Congregate shelter settings don't always fit the needs of this part of the unhoused population, with lack of adequate storage space for belongings among other issues. She urged the commissioners to think interconnectedly about the unhoused, noting creative solutions such as this will help address the variety of needs within different parts of this population. She believed advancing this legislation and pilot site will have an immense and positive outcome, opening the door for other creative and diverse shelter options. She stated urgency is the pace at which to move on these things as we have lost two people that we know of in recent months. Mr Jerome Sabo, resident in Point Breeze, commented he regularly sees the unhoused population at the intersection of S Braddock and Penn Avenues. He interacts with them on a regular basis as they are basically neighbors. He stated seeing his neighbors out on the streets is a challenging thing to behold. He said he has interacted with several people whose fingers were swollen from the cold. Trying to shake their hand or offer them something was tough when they could barely grasp whatever it was. He said was really tough to see them in that situation. He challenged previous comments about communal spaces where people live together in the safety of that space and urged others at the meeting to imagine their most difficult situations. He stated usually, they have a chance to cope with their situations in the privacy of their own homes. They could be crying, be angry, could be shouting, but they have some privacy for their reactions. In a communal setting that's very difficult if not impossible. He proposed that even if they themselves aren't necessarily a threatening individual, they could appear so going through a challenging time, which to a stranger, could look really offending. He spoke in support of this proposal for the temporary managed communities, giving people a bit of privacy, stability, and definitely warmth, "so they can, hopefully, not have frozen fingers." He also appreciated the extension of time to ensure well prepared legislation, hoping commissioners ultimately proceed with this plan, or some very similar form of it.

Mr Bob Malakoff from Allegheny West stated the concept is a good one but questioned where to locate them. He stated downtown and the North Shore aren't really the appropriate places, and was tired of hearing from people who felt threatened by the homeless camp, avoiding those places. He said there are other possible sites throughout the city that could be considered. The ordinance does not clearly indicate what a temporary structure is. He questioned if a tent or the tiny houses are temporary structures. He also questioned why the permits expire after four years. He felt the temporary part should be the length of stay of the residents who then, hopefully, transition to a better living situation. He posed if a camp is successful with minimum environmental impact, it probably should continue longer than four years. If there are major problems with it, it should go away much sooner. He noted the legislation requires a public hearing, but there is no incentive to pay attention to opinions expressed at that hearing. Because these camps are sensitive neighborhood issues, it would make more sense to have them authorized as a conditional use by the Planning Commission and City Council rather than used by right. He said this legislation might clean up the camps a little bit, but it is certainly only one small step in solving the problem.

Mr Tyler Andrews stated his concerns with balancing a long-term plan for living and housing with long term stability. He felt TMC's remove some focus on more viable permanent housing. He asked how they will consider the long-term benefit. He asked if this is the right solution? He stated it needed restructuring.

Ms Fran Barbush, a member of the Allegheny West Civic Council and a concerned Citizen, stated she had serious concerns about the intent in deciding to create these TMC's, and didn't think it was smart money. She thought it would be wiser to have a partnership with high schools and the community college, engaging students and those who need housing to work toward making permanent housing. She spoke of underutilized housing stock and land that could be used instead of recreational spaces along the riverfronts and downtown. She stated all of this

looks targeted on the North Side, and that other people are going to have to step up. She asked that they not go forward with these many structures on the North Shore and to consider alternatives other than what is maybe being proposed by powerful people.

Mr Douglas Kamper, President of East Allegheny Community Council, Deutschtown, stated this neighborhood borders the proposed area. He said they have had several community meetings regarding this bill and asked about support measures to remedy this situation. He stated their community has historically been connected with unhoused individuals. They do support measures to assist this vulnerable population, but not this bill as it is currently written. He looked forward to the different solutions or texts that might be worked through over the next eight weeks. Mr Timothy Zinn, President of Allegheny West Civic Council, stated the Council voted unanimously to appear before the Planning Commission to oppose the proposed zoning change as it is currently written. He said the proposed change would undo millions of dollars of investment in the riverfronts by the city itself, nonprofit entities, foundations, private donors, and others over the past several decades. They found it curious that the targeted areas are limited to the central business district and the city's riverfronts. They believed it disproportionately impacts those neighborhoods bordering the riverfronts and the currently proposed areas.

Mr Khalil Stanback, CEO of godfatherfamily.org stated he had a formal solution for this. He said he used his professional adult life helping landlords renting rooms. He worked with multiple agencies throughout the county. He worked with those who provided the tents and rented rooms in homes, whether they knew they were living next to one or not. He stated this plan works. He encouraged engagement with this population saying Pittsburgh would not suffer from this proposal. He stated it does not contaminate neighborhoods. The structures are solid stable structures from the dimensions to the landscaping to the solar power they bring in. He has acquired support through donors not taxpayers. He stated he will be submitting his proposal to the commission. He said he is willing to move forward as this is his mission and asked to please be considered. He doesn't take tax dollars. He has personally been able to acquire \$2 million from personal donor business owners. He asked to please consider this legislation, and he will be submitting his proposal to the commission within the eight weeks.

Mr Jerrel Gilliam, Light of Life Rescue Mission, applauded the efforts made for creative solutions. He said they need to bring all solutions that will work to the table that can work. He asked, with solutions like this, what is the program supporting these spaces. Who is being prioritized? Are they people that don't want to change, creating a magnet where police are being asked to look the other way while illegal activities happen? Those places become unsafe and this happened time and time again in other cities. He stated they need to be places for people who want to move out of homelessness. To be successful they need to have screening and intake processes and supportive services where illegal activity will not be tolerated and police presence is accepted. He stated since there are blighted homes and empty apartments buildings and hotels, they should look at existing housing stock, using developers willing to bring solutions to the table. Mr David Demco was grateful Council and commissioners had another eight weeks. He said he had about a dozen questions he hoped to be answered in that time. He stated homelessness is tragic and desperate. He said almost every day he dealt with homeless people in his neighborhood. He said this hearing is about legislation that targets downtown and the North Shore areas. He stated he didn't understand why this was a zoning issue. If the city wants to put a facility somewhere, they can do it. They are not bound by the zoning ordinances. He stated it appeared to him the city already had locations in mind for the TMC's, and felt in the spirit of openness the city should reveal those locations. He said the idea of changing zoning to enable uses in specific locations was spot zoning, and that was not allowed. He felt there was still a lot of work to be done.

Ms Lavender Seblock supported this initiative. She stated she experienced housing insecurity throughout her life. She welcomed housing opportunities on many levels in any neighborhood. She said she is a frequent user of the city trail system and was aware there is already a presence of unhoused people along the trail. She stated this proposed legislation presents a solution to something that is already happening. She stated this needs to be part of a larger initiative. She stated finding housing for the average person is very difficult. The housing shortage is affecting people on many levels. She stated social services are limited in a shelter and any kind of transitional housing would be helpful in the long run. She said finding the support can be the

most difficult part. She noted for anyone who's concerned about the idea of building the tiny homes, the presence of people living on the street is already disrupting businesses and people's experiences in shared spaces. It is important to consider that it's already a problem.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised

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

Ms Blackwell reminded everyone that being unhoused is nothing new. It has been prevalent on the north side & downtown because there are more resources there. She asked if they were planning to do all 3 motions, and what that would look like. She asked if they were looking at partners who are already doing the work.

Cn Gross stated the RIV goes to Butler St and up to the city line. They would not be near the north shore. They would be legal by right in the blue zone to be used without zoning approval. She stated deeper residential neighborhoods needed to be looked at more. A larger question was what to do for accommodation.

Cn Coghill stated they have not targeted any particular area. If and when the legislation is formed, then we will target specific areas.

Mr Wu commented this was one tool in the toolbox to address the homeless issue. They have to be looking at all different solutions. This is one of those.

Ms Dick supported this as a vital issue.

Ms Ruiz has seen growth of homelessness in the past 3 years and offered what she could do to help.

Ms O'Neill stated she wanted to see this legislation move forward and work through the issues involved.

Ms Ngami was supportive of the work that has happened. She felt they should be cautious about how they step forward with this. She stated they should not forget the holes that people can fall through, and those who will be in the temporary housing struggling to transition from pennilessness to monied.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion from the floor on the 3 recommended motions.

Recommended MOTIONS:

1. The Planning Commission recommends that City Council place a hold on Council Bill 2023-2197 while the Department of City Planning, in collaboration with the City Law Department, drafts legislation to address potential Fair Housing Act deficiencies, simplify the institutional housing categories of the zoning code, and improve access to those housing categories; and
2. The Planning Commission requests that Department of City Planning Staff to convene a Working Group of stakeholders, city leaders and subject area experts to provide guidance on the legislation to ensure that the types of Temporary Managed Communities envisioned in Council Bill 2023-2197 are not prohibited, and that other hurdles and challenges within the zoning code regarding group housing and homelessness are adequately addressed; and
3. The Planning Commission accepts the council members' request for an eight-week extension of the ninety-day timeline for Planning Commission to act and continues action regarding Council Bill 2023-2197 for eight weeks.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

CARRIED

2. Zoning Code Text Amendment - Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment removing review of sidewalk cafes in the public right of way from the Zoning Code.

Mr Cancilla presented the text amendment for staff. The amendment was to remove sidewalk cafes from the zoning code. In February, 2022, the City Council passed, and the mayor signed, ordinance 2022-23 which changed the regulations around sidewalk cafes to be regulated by the Department of

Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI), since there was a lot of duplicate as well as conflicting language between the DOMI regulations and the zoning regulations. It is important to remember that all the significant regulations for sidewalk cafes are in the DOMI regulations. In addition to both Zoning and DOMI, there is also the Department of Permits, Licenses and Inspections (PLI) that regulates sidewalk cafes, creating a situation where there are three different city agencies reviewing them. The intent of this ordinance change was to reduce the number of reviewing agencies to two agencies, DOMI and PLI. Some of the details of this amendment describe the current definition of sidewalk cafes, meaning an establishment serving food and or beverage on a public sidewalk space. This is really under DOMI's purview, because they regulate what occurs in the public right of way, and there are specific regulations for sidewalk cafes. In addition to removing it from zoning definitions, it would also be removed from certain sections of the zoning code in Chapter 908, Public Realm Districts and Chapter 909, SP, Specially Planned Districts, as well as the use table and standards in Section 911.02. This was originally identified shortly after the DOMI legislation was passed in 2022. There was a proposed zoning text amendment that was the same as this one being proposed now that was heard at briefing on March 8, 2022. Then, at the subsequent meeting on March 22, 2022, the commission provided a positive recommendation to City Council for that text amendment. It moved forward as Ordinance 2022-23 in City Council, which was held May 24, 2022. However, that ordinance was held up in the land use and economic development committee. Given that situation where there was no change made, there were still three agencies reviewing sidewalk cafes. We still have that same situation and same rationale for this renewed effort before the commission today. As a part of the report we find, based on the City Planning Department, to provide a positive recommendation to City Council to help move this text amendment forward.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Mr Malakoff.

Mr Malakoff stated he realized that a sidewalk cafe is just a restaurant with one or more tables on the sidewalk. He questioned if a restaurant puts a table on the sidewalk, does that change its status to a sidewalk cafe and remove it from the zoning table. If they stop serving food outside in the winter, does that put them back on the zoning list. He stated the legislation is supposed to simplify procedures and make things less confusing. He was still confused. Will removing it from the use table mean they are exempt from zoning rules? He questioned if not, what are those rules and where could he find them. Could someone put a sidewalk cafe in the middle of an R1D zone, assuming that category exists in the future? What about those restaurants that currently require a special exception? Would DOMI hold a hearing or would those protections go away simply because the restaurant put a table on the sidewalk? He stated the zoning use table is supposed to include all conceivable building types and uses in the city. He asked why they would consider exempting just one, which made no logical sense. Mr Layman stated there will be no functional change to how sidewalk cafes operate or how they get permits. He said they do have to be associated with a legal restaurant that has a certificate of occupancy permit. These sidewalk cafes happen entirely within the right of way. If there is an outdoor seating area on private property, that is not in the purview of DOMI. That is reviewed by Zoning. This simply is just removing a redundancy in the process and in the code. It doesn't in any way impact the status of existing, legal restaurants and future applications thereof.

Mr Fraker recognized Fran Barbash.

Ms Barbash stated they have a business that has tables and chairs set out in an alley. She asked when something was allowed by right. She noted, if fire vehicles had to get through the alley, they could not. She stated, along with the other issue being considered, it helps to know as a citizen that there is a review, and that things are not just allowed all the time without somebody taking a look at it. She remarked she didn't know if commissioners were aware that that occurs, and that there are businesses doing it.

Mr Khalil Stanbach commented, pertaining to the sidewalk amenity, he works with an elderly population, and there are many restaurants that have stairs. The outside seating provides accommodation to individuals who may be in wheelchairs, or have physical issues that they may not be able to walk upstairs. He said it happens frequently throughout the city and different areas. I knew they talked about container homes earlier, but they also have to consider the pet population. There are people who have security animals, and this should also be paid attention to. He stated handicapped accessible people need to be able to access these places. Also, there should be some type of reference to the care of outside spaces, making sure it's hygienic and everything is clean. He

stated adding that small portion to any restaurant provides more financial and economic resource and accessibility. He stated it would not be realistic for every sidewalk, but for the places it does occur, it would really be beneficial to be under the scope of accessibility for the handicapped.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

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

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh make a positive recommendation to City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Wu

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

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman thanked both in-person and online council members, commissioners, staff, and participants for their cooperation in enabling this hybrid planning commission meeting.

Chair Burton-Faulk echoed his sentiments, also thanking City Council, the clerk's office, and the City Channel for their support and assistance.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 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

February 20, 2024 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
Phillip Wu
Mel Ngami
Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00080, 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 2 Homewood South	1
Hearing & Action 1. Zoning Code Text Amendment Council Bill 2023-2197 - Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront General Industrial (RIV-GI) and Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts. 2. Zoning Code Text Amendment - Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment removing review of sidewalk cafes in the public right of way from the Zoning Code.	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for February 6, 2024.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Ms Blackwell

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2023-2197

- Erin Guay
- Katrina Woodworth
- Len Semplice
- Ann Powel

- Deborah Gross and Anthony Coghill
- Jermaine Cuyler
- Jonathan Nadle
- Dan McDowell
- Philip Hake
- Johanna Collins
- Leslie Hake
- Douglas Kamper (East Allegheny Community Council)
- Michelle Moore
- Jamie Moore
- Lynn Glorieux
- Adel Armann
- Arthur Perkins
- Erik Kath

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00080, 7600 Susquehanna Consolidation Major Consolidation 2 Homewood South

Mr Scheppke presented the plan of lots. The recommended motion was approval of the consolidation.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Mr Khalil.

Mr Khalil began his testimony for the council bill under hearing and action.

Chair Burton-Faulk interrupted Mr Khalil to let him know the item before the planning commission was for a plan of lots. The next item will be hearing and action for Council Bill 2023-2197.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for commissioners' motion.

Ms Blackwell asked if there was a plan for this consolidation.

Mr Scheppke stated as far as he was aware, there was no plan for this parcel.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion to approve.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

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

CARRIED.

D. Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2023-2197 Zoning Code Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront General Industrial (RIV-GI) and Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts.

Chair Burton-Faulk clarified at the onset of this hearing and action that Council had agreed to an 8-week extension. She read through the recommended motions and then introduced the text for this day's hearing and action. The recommended motions were:

Motion 1. The Planning Commission recommended that City Council place a hold on Bill 2023-24 while the Department of City Planning in collaboration with the city Law Department drafted legislation to address potential Fair Housing Act deficiencies, simplified the institutional housing categories of the zoning code, and improved access to those housing categories.

Motion 2. Planning Commission requested the Department of City Planning staff to convene a working group of stakeholders, city leaders, and subject area experts to provide guidance on the legislation to ensure that the types of temporary managed communities envisioned in Council Bill 2023-24 were not prohibited, and other hurdles and challenges within the zoning code regarding group housing and homelessness were adequately addressed.

Motion 3. The Planning Commission accepted the council members' request for an eight-week extension of the ninety-day timeline for Planning Commission to act and continued action regarding Council Bill 2023-2197 for eight weeks.

Cn Coghill presented the scope of work of Council Bill 2023-2197. He testified it was important to discuss the scope of work for the last two years which led to what was proposed at the hearing. A little less than two years ago then Council President Teresa Kail-Smith challenged council members to form a committee. The committee consisted of Cn Coghill, Cn Gross, Cn Wilson, and Cn Erika Strasberger. The committee set out to find a solution to the tents popping up all over the city and the increased amount of unhoused people descending on the city. They were determined to come up with a solution(s) and spent eight months holding many meetings, visiting other cities, and doing lots of research to come up with what they felt was very viable and very doable solutions in the past that could work today. The committee felt they actually needed all them. What the committee produced over that eight-month period started the meetings and discussion of this problem. They were determined to come up with solutions that they could move forward. They engaged with DSL Architects who designed Second Avenue Common. Out of the goodness of their hearts, DSL agreed to help with three different solutions. The first one was very workable but would require the same partners that were involved in Second Avenue Common, all the nonprofits, the administration, and the county. Second Avenue Common is where one turns when they are desperate, and where there are services. But, there are people waiting outside to get in. It filled up within a couple of days. The new concept was a building around the same size and same cost, about \$22 to \$24 million, but more geared toward single room occupancies. For example, once an individual graduated from Second Avenue Common, and the committee felt they were ready to get a place of their own, that is concept 1. At this current time the committee just didn't have the same partners on board, but felt this particular design could be very helpful in the long run with about 110 single room occupancies. The same services that are offered at Second Avenue Common would not be offered here. This building would have a full-service kitchen, services to help people find permanent housing, and help with any other challenges they may have. The city would supply the land and get them through permitting and the bureaucracy. The committee then hoped the county and nonprofits would come in and pay for it and service the needs of the people living there. It was not currently on the table because the nonprofits in the city and the county were not on the same page at that time. The committee hoped this would come to fruition as one piece of the pie. The second concept looked pretty familiar to the current offering being heard. It is designed around two of the many city lots (177,000 vacant lots) the city could provide. The nice thing about this concept was it didn't need the big footprint like Second Avenue Common. This could be put in pretty much any neighborhood. The concept presented is a spin-off of mini homes, and one big common area with services and everything that the folks would need. The price tag for this would probably be anywhere between \$2 million and \$4 million, which is much more cost effective. There would be 10 places that could probably house two people per residence, totaling 20 people at \$4 million compared to 110 people in the first concept at \$22 million. Anything that is done in this field is costly. Cn Coghill wanted to be clear with the commissioners and everybody at the hearing that they have never suggested the city foot the bill. They suggested the city foot the bill for the land and anything, such as public works, which would be a big part of the operation. He stated they need the partners they had at Second Avenue Common in order for something like this to go forward. The third concept was renovating empty office space, since there is plenty of empty office space downtown. He believed the county was also looking into something of this nature. The cost of this option would depend on the condition of the building to be renovated by the city or the county. The committee felt all three of these concepts should work to solve this problem. Cn Coghill stated they needed all of them to work. Sometime in October, Cn Gross and Cn Coghill originally developed an emergency effort for people to live in tents because they were worried about people freezing to death in the harsh winters in Pittsburgh. He stated, thankfully, Pittsburgh has had a mild winter, although suffering a couple of losses which have been well reported. They recommended putting at least a pilot program, the tents and the service providing tent, in one place where they could provide hygiene, luxury bathrooms and showers, garbage service, all the service providers that residents see. Many council members and service providers have been in the encampments. They felt the pilot site provided a better and safer

place for the residents and for the service providers who have had to cross four lane highways and crawl under bridges.

Cn Gross presented proposed council bills to provide a task force and trust fund for affordable housing, having conversations at community groups, advocacy organizations, and with responses on social media, emails, and phone calls to her office. One of the things that they were trying to communicate more clearly was that some people still need to understand why they don't just give people houses. She stated, "I was only on Council for a year when Cn Lavell put on the table a resolution in January of 2015 to form a task force about affordable housing. It was an 18-month project of City Council, and I really want the public to remember, involving nearly a hundred citizens. About a year and a half later in June of 2016, it put a set of recommendations on the table for City Council, including forming an affordable housing task force and forming a trust fund to fund affordable housing. It took a lot of work to not only figure out how to structure that fairly with a citizen advisory council, but also to come up with the extra funding for it, which we did when we passed a real estate transfer tax increase in 2017. By 2018, we started funding affordable housing, especially construction costs. And, at the time, we had many post agendas, many standing room only public hearings in these Chambers about these issues, and they were tough decisions that we made in support of affordable housing. We've been, since then, doing \$10 million a year allocation. So, that totals up to \$50 million a loan to fund affordable housing year after year of city taxpayer money. One of the other recommendations was to do inclusionary rezoning. We started that work in 2015/2016. The planning department helped us work on it for two straight years. We were in front of the Planning Commission in 2019, and we had a unanimous vote in support of inclusionary zoning just for Lawrenceville as a starting point, where we had a clear call to action from the residents. By 2020, we allocated another \$36 million of our federal covid relief funds toward affordable housing. In 2021, with the help of some city planning staff, we expanded inclusionary zoning to Bloomfield and Polish Hill. Later that year, it was incorporated into the revised Oakland plan after two years' work from the planning department. In 2021, we declared housing as a human right in front of this body with the support of the UN rapporteur. In 2022, this body sponsored with five co-sponsors a resolution calling on the city planning department, DPW, and the mayor's staff to identify parcels for transitional housing because we were clearly in a crisis of people living outdoors. By August, 2022, we held that resolution so the new Gainey administration could work with us. A final vote was passed in January of 2023, and continued the work on that committee. A press conference was held with those recommendations that the councilman just presented. From April, 2023, to date we count nearly \$200 million allocated from Pittsburgh taxpayer funds into permanent affordable housing. And, it is not enough. Those affordable housing units are full. There is a year-long waiting list for the people in tents on the list. Everyday there's a bulletin of empty shelter spaces, and there are none. We have worked for nearly 10 years to create more permanent indoor transitional housing. It is not enough. What is a temporary managed community? When you have no housing or shelter space for people, you need to add capacity. Temporary managed communities are needed now because providing housing first works for people. When the social workers are crawling up hillsides, crawling over railroad tracks, trying to get to the people who are camping wherever they can, that work is harder; the people are in less safe spaces. They are experiencing traumas that we don't even know about. Our work is easier when people are in safe, clean, warm spaces. We know that this is a strategy that's working. In other cities we know that. One hundred other cities have set up, basically, overflow transitional housing. In social service circles, I understand it's often called bridge housing. It's not meant to be your permanent home. It's meant to be a place where you get the services you need and get your life back. You get the treatment that you need to get over the trauma you've experienced, and you get ready for permanent housing. In the work we did on the committee, I visited a transitional housing facility for veterans in the city of Pittsburgh. It doesn't get a dime of county money or city money. It relies entirely on federal money and grants, and there's space for about 50 people. They permanently rehouse 100 people a year because the average stay is only six months. They find the affordable housing that those people can transition into, and their annual budget was less than \$2 million a year. If we had four or five more of those facilities, we wouldn't need to be talking about this one. When we say a temporary community, it is a managed community that is really, truly a community. They will have 24-hour wraparound services with people on the payroll

on site. Your basic services are provided. There will be hygiene units like luxury bathrooms and showers. In other communities these are shipping container facilities with a fancier than normal bathroom. She stated this would not be temporary structures not meant to become permanent. In the zoning legislation, they would be limited to four years at a specific site, and could not exist again at that site for at least four years. There would also be a size limit. A group of a hundred people in one site would not build a community. It is actually a safer, better living situation in smaller groups. The operators would also be the applicant for a location, and be licensed, non-profit government entities or quasi-government entities. There would be social services on site along with the licensed operators. The locations would be safe, visible, accessible sites with the kinds of city services residents' houses, such as garbage pickup and access to 911 service. She stated in every other city contacted with comparable weather, there was access to hygiene, food, and warm restrooms, bathing facilities, and food service areas. She stated if there was adequate shelter and transitional housing they wouldn't need build new ones. At the first planning commission meeting talking about permanent, affordable housing, the testimony emphasized that new construction was \$250,000 per apartment. They struggled with how to provide the funds. Those costs have doubled to \$500,000 in less than 10 years. Cn Gross said they were going to keep trying to build housing and find other permanent housing. The question is, what is cheaper, quicker, and lighter? What can be done in the meantime? She stated, community is really important in order to provide a safe space. Pittsburgh legislation requires a site design because it is important to have adequate lighting, and possibly fencing for privacy and for autonomy. She stated for years they have been providing just a cot in a church basement where people may not be safer. She noted people who were in homes three weeks ago are now in congregate shelter. Cn Gross recounted an example, stating if she found herself unhoused right now, she might not be safer in the overnight shelters. She might go in with belongings she might not have when she woke up in the morning. If she had something to protect myself, she would have to give that up when she went into the shelter. She noted what someone decides to do is not an easy, obvious choice, noting overnight shelters don't let people in until 3:00 PM or so, and then they must leave at 7:00 AM. People are outside all day. She noted if someone had belongings with them, would they be able to carry them around and back to stand in the line, unsure if they would get in or not? She noted the importance of understanding the need to be in a structure where one can lock their door, have staffing on site for physical safety, have a place where there is food, and have social service providers to help with needs necessary to get their lives back. In these communities, people can have mutual respect and support, and live with dignity and autonomy that each city resident expects. She stated the need to work out any language differences that would prolong and increase the number of people who are outside. Mr Layman presented his report about, working with the Law Department, to add a new primary use category, Temporary Managed Community (TMC), to grant flexibility in supporting the unhoused, and contrasting the differences among departments. Mr Layman read in the three recommended motions previously mentioned.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr William F Goodrich from Brighton Heights, North Side, stated, from what he could see, he did not think that establishing locations primarily on the NorthShore and the North Side was commendable to the North Side nor to the recreational activities in the city. He said he read the bill and felt it had many flaws. He stated, from his perspective, he thought they needed to be corrected to make it viable, which will not be beneficial to the city. He thought this bill established what he called plywood homes not much different than the ones he built as a kid. He asked about the outcome in the other cities that have established temporary housing for the homeless. Did it grow because now there was housing available? Why did the tent cities here grow? Was it because people gave tents to people? Where did all these people come from? Are they from Pittsburgh? He said he believed in helping people, but not becoming a mecca for homelessness in Pittsburgh. He asked who owned the property in the city. He stated pays taxes and wanted to make sure it's for Pittsburghers and not for everybody else from the adjoining states.

Ms Sam Schmidt, formerly a homeless person, an outreach worker with Food Not Bombs, Our Streets Collective, and on behalf of the Pittsburgh DSA, stated she was in favor of the TMC's. She stated, based on the responses, she believed this bill, if passed, could present a possible solution, one of many that are needed. She stated she was the person who handed out tents to

the homeless population in Pittsburgh. She confirmed all the homeless were from Pittsburgh. As part of the outreach community, she said every year in January they have a point-in-time count of the number of people living outside. She admitted it was highly unscientific, and that number is never accurate. She stated when people receive housing, there is a larger representation of those populations, which doesn't mean they are flocking here. She stated Pittsburgh is a relatively small city with a relatively small homelessness crisis as compared to other cities. She noted in the last two years the city's homeless population has grown about 19% as compared to the national average of 12%. Ms Schmidt asserted that if zero shelter beds every day wasn't issue enough (stating she herself was housing people in her living room or telling them there was nowhere for them to go for the night), it should be enough to think about homeless people that are coming. She noted she herself is not homeless anymore, but she is still a poor person. The cost of living is still rising and most people are very close to homelessness at any given time. She asked to think proactively about accommodating those people, noting it is hard to understand the urgency required if one has never slept on a sidewalk. Anyone who has knows we have waited far too long. She noted this was not the first solution proposed by council members who have been working for years to try to find solutions, nor will it be the last. She was very optimistic that something could be hashed out in the next eight weeks, and said she would be back to speak next time.

Ms Sharlene Saner, staff for Cn Coghill, stated her years of experience working with unhoused as an Operation Safety Net cold weather shelter volunteer. She stated if an unpaid person was not available to remain all night to give people a warm place to stay, it didn't happen. She won an award from the now defunct Bariums Place shelter, helping women who had no place to stay find jobs, write resumés, dress for success, etc. She also worked at Bethlehem Haven Medical Respite for those with no place to stay, and also did some stints in their shelter. She stated bounty houses are such a blessing for those people. She noted the frightening reality in a congregate setting where people who got into fights because someone passed gas or they snored. Many people who have experienced trauma preferred to stay on the street rather than in a congregate place because they didn't feel safe having someone six inches away from them. She stated quite honestly, a lot of times they were not safe. She also stated most people are one paycheck away from being homeless, and asked how it would feel if you had no place to go, were forced to stay a few inches from someone you didn't know, or who was dangerous, or experiencing difficult circumstances. She stated in a perfect world none of us would have to live in an area where there are unhoused people, but that is not reality. She asked the commissioners to consider the council members proposal.

Mr Jonathan Nadle from Beechview in Pittsburgh commented homelessness is a growing problem in Pittsburgh and elsewhere that needs to be addressed more effectively for the sake of the unhoused as well as the city. Few would argue that having growing numbers of tent encampments is desirable. The question is how to best do what works. He said other cities have successfully addressed homelessness. They can show what the best practices are in moving the unhoused out of tents and into a more stable living arrangement, with wraparound services that they need. He commented shelters and emergency warming centers play an important role but are insufficient by themselves. The creation of more affordable apartments and homes is necessary like this take years and millions of dollars. Creating temporary tiny home style small villages is what can be done successfully now. Mr Nadle encouraged commissioners to travel across a bridge, maybe even a river, to Beechview to see the model home for themselves. He stated those in opposition haven't presented any viable alternatives. He noted the tiny homes are the quickest, most cost-effective way to house the unhoused, all in a few consolidated locations, and to efficiently get them the services they need. Over the eight-week period, he requested commissioners neutrally and independently review the proposals and plans, and said they will be convinced of their merits.

Ms McElhaney recognized Rachel Nunes, Executive Director, Thomas Merton Center.

Ms Nunes of the Hill District, who has also lived with housing insecurity, was in support of the TMC's. She has also helped people acquire tents and emergency supplies after having the rug pulled out from under them, because it's the human thing to do. She has been working with unhoused neighbors and advocates who supply direct aid and advancement on their issues. She stated this legislation was one stop gap solution that has the potential to save lives in the short

term. She personally worked with Cn Gross and Cn Coghill in developing their plans and sharing their vision, values, and intent. In the next eight weeks, she hoped to reach out to community members and get their input as the legislation is refined. She said the tiny home plan is one example that would add diversity to existing shelter options. She said many unhoused and housing insecure neighbors, as well as those who serve them, have given positive feedback to this plan because the need is great. She stated Pittsburgh is in a housing crisis and, for the first time in their lives, more people are finding themselves in need of temporary or emergency shelter. Congregate shelter settings don't always fit the needs of this part of the unhoused population, with lack of adequate storage space for belongings among other issues. She urged the commissioners to think interconnectedly about the unhoused, noting creative solutions such as this will help address the variety of needs within different parts of this population. She believed advancing this legislation and pilot site will have an immense and positive outcome, opening the door for other creative and diverse shelter options. She stated urgency is the pace at which to move on these things as we have lost two people that we know of in recent months. Mr Jerome Sabo, resident in Point Breeze, commented he regularly sees the unhoused population at the intersection of S Braddock and Penn Avenues. He interacts with them on a regular basis as they are basically neighbors. He stated seeing his neighbors out on the streets is a challenging thing to behold. He said he has interacted with several people whose fingers were swollen from the cold. Trying to shake their hand or offer them something was tough when they could barely grasp whatever it was. He said was really tough to see them in that situation. He challenged previous comments about communal spaces where people live together in the safety of that space and urged others at the meeting to imagine their most difficult situations. He stated usually, they have a chance to cope with their situations in the privacy of their own homes. They could be crying, be angry, could be shouting, but they have some privacy for their reactions. In a communal setting that's very difficult if not impossible. He proposed that even if they themselves aren't necessarily a threatening individual, they could appear so going through a challenging time, which to a stranger, could look really offending. He spoke in support of this proposal for the temporary managed communities, giving people a bit of privacy, stability, and definitely warmth, "so they can, hopefully, not have frozen fingers." He also appreciated the extension of time to ensure well prepared legislation, hoping commissioners ultimately proceed with this plan, or some very similar form of it.

Mr Bob Malakoff from Allegheny West stated the concept is a good one but questioned where to locate them. He stated downtown and the North Shore aren't really the appropriate places, and was tired of hearing from people who felt threatened by the homeless camp, avoiding those places. He said there are other possible sites throughout the city that could be considered. The ordinance does not clearly indicate what a temporary structure is. He questioned if a tent or the tiny houses are temporary structures. He also questioned why the permits expire after four years. He felt the temporary part should be the length of stay of the residents who then, hopefully, transition to a better living situation. He posed if a camp is successful with minimum environmental impact, it probably should continue longer than four years. If there are major problems with it, it should go away much sooner. He noted the legislation requires a public hearing, but there is no incentive to pay attention to opinions expressed at that hearing. Because these camps are sensitive neighborhood issues, it would make more sense to have them authorized as a conditional use by the Planning Commission and City Council rather than used by right. He said this legislation might clean up the camps a little bit, but it is certainly only one small step in solving the problem.

Mr Tyler Andrews stated his concerns with balancing a long-term plan for living and housing with long term stability. He felt TMC's remove some focus on more viable permanent housing. He asked how they will consider the long-term benefit. He asked if this is the right solution? He stated it needed restructuring.

Ms Fran Barbush, a member of the Allegheny West Civic Council and a concerned Citizen, stated she had serious concerns about the intent in deciding to create these TMC's, and didn't think it was smart money. She thought it would be wiser to have a partnership with high schools and the community college, engaging students and those who need housing to work toward making permanent housing. She spoke of underutilized housing stock and land that could be used instead of recreational spaces along the riverfronts and downtown. She stated all of this

looks targeted on the North Side, and that other people are going to have to step up. She asked that they not go forward with these many structures on the North Shore and to consider alternatives other than what is maybe being proposed by powerful people.

Mr Douglas Kamper, President of East Allegheny Community Council, Deutschtown, stated this neighborhood borders the proposed area. He said they have had several community meetings regarding this bill and asked about support measures to remedy this situation. He stated their community has historically been connected with unhoused individuals. They do support measures to assist this vulnerable population, but not this bill as it is currently written. He looked forward to the different solutions or texts that might be worked through over the next eight weeks. Mr Timothy Zinn, President of Allegheny West Civic Council, stated the Council voted unanimously to appear before the Planning Commission to oppose the proposed zoning change as it is currently written. He said the proposed change would undo millions of dollars of investment in the riverfronts by the city itself, nonprofit entities, foundations, private donors, and others over the past several decades. They found it curious that the targeted areas are limited to the central business district and the city's riverfronts. They believed it disproportionately impacts those neighborhoods bordering the riverfronts and the currently proposed areas.

Mr Khalil Stanback, CEO of godfatherfamily.org stated he had a formal solution for this. He said he used his professional adult life helping landlords renting rooms. He worked with multiple agencies throughout the county. He worked with those who provided the tents and rented rooms in homes, whether they knew they were living next to one or not. He stated this plan works. He encouraged engagement with this population saying Pittsburgh would not suffer from this proposal. He stated it does not contaminate neighborhoods. The structures are solid stable structures from the dimensions to the landscaping to the solar power they bring in. He has acquired support through donors not taxpayers. He stated he will be submitting his proposal to the commission. He said he is willing to move forward as this is his mission and asked to please be considered. He doesn't take tax dollars. He has personally been able to acquire \$2 million from personal donor business owners. He asked to please consider this legislation, and he will be submitting his proposal to the commission within the eight weeks.

Mr Jerrel Gilliam, Light of Life Rescue Mission, applauded the efforts made for creative solutions. He said they need to bring all solutions that will work to the table that can work. He asked, with solutions like this, what is the program supporting these spaces. Who is being prioritized? Are they people that don't want to change, creating a magnet where police are being asked to look the other way while illegal activities happen? Those places become unsafe and this happened time and time again in other cities. He stated they need to be places for people who want to move out of homelessness. To be successful they need to have screening and intake processes and supportive services where illegal activity will not be tolerated and police presence is accepted. He stated since there are blighted homes and empty apartments buildings and hotels, they should look at existing housing stock, using developers willing to bring solutions to the table. Mr David Demco was grateful Council and commissioners had another eight weeks. He said he had about a dozen questions he hoped to be answered in that time. He stated homelessness is tragic and desperate. He said almost every day he dealt with homeless people in his neighborhood. He said this hearing is about legislation that targets downtown and the North Shore areas. He stated he didn't understand why this was a zoning issue. If the city wants to put a facility somewhere, they can do it. They are not bound by the zoning ordinances. He stated it appeared to him the city already had locations in mind for the TMC's, and felt in the spirit of openness the city should reveal those locations. He said the idea of changing zoning to enable uses in specific locations was spot zoning, and that was not allowed. He felt there was still a lot of work to be done.

Ms Lavender Seblock supported this initiative. She stated she experienced housing insecurity throughout her life. She welcomed housing opportunities on many levels in any neighborhood. She said she is a frequent user of the city trail system and was aware there is already a presence of unhoused people along the trail. She stated this proposed legislation presents a solution to something that is already happening. She stated this needs to be part of a larger initiative. She stated finding housing for the average person is very difficult. The housing shortage is affecting people on many levels. She stated social services are limited in a shelter and any kind of transitional housing would be helpful in the long run. She said finding the support can be the

most difficult part. She noted for anyone who's concerned about the idea of building the tiny homes, the presence of people living on the street is already disrupting businesses and people's experiences in shared spaces. It is important to consider that it's already a problem.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised

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

Ms Blackwell reminded everyone that being unhoused is nothing new. It has been prevalent on the north side & downtown because there are more resources there. She asked if they were planning to do all 3 motions, and what that would look like. She asked if they were looking at partners who are already doing the work.

Cn Gross stated the RIV goes to Butler St and up to the city line. They would not be near the north shore. They would be legal by right in the blue zone to be used without zoning approval. She stated deeper residential neighborhoods needed to be looked at more. A larger question was what to do for accommodation.

Cn Coghill stated they have not targeted any particular area. If and when the legislation is formed, then we will target specific areas.

Mr Wu commented this was one tool in the toolbox to address the homeless issue. They have to be looking at all different solutions. This is one of those.

Ms Dick supported this as a vital issue.

Ms Ruiz has seen growth of homelessness in the past 3 years and offered what she could do to help.

Ms O'Neill stated she wanted to see this legislation move forward and work through the issues involved.

Ms Ngami was supportive of the work that has happened. She felt they should be cautious about how they step forward with this. She stated they should not forget the holes that people can fall through, and those who will be in the temporary housing struggling to transition from pennilessness to monied.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for a motion from the floor on the 3 recommended motions.

Recommended MOTIONS:

1. The Planning Commission recommends that City Council place a hold on Council Bill 2023-2197 while the Department of City Planning, in collaboration with the City Law Department, drafts legislation to address potential Fair Housing Act deficiencies, simplify the institutional housing categories of the zoning code, and improve access to those housing categories; and
2. The Planning Commission requests that Department of City Planning Staff to convene a Working Group of stakeholders, city leaders and subject area experts to provide guidance on the legislation to ensure that the types of Temporary Managed Communities envisioned in Council Bill 2023-2197 are not prohibited, and that other hurdles and challenges within the zoning code regarding group housing and homelessness are adequately addressed; and
3. The Planning Commission accepts the council members' request for an eight-week extension of the ninety-day timeline for Planning Commission to act and continues action regarding Council Bill 2023-2197 for eight weeks.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

CARRIED

2. Zoning Code Text Amendment - Proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment removing review of sidewalk cafes in the public right of way from the Zoning Code.

Mr Cancilla presented the text amendment for staff. The amendment was to remove sidewalk cafes from the zoning code. In February, 2022, the City Council passed, and the mayor signed, ordinance 2022-23 which changed the regulations around sidewalk cafes to be regulated by the Department of

Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI), since there was a lot of duplicate as well as conflicting language between the DOMI regulations and the zoning regulations. It is important to remember that all the significant regulations for sidewalk cafes are in the DOMI regulations. In addition to both Zoning and DOMI, there is also the Department of Permits, Licenses and Inspections (PLI) that regulates sidewalk cafes, creating a situation where there are three different city agencies reviewing them. The intent of this ordinance change was to reduce the number of reviewing agencies to two agencies, DOMI and PLI. Some of the details of this amendment describe the current definition of sidewalk cafes, meaning an establishment serving food and or beverage on a public sidewalk space. This is really under DOMI's purview, because they regulate what occurs in the public right of way, and there are specific regulations for sidewalk cafes. In addition to removing it from zoning definitions, it would also be removed from certain sections of the zoning code in Chapter 908, Public Realm Districts and Chapter 909, SP, Specially Planned Districts, as well as the use table and standards in Section 911.02. This was originally identified shortly after the DOMI legislation was passed in 2022. There was a proposed zoning text amendment that was the same as this one being proposed now that was heard at briefing on March 8, 2022. Then, at the subsequent meeting on March 22, 2022, the commission provided a positive recommendation to City Council for that text amendment. It moved forward as Ordinance 2022-23 in City Council, which was held May 24, 2022. However, that ordinance was held up in the land use and economic development committee. Given that situation where there was no change made, there were still three agencies reviewing sidewalk cafes. We still have that same situation and same rationale for this renewed effort before the commission today. As a part of the report we find, based on the City Planning Department, to provide a positive recommendation to City Council to help move this text amendment forward.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Mr Malakoff.

Mr Malakoff stated he realized that a sidewalk cafe is just a restaurant with one or more tables on the sidewalk. He questioned if a restaurant puts a table on the sidewalk, does that change its status to a sidewalk cafe and remove it from the zoning table. If they stop serving food outside in the winter, does that put them back on the zoning list. He stated the legislation is supposed to simplify procedures and make things less confusing. He was still confused. Will removing it from the use table mean they are exempt from zoning rules? He questioned if not, what are those rules and where could he find them. Could someone put a sidewalk cafe in the middle of an R1D zone, assuming that category exists in the future? What about those restaurants that currently require a special exception? Would DOMI hold a hearing or would those protections go away simply because the restaurant put a table on the sidewalk? He stated the zoning use table is supposed to include all conceivable building types and uses in the city. He asked why they would consider exempting just one, which made no logical sense. Mr Layman stated there will be no functional change to how sidewalk cafes operate or how they get permits. He said they do have to be associated with a legal restaurant that has a certificate of occupancy permit. These sidewalk cafes happen entirely within the right of way. If there is an outdoor seating area on private property, that is not in the purview of DOMI. That is reviewed by Zoning. This simply is just removing a redundancy in the process and in the code. It doesn't in any way impact the status of existing, legal restaurants and future applications thereof.

Mr Fraker recognized Fran Barbash.

Ms Barbash stated they have a business that has tables and chairs set out in an alley. She asked when something was allowed by right. She noted, if fire vehicles had to get through the alley, they could not. She stated, along with the other issue being considered, it helps to know as a citizen that there is a review, and that things are not just allowed all the time without somebody taking a look at it. She remarked she didn't know if commissioners were aware that that occurs, and that there are businesses doing it.

Mr Khalil Stanbach commented, pertaining to the sidewalk amenity, he works with an elderly population, and there are many restaurants that have stairs. The outside seating provides accommodation to individuals who may be in wheelchairs, or have physical issues that they may not be able to walk upstairs. He said it happens frequently throughout the city and different areas. I knew they talked about container homes earlier, but they also have to consider the pet population. There are people who have security animals, and this should also be paid attention to. He stated handicapped accessible people need to be able to access these places. Also, there should be some type of reference to the care of outside spaces, making sure it's hygienic and everything is clean. He

stated adding that small portion to any restaurant provides more financial and economic resource and accessibility. He stated it would not be realistic for every sidewalk, but for the places it does occur, it would really be beneficial to be under the scope of accessibility for the handicapped.

Mr Fraker saw no other hands raised.

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

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh make a positive recommendation to City Council.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Wu

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

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman thanked both in-person and online council members, commissioners, staff, and participants for their cooperation in enabling this hybrid planning commission meeting.

Chair Burton-Faulk echoed his sentiments, also thanking City Council, the clerk's office, and the City Channel for their support and assistance.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 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

March 5, 2024 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
 Monica Ruiz
 Phillip Wu

Not Present

Mel Ngami

Peter Quintanilla

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots	1
Hearing & Action 1. Council Bill 2024-00059 Zoning Code Text Amendment to allow Single-Unit Attached Residential Uses in Single-Unit Detached Residential Districts Residential Single-Family Districts Citywide. 2. DCP-HN-2023-01290 Historic Nomination of Beth Abraham Cemetery Complex Overbrook Neighborhood. 3. DCP-ZDR-2024-00053 – 912 Fort Duquesne Boulevard Install High Wall Signage Central Business District.	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for December 12, 2023.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

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

ABSTAINED: Mr Wu

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2024-00059 Regarding Single Unit Attached Uses in Single Unit Detached Districts

- Karen Streb
- Pamela Rall-Johnston
- Rich Johnston
- Katalin Reimann
- Joachim Reimann

- Ellen Mazo
- Susann Reiman
- Jerry Dorsch
- Gerald Dorsch
- Janet Dorsch
- Mark McClelland
- Christine Grenci
- Kimberly McClelland
- Bob Malakoff
- Adrienne Johnson
- Kathie Burns
- Frank McClelland
- Gary Mellott
- Mike Turecki
- Ron and Marcia Kraus
- June Lloyd
- Adrienne Johnson
- Abby Rae LaCombe
- Daniel Elsass
- Jessica Semler
- Catherine Brosky
- Candace Cain

Council Bill 2023-2197 regarding Temporary Managed Communities

- Andrew Collins
- Bernadette Collins
- Debra Kelly

C. Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2024-00059 Zoning Code Text Amendment to allow Single-Unit Attached Residential Uses in Single-Unit Detached Residential Districts Residential Single-Family Districts Citywide. Ms Rakus presented Council Bill 00059 for staff. She first wanted to make sure there was common understanding about the difference between single-unit attached and single-unit detached houses. She explained single-unit attached houses are individual dwelling units on one zoning lot that are attached to each other. Each of these houses is an individual property on its own zoning lot. Single-unit detached is one property not connected to any others. The technical definition of single-unit attached is the use of a zoning lot for one dwelling unit that is attached to one or more dwelling units by a party wall, or separate abutting wall, and that is located on its own separate lot. Single-unit detached means the use of a zoning lot for one detached housing unit. This does not regulate or change or apply to two unit residential, which is one zoning lot with two dwelling units within a single building on that lot. Everything talked about at this hearing were attached properties, individually owned, on their own lots. The proposed legislation would allow single-unit residential uses in detached, single-unit residential zoning districts. Currently, these are prohibited in the same way that a commercial or industrial use would be prohibited in a detached, single-unit residential zoning district. A use variance would be required for a single-unit attached use in a detached district, which should really be more like a dimensional variance. Ms Rakus explained how the single-unit attached residential in the single-unit detached districts would be approved. Single-unit attached would be permitted by right on parcels with lot widths of 35 feet or smaller. On lots with widths larger than 35 ft, single-unit attached uses would be permitted as a special exception, using the standard special exception provisions that require a hearing at the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The legislation doesn't change any other standards, setbacks, height, etc., for these zoning districts. She explained that the 35-foot distinction came from the context of the existing Pittsburgh neighborhoods. There are a lot of smaller lot widths within existing single-unit attached districts that already have these non-conforming uses in them. She presented an example of a rowhouse in Morningside that has an

average lot width of less than 35 ft and contains a number of structures which are attached to each other, trying to set this threshold based on the existing neighborhood context, and what would already be more common in neighborhoods with smaller lot widths. She presented a slide with information about the single-family detached zoning district, providing a link to a GIS map locating where R1D districts are in the city, and then the breakdown between where it would be allowed by right and where it would be a special exception. The single-family detached zoning district is about 26% of the city. Of the residential zoning districts, it's about 56%. Broken down, these are approximate numbers for the parcels 35 ft or less because it's drawn from the county data which isn't survey accurate, but it breaks down for what would be permitted by right or special exception. Staff suggested that the planning commission make a positive recommendation to city council with one change in the language in the use table to be P/S. P would represent permitted for the smaller lot widths, and S would represent a special exception for the larger lot widths. As with any zoning code text amendment, this is from city council to staff to make a recommendation to them. The next step in the process would be a public hearing at city council and then city council's standard process. Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony, instructing that she would call their name.

Mr David Demco, a resident of the city of Pittsburgh said he appreciated what they were trying to do and their motives, noting he thought they were pure, but he had issues with both the substance and the process of this zoning ordinance. He said this was a sweeping zoning change, and it would be more honest to say that all R1D's would now be R1A's. He felt that was fundamentally what was happening with the special exception for wider lots and didn't understand why that was. He stated he couldn't think of a situation where a wide lot would not pass the impact evaluation needed to get a special exception. Another thing about the wide lot, assuming that all the houses were on separate subdivided lots, there are alternate land ownership relationships like co-ops. He asked if the lot is too large could it be subdivided. What if the owner of detached housing doesn't want to subdivide? Are these decisions appropriate for the ZBA to make? He felt there were too many hypotheticals to consider regarding the process. He also stated non-conforming uses within a neighborhood do not form a basis to allow those uses by right. He expected a zoning change of this magnitude to be backed up with a white paper report with sources and evidence that support the claims being made. He asked if this would really make housing more affordable, or is the price of housing really determined by the location? Was there a survey done in the R1D neighborhood showing general support for this change? Where else in the country has this been done? What were the results; have the results been positive; or have they been marginal? He said he was also disturbed by the insinuation that this zoning change was in response to a zoning variance that was overturned in the court of appeals. He noted the mayor and the city council have dedicated \$6.2 million for research and outreach to rewrite the city zoning code, and this is not an ordinance to be rushed at peace meal, but rather should be considered in a broad context based on the results this planned outreach process returned.

Chair Burton-Faulk recognized Danielle Robinson who was possibly online. There was no response from Ms Robinson. Chair Burton-Faulk reserved time to come back to Ms Robinson.

Ms Mazo, Vice President of the Fineview Community Organization, stated Fineview residents asked for an organization that gives credence to what they believe to be imperative to support sustainable development or property restoration. Affordable housing was just as important to preserve the fabric of the community in a manner that was transparent and equitable. She had concerns about the proposed ordinance that seeks to eliminate R1D zoning across the city of Pittsburgh. She said she was certain commissioners could make a more informed decision by allowing all voices to be heard. She stated the zoning change was being pushed through before the necessary research and community input the commissioners have always embraced, and that there was a process in place for that. She stated city council and the mayor agreed to spend \$6.2 million to enable the research and community outreach to help make informed decisions on how to proceed with a Citywide comprehensive plan and engagement strategy. She said pushing through this ordinance undermines the commissioners' principles of transparent and inclusive decision making. She stated the immediate elimination of R1D zoning could only be recognized as a reckless disregard for residential neighborhoods across Pittsburgh. She said the diversity of the city's neighborhoods is precious, and to callously impose this ordinance on all neighborhoods takes advantage of low, moderate income communities. She stated Pittsburgh has more than 11,000 vacant Lots, many of which are ripe for development, in a location where attached houses are possible. She said especially in our city of 90

unique neighborhoods of all shapes and dimensions, one size does not fit all. She stated a good comprehensive zoning policy was needed, not a patchwork of ordinances brought on in retaliation to the Common Pleas Court decision. The community organizations and city council members advocating for this ordinance have provided no evidence that arbitrarily opposing their city wide R1D zoning change would lead to lower housing costs or make new construction more affordable. Instead, it appears that this ordinance was introduced in response to one developer's unsuccessful attempt to build in violation of the existing zoning regulations. For that reason, this ordinance eliminates protections for all R1D neighborhoods. She stated in their role to serve the residents of Pittsburgh, they could reject rushing to implement sweeping and indiscriminate change. She said instead, they could recommend that we all work together so that the more than \$6 million appropriation was used wisely to find alternative, targeted, and community focused solutions. She requested they recommend against adoption of this council bill.

Ms Brosky handed out sets of 4 pictures to the commissioners and commented she was a resident of Pittsburgh. She appreciated Cn Wilson's effort to streamline the zoning code but was concerned with any blanket approval process. She saw it as incongruent with Pittsburgh's unique topographical characteristics. She stated the city's steep hills can present development limitations, such as narrow streets, that do not allow many options for parking or yards, which she felt were necessary for Pittsburgh to remain competitive for future homeowners purchasing property for long-term residency. Her understanding of the underlying proposal was the assumption that things like parking and larger setback requirements added additional expense when building a housing development. Thus, it creates a gap between its cost and what a family can afford. While an estimated additional \$20,000 was provided by city planning for these requirements, no estimates or market evidence regarding the costs or disadvantages of implementing such policy were presented. In her opinion, it was a mistake to consider only information that supports one point of view instead of examining both sides of the cost of any major policy change having far-reaching impact on the lives of so many residents. She stated one could only assume the proposal allows attached housing by right on lots less than 35 feet wide, because there were no issues regarding parking or setbacks when replacing previously existing or current multiple attached housing. She offered an example, noting on an attached map the houses on one side of Fountain Street are zoned R1A-VH, which is very high density, and the houses on the other side are zoned RM-M. All the lots are less than 35 ft except one. On paper, it seems ideally suited for additional density based on the council member's proposal. She directed attention to pictures of Fountain St (Two) and Dunloe St (Three) which provide egress from the area. She noted the map's lack of terrain indicators failing to show the narrowness of both streets. She also noted the steep hillsides that would make widening the roads difficult. She noted without a full picture of the area, one would not notice emergency vehicles' inability to turn the corner, especially with cars parked within the fire lane clearly posted with a sign. She stated it is physically impossible to provide rear parking for structures on one side of Hemlock St because there are city steps on that side. She also noted the proximity of the street to a hospital and the additional competition for parking during work hours. She stated the only thing keeping animosities over parking from becoming physical is that some lots no longer have structures, and some structures that are currently vacant. She noted all the vacant properties on the map marked with a X. With her time expired she hoped the commissioners would take the time to read the next few sections.

Ms Cain, a resident of Fineview, stated the residents of Fineview want a vibrant and diverse city. They want to build affordable housing and to work with developers. Pittsburgh's population is not growing fast. She stated it is about half the size it was when much of the city's housing was built. She said there are thousands of empty lots. Fineview is a small, low to moderate income neighborhood with fewer than 600 households. As a result, every housing development in Fineview has an outsized impact on our community. Many of our narrow 20-foot wide lots were laid out a century ago for factory workers who did not have cars. Allowing attached housing by right on these narrow lots, such as those on Lanark St, will increase density in areas of Fineview that are already dense. Lanark St is close to the popular overlook, an area vulnerable to congestion. Since the 1990s, fine view residents themselves have built four affordable housing developments totaling at least 30 new detached houses. Fineview has a history of constructing affordable housing with features to encourage neighbor contact, such as front porches and small yards. Detached houses have more privacy and allow the neighborhood to enjoy its best feature, its great views. She said Fineview residents-built housing for a reason from 1983 when the Fineview Citizens Council was

founded until 2016, its board meetings were open to members and the community. She was a board member for six years and cycled off the board as president at the end of 2002. However, transparency disappeared around 2016. Community participation in decisions stopped. Since then a handful of Fineview Citizens Council board members meet behind closed doors with Perry Hilltop Citizens Council board members to make decisions about Fineview. It is noteworthy in 2005 the planning department's Map Pittsburgh project reviewed every lot in Fineview for its current appropriate use, including detached housing on Lanark St. Most important, no one in Fineview ever argued that City of Bridges or Fineview citizens should cancel the project or not build affordable housing on Lanark St. Instead, neighbors urged them to modify the project by building fewer houses at that location due to density and congestion around lower Lanark St, and to build replacement houses or additional houses on other Lots owned by the Fineview Citizens Council. She asked that all zoning issues be studied along with the rest of Pittsburgh.

Chair Burton-Faulk recognized Leretta Pay, who was possibly online. Hearing no response, she decided they would come back to her.

Mr Ed Nusser, Executive Director at City of Bridges Community Land Trust in Garfield, stated he was in favor of Council Bill 59 and of a positive recommendation on it. He agreed that one size does not fit all. He stated people need housing choices for them and their communities to thrive. He said in R1D zoning, its specific use requirements limit housing choice and create a one-size fits-all approach. With this bill it is allowing properties to be redeveloped. It is not mandating that homes must be attached. It is simply giving the option to neighborhoods, communities, and property owners to effectively use limited land resources to create the necessary affordable housing that the city needs. He noted the city is 20,000 affordable homes short. Creating these artificial limits of how much housing can be built in the neighborhoods based on zoning from a half a century ago impacts the health and vibrancy of the city. It means fewer and fewer people are able to call the city of Pittsburgh home. He stated at City of Bridges, they have been to the ZBA for a lot of their projects. They have had to request zoning variances to build what exists next door, and noted the city is full of these examples. Existing, non-conforming uses is what they are called, but these are the buildings and the neighborhood fabric that give our communities the character we love. He said so often now, that can't be rebuilt because of the way the zoning is written. What this bill does is a modest step towards what is really soft density that does not increase unit count beyond one unit per parcel, allowing us to maximize the very typical narrow land and parcels in Pittsburgh. He stated today's communities cannot be built on yesterday's zoning. He noted the city has seen a massive drop in the black population, and median home prices have increased over 25% since 2019. We need tools that allow us to build more homes, taking account of the context and fabric of the existing community. He stated this legislation will allow the zoning code a new flexibility for community supported projects to advance quickly into construction. This is not about one project or one community. This is about how we can advance a movement to create more accessible, affordable housing for our city.

Adrienne Johnson, resident of Fineview, commented she moved to Pittsburgh five years ago, one of the important factors was finding a home in an R1 zone. With two vacant lots next door, she wanted to know if there will be one neighbor or multiple neighbors there. She stated the presentation said it's going to be one person for one lot, but this bill has been proposed in the wake of somebody wanting to build eight units on five lots. She said it wasn't exactly doubling the density, but was adding more people into the side yards of the adjacent properties. Depending on the choices of people to self-divide, it could be quite a few more. She commented other people talked about not being able to see the views anywhere, this will crowd the neighborhood, and parking is a very strained critical resource. She commented the bus could not get through for 15 minutes on New Year's Eve, blowing the horn until they found whose car was blocking the way. That happens frequently because there are so many cars parked on the sidewalks and everywhere. She stated the expectation is that the density isn't going to increase, it's going to stay the same neighborhood. She noted there are 11,000 lots in Pittsburgh that are available to be developed, and most importantly, there are 15 houses in the Fineview area that are currently being used as short-term rentals, Air BnB's. The city zoning classifies those as hotels. She said if you enforce the zoning against hotels in R1 districts, that's 15 more one family houses that would be added to the stock of houses in the city.

Emma Gamble, Engagement and Program Manager, Lawrenceville United, stated they are a resident-based nonprofit in the neighborhood. Their mission is to preserve and protect quality of life for all Lawrenceville residents. She said she was there to speak in support of the proposed zoning

text amendments. She stated the shortage of affordable housing in Pittsburgh is a crisis that requires bold action from city leadership. According to the city of Pittsburgh's 2022 housing needs assessment, there is a supply gap of over 8,000 affordable units for renters under 30% AMI. The crisis disproportionately affects black and brown neighbors. She noted Pittsburgh lost over 10,000 black residents between 2010 to 2020. During that same time period, Lawrenceville lost over two-thirds of its black population. She stated neighbors in Lawrenceville fought back against these trends, creating the first community land trust in Western Pennsylvania, joining with other communities to fight for the Housing Opportunity Fund, and passing the first mandatory inclusionary zoning policy in Pennsylvania outside of State College. She stated as a community they have experienced firsthand how the zoning code can be a barrier to their affordable housing goals by making it illegal or difficult to build common sense contextual historic infill and mixed-income housing developments. She said it needs to be easier to build the housing that our neighbors desperately need. She stated this proposed zoning text amendment provides a small and modest adjustment to the zoning code that's totally consistent with the built environment of our historic neighborhoods. While bolder reforms within the zoning code are necessary to meaningfully grapple with our housing crisis, this legislation is a helpful first step and we encourage the Planning Commission to recommend it.

Cassandra Armour, Marketing Communications Manager, City of Bridges Community Land Trust, from the North Side, read a statement from one of the homeowners who is a City of Bridges Community Land Trust resident and home owner of an attached home. "I urge the city to promote and pass attached house zoning. Pittsburgh urgently needs more affordable and mixed-income housing, and attached housing is an easy and sensible approach. Some of the city's most historic neighborhoods are so vibrant because of, not in spite of, low-income and middle-income attached housing. Pittsburghers deserve more housing options in more neighborhoods, and passing zoning that allows for more attached housing will do just that at a time when inflation is high, and we are in an affordable housing crisis. City Council and city officials should do everything in their power to counteract these trends. Please pass zoning laws to allow additional development of attached homes today."

Joachim Reimann, resident Meadville St, Fineview, stated he was sad that the interests of citizens against politics are now in court. It shouldn't be. His take-away, for example, the population of Fineview decreased in the last 50-60 years by around 50%, but, what did not decrease were the properties, which are still there. Some are occupied like ours. The old house was torn down and a new building was put up. Other properties were just plain leveled, so they are actually empty. Then there are a lot of houses that have a blue condemnation sign. There is a lot of work to do, and I would like to see that happen because our future people are not just looking for housing they also have kids. If you took a tour to Meadville Street in Pittsburgh, you don't want to go through at night. You may meet some rats or other creatures. I oppose this.

Mr Fred Smith, co-chair of the Housing Working Group for Perry Hilltop stated they have been working to create affordable housing throughout all of Perry Hilltop and Fineview. They have partners, Rides and Tides and City of Bridges, to help them with their mission to create affordable housing. There was discussion around whether affordable attached housing is cheaper than detached housing. He stated he was willing to do the study or whatever it takes. He said they met with the community of Fineview on several occasions, went door to door, they had agreement, and had this in place, and now, for this to be an issue. He is for the idea of creating available options. There has been a decrease in the black and brown community since the creation of those houses in Fineview. They moved the black and brown community out to Zelienople and places where they can't even get buses to come into town. He stated they were trying to prevent the displacement for six years. He said this is one way of preventing that, and he was for the project going forward.

Bob Malikov stated he has been involved in zoning in his neighborhood of Allegheny West for over 40 years, and this is probably the worst piece of zoning legislation he has seen. He stated this is the beginning of several pieces of zoning legislation being drafted by people who have very little understanding of zoning and how it works. He said many residents also do not understand zoning and do not realize the negative impact this will have on their neighborhood. Because City of Bridges, who knew that attached housing was not permitted, was denied a use variance by Common Pleas Court, two city council members unreasonably blame the zoning ordinance for holding up the development of affordable housing in general. They decided to essentially eliminate the R1D category, which is present in many different neighborhoods in the city, not just in some of the

wealthier areas of the East End. To totally eliminate a zoning category because one project, or a few, is outrageous. For all he knew, it might be illegal. Attached housing is permitted in every residential zoning category but one and several non-residential categories. Zoning in various neighborhoods of Pittsburgh, which was done with input from the residents, reflects the existing condition of the neighborhood and its direction for the future. It should provide stability to a neighborhood. Residents want to know what is in store for their neighborhood in the future. Increasing density should not mean increasing it everywhere. He stated some neighborhoods have a very low density due to prevalence of vacant houses and vacant lots. Develop those areas that need redevelopment and make affordable housing part of that. Pittsburgh is known as a city of unique neighborhoods. The Pittsburgh Zoning Code says it best: Introduction - Pittsburgh's overall character is defined to a great degree by its diverse and unique residential areas. The urban zoning code's approach to residential zoning reflects this diversity by allowing very fine-grained adjustments in the range of zoning controls applied within and among neighborhoods. The purpose of these controls is to encourage development and redevelopment while preserving the character of existing residential neighborhoods. Don't mess it up.

Adelina Molita, a resident of Lawrenceville for 16 years, approved of this because she thought Pittsburgh needs more affordable housing. She stated her friends have been pushed out of neighborhoods because of the current housing crisis. More affordable housing, which means attached housing, is only going to help neighborhoods expand, and allow young people to grow families within the neighborhoods. She said she was able to purchase an attached house in Lawrenceville. Because of that, she was able to have two kids and enjoy the perks of a neighborhood that also has some attached houses around hers. It really makes the fabric of the neighborhood better to have more diverse people within the neighborhood who can afford to start their lives by being able to pay for houses. She stated attached housing is really the way to go, and she is for this.

John Hanrahan, a resident of Fineview, supported the bill and some of the comments so far. Speaking for himself, he was excited at the prospect of a zoning code that embraces the city's nature where buildings are close to each other; where we don't prioritize the needs of our big stinking automobiles over the needs of affordability, connection, and neighborhood vibrancy. He stated the comment about AirBnB's being hotels and noncompliant is an awesome idea. He wanted to learn more about that, and would love to see a bill from City Council on that very soon. He was also curious to hear this was not a debate over whether we like or dislike attached housing. For the purposes of this meeting, the discussion was whether there needs to be legal safeguards against attached housing in certain neighborhoods. He asked if that was what there were asking. Should the law protect its citizens from houses that touch each other? He was curious to hear what the distinct kind of clear positive arguments for that would be. He stated, so far, he heard congestion, parking, and obstruction of view. He said it was sad to hear those arguments rehashed decade after decade when we know what those arguments, and no disrespect to the folks making those arguments, have wrought so much destruction throughout our city for the past century at the expense of the vibrant, beautiful neighborhoods in pockets of our city. He said it has been lost in other pockets of the city. He commented about the obstruction of view as well, but beyond that it was not clear why we need the government to step in to protect people from houses that are touching each other in our neighborhoods. He stated as a person who has lived in an apartment, in an attached house, and lived in denser cities, he didn't see the need. He said as a person who has rented, who has paid too much for rent, he supports this bill. He supports affordable housing, and wanted to see this passed. Hannah Dean, a resident of Shadyside, member of City of Bridges Community Land Trust, and a concerned resident, urged the Commission to support this legislation. She stated she rented in an attached townhome. In her opinion, some of the comments made regarding the concerns in safety, congestion, or parking were red herrings. She stated, as someone who lives in a neighborhood with multiple attached units, if those residents are so concerned about parking and congestion, there are plenty opportunities to advocate for improved public transit. She said she herself has done that. She agreed there can be difficulties with parking when you have increased housing density, but that doesn't mean our public transit system can't also be improved. In addition, she said it doesn't mean that increased density does not make the neighborhood better, and in her opinion, it is very nice to live in a neighborhood that is denser, closer to many things, and has very good public transit. She said this is an opportunity for places like Fineview and other neighborhoods to create even more

economic diversity than there currently is in Shadyside. She addressed concerns about the expectations of homeowners that, when you purchase a home, there is no guarantee or contract about what's going to happen in their neighborhood. She thought some of the concerns that were brought up were disingenuous, and in some situations, it appeared to her, thinly veiled racism about what it implies with increased density in a given area, and what that "could bring" to a neighborhood. She stated the real predicament here is that Pittsburgh is in an affordable housing crisis and this offers just a possibility of creating more affordable housing. She noted other alternatives are being worked on by many different organizations in the city to develop the vacant lots and create more affordable housing, but there are many obstacles. This is just trying to remove one of them. She thought the opposition was disingenuous and was not rooted in true concern for creating a more economically diverse city where people are not forced out because of lack of affordability.

Jo Demming, Executive Director of the Pittsburgh Food Policy Council, formerly the Executive Director of Perry Hilltop and Fineview Citizens Council, who also goes by Joanna, spoke as a concerned resident. She stated that food and housing are intricately linked. She said as the work to increase food access occurs, property values will go up. Keeping and building more affordable housing is going to be essential for keeping folks in the city close to transit, jobs, and food. She supported the zoning change. She stated single family zoning gained momentum after World War II to preserve a suburban ideal fueled by Federal loans offered predominantly to white people. Too often to foster segregation, policies that restrict multiunit housing development to a fraction of available land don't take into account population growth, the environmental impact of urban sprawl, the unaffordability of detached homes, or the lifestyle of Millennials. Pittsburgh is now the oldest, whitest, and has the least foreign-born residents. The largest 30 metropolitan areas in the US, more than 82% of urban and suburban areas, are white. She stated she spent six years knocking on doors, meeting with neighbors, and listening to both residents of detached dwellings, who are predominantly white, and residents of attached dwellings, who are predominantly black, in Fineview. She stated, now that attached dwellings are slated for redevelopment, while attempts were made to engage residents in attached dwellings in the past, for the most part, those residents did not have a seat at the table, nor did they feel welcome where decisions were being made. The residents in attached dwellings are Fineview residents who deserve to stay in Fineview. Building only single-family homes will not allow this to happen. The zoning change would prevent displacement in Fineview as well as other communities facing similar challenges. Racial motivation, or not-in-my-backyard, is the message of those opposed to this policy, and more exclusion is the outcome. Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for comments from commissioners.

Ms O'Neill spoke to clarify a few things as someone with a background specializing in zoning. She thought it was a misnomer that they were talking about the affordability of housing, which is important and should be supported, but the topic was really about a little bit of red tape. She explained there are single unit detached residential and single unit attached residential districts in the city. This is proposing a small change to the use category here. There still are distinctions between those districts. Somebody said it was eliminating one. If you look at the use table, there are still other uses that are permitted in one and not the other. They are treated separately. So, it is not getting rid of a zoning district. Today, the city has a lot of very narrow lots. It is an existing condition in a lot of areas. If this was not passed today, by right, people can build in residential districts up to three feet from the lot line. That's a narrow provision in the zoning code. What we're allowing here is, when there is an adjacent property built to a zero lot line, to let that 3 feet close. That's it. Three feet is not a significant difference in terms of density. It is allowing for some of those infill lots that previously would have had to obtain variances to be used instead of neglected. Simply put, only if you are already up to the property line would your neighbor be able to build to your property line at that zero lot line. It is just allowing your neighboring property owner to do the same thing that you are doing. In terms of new builds, somebody could conceivably have two adjacent lots and put attached housing, one on each of those lots. She clarified it is not changing the minimum lot size, nor changing other requirements for density. The minimum lot size for any residential district is 1200 square feet. So, no one is taking a really large lot and putting 10 on there without either complying with that 1200 square foot lot requirement or getting a variance. This is a very minor adjustment. She didn't think anybody had been purposefully misleading on that. She thought maybe they had been misled about its impact. She said here today, there are talking about just a minor adjustment that does make more property usable by allowing a modicum more of density in areas that are traditionally dense. She

stated she would like to see a lot more, but thought this is an appropriate adjustment to get rid of some red tape before they do go through that more comprehensive zoning. She thought density is warranted in all districts regardless of income, lot size, or things like that. That is something she is looking forward to being addressed in the comprehensive. Here it really is a minor adjustment. It is not forcing anybody to create an attached house on their own property. She was very much in support of this, but wanted to be clear it is a minor adjustment, as she said five times. She also wanted to be clear the Commission was making a recommendation today. This was not the last opportunity for people to have public comment. There will be a public hearing before City Council. In addition to the following City Council meetings, where you are also allowed, please take advantage of those opportunities. She stated she really appreciated everybody's input, coming out today to talk about this.

Mr Wu echoed this legislation would not force property owners to do anything. He said, having worked in the Department of City Planning in the past he had opportunities to see up close what the development picture is like in different neighborhoods. In Garfield, for example, a neighborhood that has rapidly become less affordable, a lot of neighborhoods including Garfield have lost significant black residents. He knew part of the challenge in a place like Garfield is there is so much R1 detached zoning. Developers looking to build new homes there have not been able to do so without variances. It is no longer economically feasible for developers in many parts of the city to only build single family detached. By doing so, they're not making money, and they're also not able to pass affordable housing on to people in the market who want affordable housing. As some have mentioned, the city has lost a lot of people over the decades. Population has declined. If we want to grow the city's population again, it needs to be easy to build new housing. It just isn't economically feasible in many cases to build detached housing in this market. This is not going to force property owners to do anything with their properties, and it's not going to have as much of an impact in neighborhoods that are not seeing a lot of demand as it is in neighborhoods where there is a lot of demand.

Chair Burton-Faulk stated she wanted to be clear and reiterated this is a recommendation to Council for Council to approve. As commissioners have stated today, this is not a one-and-done, meaning it is not your last opportunity to have some discussion, but it is the next step in the process. You can participate in that as well, okay?

MOTION:

The Planning Commission makes a positive recommendation to City Council on the Zoning Code Text Amendment, Council Bill 2024-0059 with the following condition: Amend the Use Table from "A" for Administrator Exception, to "P/S" for Permitted and Special Exception.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

CARRIED

2. DCP-HN-2023-01290 Historic Nomination of Beth Abraham Cemetery Complex Overbrook Neighborhood.

Ms Quinn presented the historic nomination of Beth Abraham Cemetery on which the commissioners would make a recommendation to City Council. Ms Quinn discussed slides depicting an internal view the cemetery which was originally founded in 1891. She thought the most important thing about the cemetery is that it grew over the years based on immigration related to the Lithuanians, then Russians, then Romanians, and then Polish Jews who all lived in the Hill District. She noted the cemetery used to be outside of town. Pittsburgh has grown around it. She noted the changes in design of the Tombstones over the years, and presented slides of the older tombstones. She felt one of the most important things produced from the nomination was developing a management plan to review the historic resources as appropriate to be applied to future cemetery landmarks. She explained basically, the Historic Review Commission would review gates, retaining walls, and tombstones of graves that are aged 50 years or greater. This would encompass anything before 1974. She showed a slide of the retaining walls along the entrance street. She stated in the

management plan, the Jewish Cemetery and Burial Association put together a maintenance plan for their stones and a review process by the HRC, which won't require them to come back every time they want to do something.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized Matthew Falcone.

Mr Falcone, a Deutschtown resident representing Preservation Pittsburgh, stated they worked in tandem with the Jewish Cemetery and Burial Association of Greater Pittsburgh to bring this nomination before the commission. He stated he listened to the comments in a previous briefing and wanted to thank all the Commissioners for taking the time an effort to read the nomination. He stated he knew part of their consideration of this unique scenario would be about any impact this designation would have on the surrounding properties. This cemetery is bounded on one side at the edge of the city and the remaining boundary is a dense residential neighborhood. He noted there would not be a significant about of change in the near future and that this is a complicated property. He stated the cemetery may be in Carrick but it is not of Carrick. The community that most closely associates with this property was primarily located in the Hill District, but is now primarily in the East End. He noted there are several different community threads running through the cemetery. He observed from all the different partners how cared for and loved the cemetery is and looked forward to receiving recognition for such an important piece of their community and their history.

Ms McElhaney saw no other hands raised.

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

MOTION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission votes to provide a positive recommendation to City Council.

MOVED BY: Mr Wu

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2024-00053 – 912 Fort Duquesne Boulevard Install High Wall Signage Central Business District.

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing item. Ms Moradian presented the project for staff. The high wall signage was filed by Kolano Design for two high wall signs in the Golden Triangle Subdistrict C (GT-C), one at 195 sq ft and one at 314 sq ft on an existing building. The proposed signs meet the zoning criteria per Section 919.03.M.7(c). The proposed signs are the business name and logo mounted higher than 40 ft above grade, and do not exceed 2% of exposed facade area. The signs will not have any motion or animation. A ZBA hearing was not required. Design staff conducted a review of the proposed wall signs on January 5, 2024. Staff was supportive of the design and had no recommendations. There is a Registered Community Organization (RCO) at this location. A Development Activities Meeting was held on February 11, 2024, and was supportive. High wall signage in the GT-C requires a review and approval as a project development plan by the Planning Commission. Based on the information in the application and analysis of the facts of record, the city planning staff recommended approval of two new high wall signs of 195 sq ft and 314 sq ft, one on the north façade and one on the west façade of an existing 10-story building at 912 Fort Duquesne Blvd., Kolana Design, The applicant, presented slides of the high wall sign and logo. The Pittsburgh Foundation is the fourth major anchor tenant to occupy this building. It was built for Comco many years ago. Fiserv was the second major occupant. Then, it became the home of 4moms, who erected a high wall sign. Now, the Pittsburgh Foundation will occupy their space, and the Fort Duquesne sign will be in the same place where the 4moms sign was located. The applicant presented images of a requested sign plan representing the north facade facing Fort Duquesne Boulevard and the west façade, which are code compliant. The north facade at 2% allowance provides 195 square feet of sign permitted. The proposed sign will be using 195 square feet. The second façade provides 593 square feet for the logo mark. That sign will use about half of that at 314 square feet. The Pittsburgh Foundation sign type will be within a black band of spandrel glass between floors at the top of the building with vision glass above it and below it. The sign will be keeping to the dimension of the

spandrel glass of 49 feet by 4 feet high. The logo sign will be 22.5 feet by 14 feet. The applicant presented a view from a program that places a green light on the sign face and shines it outward. Everywhere the green light was depicted on the drawing the sign could be seen. The program is so detailed it also depicted the shadows on the river where the sign could not be seen. The 4-foot sign will be visible within a radius drawn in red around that green field. Both signs will be illuminated with the possibility to change color. The applicant didn't know if that would be affordable at the time of the presentation. A letter was submitted that the signs will comply with the city's illumination regulations. Another image showed the signs illuminated at night in the white and blue logo colors with the possibility to change for special events. The last views showed the signage from the Rachael Carson, Andy Warhol, and Roberto Clemente Bridges, and from inside PNC Park. Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony. Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised. Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for questions or comments or a motion.

MOTION: Based on the information in the application and analysis of the facts of record, the City Planning Staff recommends approval of two new high wall signs of 195 sq. ft. and 314 sq. ft.— one on north and one west facades—on existing ten-story building at 912 FORT DUQUESNE BLVD.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick
 SECONDED BY: Mr Wu
 IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu
 RECUSED: Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED

D. Director's Report
 None

E. Adjournment
 The meeting adjourned at 3:32 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

March 19, 2024 at 2:55 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell

Monica Ruiz
 Peter Quintanilla
 Phillip Wu

Not Present

Rachel O'Neill

Mel Ngami

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots	1
Hearing & Action 1. Saw Mill Run Green Boulevard Master Site Development Plan Beechview, Beltzhoover, Bon Air, Brookline, Carrick, Duquesne Heights, Knoxville, Mount Washington, Overbrook, Ridgemont, and West End. 2. DCP-MPZC-2024-00046 / Council Bill 2023-2330 – McKee Place and Louisa Street Oakland Land Use Plan Update and Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning district from UC-E (Urban Center – Employment) to Residential MixedUse (R-MU) for six parcels on the westerly side of McKee Place and Louisa Street Central Oakland..	2

A. Approval of Minutes

None.

MOTION:
 MOVED BY:
 SECONDED BY:
 IN FAVOR:
 ABSTAINED:
 CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2023-2330 Central Oakland Zoning Map Amendment

- Molly Finnell
- Georgia Petropoulos; Chief Executive Officer; Oakland Business Improvement District

Bedford Dwellings Francis Street Official Hill CDC/ DRP

- Marimba Milliones President and CEO, Hill CDC

C. Hearing & Action

1. Saw Mill Run Green Boulevard Master Site Development Plan Beechview, Beltzhoover, Bon Air, Brookline, Carrick, Duquesne Heights, Knoxville, Mount Washington, Overbrook, Ridgemont, and West End.

Ms Battistone presented slides and an outline of the site development plan. This project was really an initiative of Watersheds of South Pittsburgh. She presented a background of the corridor, an overview of the planning process, some of the key design focus areas, findings, and recommendations, and next steps. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr, a famous landscape architect known for Central Park, visited Pittsburgh. He urged that this corridor be preserved as a green boulevard and the open space maintained as a valuable public amenity. That is not exactly how it turned out. This corridor is subject to the kind of tragedies that come with being an urban stream. There have also been a lot of studies in this corridor over the last couple of decades. This project was an effort to bring all of that work together and actually move this corridor forward in a way that is valuable for the residents, for the environment, and for the stream. The study corridor specifically followed the ridgeline down to both Sawmill Run stream and Sawmill Run Road, going everywhere from the West End to Overbrook, including all the neighborhoods listed. The corridor conditions involved 24 flood events in the past 11 years. She stated that probably did not include basement backup flooding and less widespread flooding happening for property owners. The corridor has many used car lots, which means a lot of impervious surfaces making it difficult for the water to find anywhere to percolate into the ground. There is not a diverse mix of businesses, and it is not pedestrian friendly. There is little to no sidewalk connectivity or curb establishment along the corridor, which makes it difficult for drivers in vehicles and pedestrians, impacting the development along the stream, and the state route. The water quality is degraded because it is rushing straight from the road. There is no curb to stop it from going directly into the stream, bringing everything with it, sediment contaminants and large objects. This plan proposes to create some coordinated efforts on how to go about remedying some of these conditions. The plan identifies it as being a corridor of corridors. There is about 800 feet that include the south busway, a rail line, the Sawmill Run stream, Route 51, and the T-line. It is crammed with a lot of valuable thoroughfares and ecological elements. She presented several photos showing a car in the stream, the orange tint in the water from abandoned mine drainage, and the environmental issues to be dealt with, as well as how confined the space is, having all those different elements. She stated there is a huge opportunity here. Other photos showed the seldom seen greenway and Sawmill Run stream, and what a beautiful and valuable public amenity it could be with a fair amount of work on floodplain restoration and creation of a better connection through the corridor. A timeline on another slide depicted the planning process that occurred over a wide period of time. There was an advisory committee that convened monthly for the better part of two years, as well as public workshops, and larger public engagement, and specific interviews with stakeholders involving some of the larger businesses and property owners in the corridor. A lot of technical analysis went into identifying some of the key areas where interventions could have the most impact. The advisory committee involved many agencies that can or should play a role in this corridor, including PWSA, PENNDOT, Allegheny County, City Planning, Pittsburgh Regional Transit, State Representative Jessica Benham's office, Riverlife, board members from Watersheds of South Pittsburgh, and a handful of involved residents. The goals of the plan are both wide reaching and concentrated. They reflect looking at traffic and mobility issues in the corridor, environmental opportunities and obstacles, and what policies and specific planning tools could be deployed to improve some of these conditions. Recognizing that the property owners and people who live there have specific needs dealing with some of those more granular elements is a key to creating some of these larger changes. As stated earlier, the process spanned about two years, and started with receiving a grant from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to do this work, as well as funding from some foundations. After a consultant was selected the meetings kicked off in June. The meetings continued monthly until the fall. In the fall of 2022, there was a chartered bus tour with lots of stakeholders on the ground in the corridor. Making the mad dash across Sawmill Run as a pedestrian and the reality of what that's like was a very important bonding experience for people. There were also community workshops and design charettes, as well as key stakeholder interviews. Moving into the spring, the consultant team, Environmental Planning and Design, did a lot of technical analysis and

began drafting both an approach and a plan. Moving into the summer, it was submitted to DCNR. They sent back comments, and were incredibly supportive of the approach of this effort resulting in the plan. She stated, after coming to Planning Commission, they will be looking to submit the final report to DCNR. The technical analysis looked at the land use and zoning of this corridor; the environmental overlays, like steep slopes; the open space and parks that are present here; the specific transportation data, crash prone data, trips being made both through and within the corridor; and then the more ecological elements such as hydrology, flooding, and the acid mine drainage specifically. The technical analysis and stakeholder interviews all led to identifying six key design focus areas. The final plan has conceptual plans for each of these spaces, and what types of interventions could be effective in achieving some of those larger goals. For the West End, number one is the underutilized Wabash Park. If there were more natural elements, floodplain restoration could serve to improve the water quality and flooding the West End experiences, as well as being a more vibrant public amenity for the residents. A lot of the recommendations in this plan are focused on floodplain restoration and building upon the potential that's already there as a public park. Concerning the bathtub south of Woodruff Street, the plan makes some pretty intense recommendations about some check dams and pretty serious floodplain restoration there, since it is not necessarily a place that is publicly accessible and could work to hold some of the water from the rest of the corridor. Similarly, the same plan could be used at Red White and Blue Thrift in the Accamando Center with a mix of flood plan restoration and water quality interventions, and improved pedestrian connections through those spaces. At Ansonia Place where FEMA funds were used to buy those properties out. It's really low-lying and any kind of intervention or development there would need to be flood proofed. Ideally, it can be a space that connects pedestrians especially to the busway that lies right above it. The plan includes conceptual recommendations and plans for all of those spaces and identifies them as places where stakeholders should look to start implementation. A general statement of the recommendations defines some corridor wide policy and potential land use determinations and changes to be made, as well as focusing on site specific improvements in those design focus areas. Those two things together can really work to improve storm water and flooding in the corridor, as well as the general experience for those in vehicles, walking, rolling, biking, etc. Some of the policy recommendations are looking at implementing a zoning overlay that would make certain requirements about vehicular access management, such as how many curb cuts there are to any specific property. That could have a range of benefits environmentally, for mobility, reducing some of the impervious surface to help improve the flooding and storm water management, keeping a specific eye on pedestrian safety and mobility concerns by controlling setbacks both from the street and from the stream. A lot of buildings are built right up to the stream, which leaves very little room for flooding, and creates a really dangerous situation. It also makes it difficult for stream bank and slope stabilization. Moving the plan into implementation, the planning and management concerned how to convene people who can and want to do the work to improve this corridor. That would include everyone from nonprofit partners and the city council offices, to the residents who feel like 311 is not effective in addressing their concerns. Other concerns involved how to create a forum to facilitate discussions; how to evaluate the progress of the group and recommendations; what can be prioritized among the design focus areas; key funding and partnership opportunities. Some of the obstacles are the large number of agencies that work in this corridor from PENNDOT to the railroads, to DOMI and how to convene and coordinate all of those efforts; the difficulty to enforce policy changes if no redevelopment is occurring; and the level of intervention needed to improve the stream and the right of way conditions. Some of the opportunities in implementing this are concentrating on those design focus areas, and avoiding any missed opportunities for coordinating or partnering with groups like The Army Corps of Engineers to help do some of the more intensive floodplain restoration. Another opportunity is how to utilize the large amount of publicly owned land adjacent to the stream and the road to make some of these changes. And then lastly, how can the rollout of the comprehensive plan feed into the Sawmill Run Development Plan and vice versa? She stated a lot of this is top down and bottom up at the same time. There needs to be some large serious policy changes, but there also needs to be site improvements where people can see visible change and get involved, as well.

Ms Winterbrown stated anyone who's been down to the stream is always surprised at how beautiful it actually is. There are fish, there are birds, there are snapping turtles, and it offers a unique space for improvement. Other cities have done this with their urban streams. To have an urban stream that is mostly open and that people could possibly enjoy is unique, and this is something that could really benefit not only the city of Pittsburgh but our region as well. She believed this plan offers a template for these kinds of projects elsewhere, especially in the state of Pennsylvania, because there are a lot of streams that have experienced these issues. In fact, DCNR was really quite pleased with this plan and how broadly we tackled it, really focusing on the issues, and offering some wonderful solutions.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for comments from commissioners or a motion from the floor.

Ms Ruiz commented she is very happy I live close to this and I see it every day, and cannot wait to see.

Ms Dick thought a tremendous amount of spade work and detailed research has been done on this project by many community groups and governmental agencies at all levels. She thought it was a really encouraging piece of work. She moved to accept this study.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission **ACCEPTS** the Saw Mill Run Green Boulevard Plan.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

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

CARRIED

2. DCP-MPZC-2024-00046 / Council Bill 2023-2330 – McKee Place and Louisa Street Oakland Land Use Plan Update and Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning district from UC-E (Urban Center – Employment) to Residential Mixed Use (R-MU) for six parcels on the westerly side of McKee Place and Louisa Street Central Oakland

Mr Fraker presented the land use update and zoning map amendment for staff. The proposal was for an update to the Oakland land use plan and zoning map amendment to change the zoning map for certain parcels in central Oakland. The proposed master plan zone change application, DCP-MPZC-2024-00046, was filed by Cn Bob Charland to change the zoning district for six parcels at the corner of McKee Place and Louisa Street from Urban Center-Employment (UC-E) to Residential-Mixed Use (R-MU). The intent of the UC-E district is to support life sciences, health care, and other employment uses. The priority is on employment over residential uses. The

intent of the R-MU is to provide healthy, attractive, multi-family residential uses with neighborhood-serving retail. In the UC-E district, either 100% of residential units must be affordable and located on site, or residential housing shall be less than 50% of the gross floor area in a mixed-use structure. In the R-MU district, the standard inclusionary zoning requirements would apply. This would require 10% of units to be inclusionary units with an affordability period of 35 years. Both zoning districts are governed by the 120-foot max height requirement. There are also minor differences in the upper story step back requirements between the districts. In addition to the zoning map amendment, the Planning Commission can consider an update to the land use strategy of the 2022 Oakland plan, in which the land use map would align with the new proposed zoning district. The current land use strategy map includes the parcels to be rezoned as part of the Innovation District. If the plan were to be updated in concurrence with the zone change, the parcels would be part of the higher density residential land use type. These two districts are characterized by different development standards and goals for the Innovation District which prioritizes new research and development buildings, and the higher density residential land use type which prioritizes residential options for long-term residents, including graduate students and neighborhood-serving retail. For the proposed zone change to align with the land use strategy, the Planning Commission may consider revising the

land use strategy and concurrence with their recommendation regarding zone change. Planning staff found that the proposed Oakland land use plan update and zoning map amendment are in compliance with the Oakland plan. Both the UC-E and R-MU zoning districts were conceived as part of a community driven process during the adoption of the Oakland plan. The recommended motion is for the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh to approve an update to the Oakland land use plan to revise land use strategy and the land use strategy map, as outlined in D18 on page 74 of the Oakland plan, from Innovation District to high density residential, and that the Planning Commission approves DCP-MPZC-2024-00046 for the zoning map amendment to change from Urban Center-Employment (UC-E) to Residential-Mixed Use (R-MU) for certain properties located on McKee Place in Central Oakland.

Mr Kamin, council for the property owner, stated the owner had previously worked with Cn Bruce Krauss's office, and now Cn Bob Charland's office, to essentially introduce both this zone change and map amendment in order to move forward.

Ms Alicia Carberry spoke on behalf of Cn Bob Charland who was not able to be present at the hearing. She stated he looked forward to following up and reviewing the commission meeting. She stated this new rezoning will continue to help guide the growth in Oakland and create necessary high-quality housing. It also brings with these parcels a conforming use consistent with their current use. She wanted to let the record reflect that Cn Charland is committed, with the help from partners in Oakland planning and the Oakland Innovation District, to a second step where he will engage in a rezoning of UC-E parcels between Senate and Louisa Streets in the stepdown area to continue to better fit the needs of Oakland.

Mr Kamin presented slides of an area that is part of this rezoning application bounded by Louisa Street and McKee Place. Closer to the Forbes Avenue Corridor, they showed a 1980's vintage office building owned by UPMC. Diagonally across the street are the HERE Apartments for student housing, which have recently been completed, they showed the former UJF office building that has now been demolished. Notably, even though that was an office building, the entire site was residentially zoned before the UJF building was a non-conforming use. Aerial shots showed the surrounding conditions currently in the neighborhood. They showed the shared access of the UPMC property and the UJF building, now razed. The view of Louisa Street and McKee Place buildings showed what would be considered pre-war, multi-family units and which are currently 99% student housing. A view up from Louisa Street showed apartment property owned by Walnut Capital on the other side of Louisa Street where there are some very special public realm opportunities that extend not just down to Louisa Street but also on McKee Place. Mr Kamin highlighted the UC-E, which is really the Fifth and Forbes Corridor, that extends into the neighborhoods slightly. UC-E is really about employment not about residential use. It focuses on lab space, office space, and other employment opportunities. If there is a new property with more than 50% residential, 100% of those units must be affordable. Looking at what would be the proper highest and best use for this site given the surrounding neighborhood, and also its presence off of the Fifth and Forbes Corridor, after significant study, our conclusion is that residential-mixed use is what is best for that site. It does give an opportunity to continue the use. It is adjacent to a residentially zoned district. In terms of the uses focusing on the E aspect of the UC-E,

they're not generally going to be interested, at least at this point, in dropping off of the Fifth and Forbes Corridor. One of the reasons that this makes sense is, looking at the purposes of both zoning districts juxtaposed to each other, the priority of the UC-E is on employment over residential uses. Then, looking at the intended purpose of the R-MU district, the priority is to provide healthy, attractive, and affordable rental housing and multi-family buildings, encouraging a mixture of restored historic homes and modern apartment buildings with neighborhood-serving retail. He stated they thought the R-MU is very consistent with what these properties want and should be and historically have been. One of the other points they wanted to make about McKee Place when it comes to the public realm is that there is a 40-foot deep setback that runs south of Forbes Avenue along all of McKee Place. That provides a wonderful opportunity for public realm improvements that are not just in the right of way but also fronting these properties. Also, they believed the 40-foot deep setback fits in very nicely with residential mixed use, providing an opportunity for people who reside there to have great access to the outside, and also for the neighborhood-serving retail to have coffee shops and places to sit outside. This provides a much

more meaningful way for the development to engage in the community and to become part of something very special on a residential-mixed use basis below Forbes Avenue.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms Georgia Petropoulis, CEO of the Oakland Business Improvement District (OBID), a Registered Community Organization representing Oakland, stated the commission had received their letter of support on behalf of their board of directors. She was here to reiterate a few key points. They understand Oakland another downtown regional economic renter that benefits not only the immediate surrounding area in Oakland but also the region at large. She was proud they saw local, regional, and international populations. It is really no surprise that five years after the Oakland plan process began in 2019, and after a major pandemic, they are here reviewing land use plans and strategies and how that best serves the needs of not only our community but also of our city. The city is undertaking a very similar approach in downtown, the biggest employment center, through its comprehensive plan on how to meet the needs of housing. She was proud Oakland is responding to those needs and aligning with the city's approaches throughout Pittsburgh. She noted there were two cities that The Open Plan team referenced and used as precedent, midtown Atlanta and University City Philadelphia, of which she, her colleagues, and members of their board visited. One of the things they learned about high economic impact growth areas of both of those cities also serving a large university hospital community district is they annually re-review their zoning and land use plans to make sure that keeps up with the needs of a constantly growing region and population. She stated they support and agree that this is the highest and best use not only for Oakland but for the city of Pittsburgh.

Ms McElhaney recognized Mike Madden.

Mr Madden, representing the Pittsburgh Innovation District, wanted to give a brief verbatim testimony of support that will also complement the letter of support that they sent earlier in the day. "The Pittsburgh Innovation District would like to offer strong support for the proposed zoning amendment change to the aforementioned parcels going from UC-E to R-MU. While we support UC-E Zoning for the blocks from Fifth and Forbes, it is critical that the surrounding areas support the corridor of innovation with high density residential and mixed uses. Given Oakland's important role in the present and future of Pittsburgh's economy, zoning regulations must allow the building of the highest and best use of the land surrounding the Fifth and Forbes corridor. We believe mixed use residential is the highest, best use for McKee Place at this current time. The development will provide opportunities for Pittsburgh to compete with our peer innovation districts for talent and investment by providing critical walk to work housing. We encourage the Planning Commission to adopt this proposed zoning amendment and thank you for your consideration.

Ms McElhaney recognized Andrea Boykowycz.

Ms Boykowycz, Executive Director at Oakland Planning and Development Corporation and a resident of Oakland, stated she had not yet submitted written testimony. This has been a bit of a moving target. She wanted to offer this a little bit off the cuff to say OPDC supports the development of multi-family housing in central Oakland within easy reach of Oakland's educational employment centers, recognizing that the shortage of that housing is one of the contributors to unaffordability in the neighborhoods. The parcels in question are by and large currently residential, and there's no concern in that regard for compatibility of use. She said emphatically they do not support this particular approach to public planning whereby bills are introduced from City Council for this particular purpose. It circumvents the public process. It undermines, ultimately, the Department of City Planning. It erodes the public trust in the planning process. She echoed that it is necessary to engage critically with the plan especially in similar districts as in Oakland where there is both residential and a robust business center. She stated it's important to keep up on that. This kind of approach to rezoning does not allow for that kind of broad, public, critical engagement. Especially given the hundreds of hours that neighborhood residents and stakeholders put into the recently completed Oakland plan process, there was no public objection of any kind during those years we were all spending about including these particular parcels in the UC-E. There are different interpretations of what constitutes the highest best use there, and it's open to that kind of interpretation. Alluding to the statement that Ms Carberry read from Cn Bob Charland at the beginning, OPDC would support a public process led by the Department of City Planning with participation from Oakland's RCO's and its city council representatives to consider whether a larger section of the UC-E below Senate St or Iroquois St

should be rezoned as UC-E, which would be a better base zone for that swath. Perhaps it would because there is demand in this section for both residential and commercial uses, including neighborhood serving businesses. She wanted to be able to say for the record they don't have an objection to the change in use to residential for this section, but they would very much prefer a public planning process to be able to deliver these kinds of responses to the changing markets in Oakland.

Ms McElhaney saw no other hands raised.

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

MOTION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES an update to the Oakland Land Use Plan to revise the Land Use Strategy Map, as outlined in D-18 on page 74 of the Oakland Plan for (Parcels 28-F-314, 28-F-310, 28-F308, 28-F-306, 28-F-304, and 28-F-302).

MOVED BY: Mr Wu

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

Mr Dash reported last week the mayor launched the comprehensive planning process. At this point in time, consultants have been selected for both engagement and for technical services. We are working to finalize the scopes to get into the contracting process with them. Even though the announcement was made last week, there is some time until we really get underway with the consultants. As we get things finalized with the consultants and get them on board we'll be reaching out to start interaction with the commission on the plan as well.

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

April 2, 2024 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

Mel Ngami
Peter Quintanilla
Phillip Wu

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Monica Ruiz

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00316, Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, Major Lot Line Revision, Squirrel Hill North	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2021-12009 - 1903 Fifth Avenue New construction of two Mixed-Use structures with shared plaza and parking Crawford-Roberts 2. DCP-MPZC-2023-00693 and DCP-ZDR-2023-11179 - 4644 Forbes Avenue Minor Amendment to the Carnegie Mellon University 2022 Institutional Master Plan, and new construction of the CMU Richard King Mellon Hall of Sciences North Oakland	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from February 20,2024.

MOTION: To approve minutes from February 20, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

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

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Temporary Managed Communities

- Gina Grone, Executive Director; North Side/Shore Chamber of Commerce

DCP-ZDR-2021-12009

- David Rotenstein

DCP-MPZC-2023-00693 and DCP-ZDR-2023-11179 - 4644 Forbes Avenue

- Georgia Petropoulos; Chief Executive Officer; Oakland Business Improvement District

DCP-ZDR-2021-12009. 1903 Fifth Ave (3 additional pieces of correspondence)

- Helen Perilloux, Uptown Resident
- Jeanne C. McNutt
- Rona L Peckich

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00316, Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, Major Lot Line Revision, Squirrel Hill North
Mr Scheppke presented the lot line revision. The recommended notion was to preliminarily approve the revision and schedule final review 04/16/2024.

MOTION: Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, 14th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on April 2, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on April 16, 2024

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu
CARRIED.

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-MPZC-2024-00046, Council Bill 2023-2330

Chair Burton-Faulk clarified from the 03/19/24 meeting, the intent of the Planning Commission was to vote on a positive recommendation with the following motion on Council Bill 2023-24. She needed a motion, a second, and a full vote intended for the Planning Commission of the city of Pittsburgh to make a positive recommendation on zone change application DCP-MPZC-2024-00046, Council Bill 2023-2330, for a zoning map amendment to change from Urban Center-Employment (UC-E) to Residential- Mixed Use (R-MU) certain properties are parcels 28-F-314, 28-F310, 28-F-308, 28-F-306, 28-F-304, and 28-F-302 located on McKee Place in Central Oakland.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED: Ms Ngami,

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2021-12009 - 1903 Fifth Avenue New construction of two Mixed-Use structures with shared plaza and parking Crawford-Roberts.

Ms Moradian presented the project for staff. The project development plan application DCP-ZDR-2021-12009 was for new construction of a 254-unit, transit oriented, six-story, mixed-use development in the Uptown Public Realm Subdistrict B (UPR-B) zoning district. The proposed request was to consolidate 23 parcels. The development will consist of two six-story structures, Building A and Building B, with a 254-unit variety of apartment types and sizes, and retail and amenity spaces on the ground floor, which is separated by the courtyard in between. The plan will consist of vehicle parking in Building B on two underground levels, and indoor and outdoor bicycle parking in both buildings on the first floor. At least 5% of units will be designated as affordable housing for below 80% AMI. An environmental performance standard has been reviewed per code Chapter 915, and the staff supported the storm water strategy. Storm water permit SWM-2023-17184 was issued and complies with the requirements of Chapter 13 and the City of Pittsburgh Storm Water Design Manual. The site will meet their performance by having two bonus points per Section 911.07.D.5.d. The Green Building Advisory Committee was held May 16, 2023. The site will have a BRT stop, allowing residents access to the major employers, universities, and city. A Development Activities Meeting was held January 17, 2023. There are four Registered Community Organizations at this location. Design review staff have recommended review by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel, which supported the overall massing and scale of the design and site. The proposed mixed-use development meets the zoning code criteria per Section 908.04.C.2. The Historic Review Commission review was conditionally approved on March 6, 2024, with a few final details on the garage demolition needing to be submitted for final

approval. The transportation development review application was under review by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure (DOMI). The construction management was approved, meeting Section 917.06. Per Section 914.1.B.2, the Zoning Administrator required the reduction of the off-street loading, based on Section 914.10.A. The mixed-use development in the UPR-B district must be reviewed and approved as a project development plan per Section 908.01.F. Based on the information in the application and a list of the facts of record, the city planning staff recommended approval of the new construction of the 254-unit, transit oriented, six-story, mixed-use development in the UPR-B zoning district with the following conditions: 1. The Historical Review Commission shall approve the final detail of the garage demolition; 2. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall approve all DOMI permits and the construction management plan before issuing the Record of Zoning Approval (ROZA); 3. The final construction plans, including site plan, floor plan and elevations must be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator before issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

The project team included Brent Little of Fountain Residential Partners, Brian O'Connor of Qube3, Michael Takacs, Bowler Engineering Site Civil Consultant.

The team began the presentation stating they worked very closely with DOMI, city staff, Historic Review Commission, Uptown Partners, and other groups, on the dedication of the Tito house preservation. Slides showing the parcel conveyance of the Tito house depicted the existing configuration of the 23 parcels that comprise the site, total project area boundary, and the actual Tito house at 1817 Fifth Avenue to be purchased and then donated to Uptown Partners. In addition to the Tito house and parcel, they were also donating the property immediately to the west of the Tito house up to the DPW building. There will be a 10-foot setback from the proposed project to give the Tito house itself and property more room to breathe. A historic review hearing was held regarding the Tito house preservation. In order to access the garage off Colwell Street, because of the grade, they needed to apply for a demolition permit for the Tito garage. The team and the HRC worked to provide a meaningful reuse of some of the material from the Tito garage by salvaging some of the brick to recreate the garage facade on the west end of Building B along Colwell Street. The recreation will be at the same location where the Tito garage once stood. The team showed a number of slides presenting the development located on 23 Parcels, 2.17 acres, with a mix of one, two, and three-bedroom units and approximately 6,600 square feet of ground floor amenity space. The project will be a transit-oriented development located in the Crawford Roberts neighborhood that will be able to connect people from downtown to the university district. They presented context photos, elevations and perspectives of both buildings, the architectural design and the break-up of the facades, the massing and neighborhood context, the configuration of the two separate buildings interconnected by the courtyard, and the use of high quality materials to create visual interest. They settled on a warm color palette using colors, textures, and tones contextually consistent with the long history of masonry buildings in Pittsburgh. There is a 40-foot grade change, a fairly significant challenge topographically, and a lot of the elevation decisions were directly related to this topography. Both Building A and Building B will be organized in an east-west fashion to work with grading to create an active and engaging street edge to Building A, having bike lanes, bus routes, and car access along Fifth Avenue, and a courtyard space between the two buildings. Working with the topography of the site and because there is no ramping in the garage, all parking for the site will be located off Colwell Street with a separate entrance to each of the two levels of parking. There will be public bike parking, along with a rental bike station. Building A will have both retail and amenity space accessed directly from Fifth Avenue. A considerable amount of time was paid to the Fifth Avenue frontage, making sure there will be visible entries, transparency, and prominence to the front of the building. Beginning from the west end of Building A at the Fifth Avenue ground level elevation, there will be a primary amenity space, and an open street-level plaza with access to both the amenity space and one of the retail blocks. Next, there will be two retail blocks, open bike parking and a lounge area, and vehicular access to a loading and service area from Fifth Avenue at the eastern edge, along with accessible elevator access. Level 2 will be residential units only along the front edge of the building above the retail and amenity space. The balance of the backside of Building A will be in the hill. Level 3 will have a full floor of residential units and amenity spaces with direct access off the courtyard space between the two buildings. Full residential floors continue up on levels 4 through 6. Building B will have residential access points along Colwell Street mostly towards Dinwiddie St to the west. The levels in Building B begin with two levels of underground parking below the level of Colwell Street. Building B will have the

first residential level even with Colwell Street and continuing up through levels 2 to 6. Public access to the courtyard will be provided from Fifth Avenue using a set of stairs on the west end of the property. In addition, there would be an ADA accessible route through the plaza carved out at the ground level of Building A. The site will include universal access to users of all abilities. A slide was presented summarizing the areas that will be fully accessible and comply with universal design criteria. Another slide depicted a sample unit showing all of the turning radii and accessibility criteria required. All common outdoor spaces on Fifth Avenue, the courtyard, and building interiors will be ADA accessible. Also noted at the ground floor plaza area between the sections of Building A was a placeholder for public artwork. The team will involve public artists and the artistic community to create an opportunity for art and community engagement. The project will use landscaping and urban design appropriate to native and regional species. A slide illustrated the landscaping plan and amenity spaces in the courtyard, keeping to as many native species as possible. The use of non-natives or ornamentals, where necessary, will be kept to a bare minimum. None of the street trees or the outside plantings of the amenity space would fall into that category. There will be landscaping along Building B on Colwell Street as well. The stair access on the west side of Building A will be screened with landscaping to minimize that elevation difference. The courtyard will be made up of a series of separate paved areas using a variety of paver types, stamped concrete pavement, and potentially artificial turf in some areas. There will be outdoor seating for gathering, planters, cafe tables for outdoor dining, and an outdoor kitchen and pavilion. They also proposed a semicircular outdoor stage and projection screen in the courtyard. There will be a small fenced dog area on the west side of the site. The public plaza space on Fifth Avenue underneath Building A will contain outdoor patio furniture and tables with umbrellas as it extends out beyond an overhang. The next slide presented the approved storm water management plan which will manage the rate and volume requirements set forth by the city. It will also secure two additional height credits. The plan will capture the storm water from the roofs into two separate storm water collection tanks. That water will be reused for irrigation of the property's landscaping in the amenity space as well as in front of both Buildings A and B. The water then will go into a series of underground chambers with infiltration capacity where the water will discharge out into the public system in Fifth Avenue. Slides were presented outlining the community process, working extensively with Uptown Partners and various agencies in Pittsburgh. One thing that was not actually identified at a previous meeting was their commitment to 5% of the units being affordable at or below 80% of AMI. Also presented was a slide depicting the construction management of the site.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized David Rotenstein.

Mr Rotenstein spoke in opposition to the proposal. His testimony supplemented and expanded on the written testimony that the commission received by email, which was acknowledged by the chair. He addressed the Historic Review Commission's approval of the demolition of the Tito garage on Colwell Street, stating they made a significant error both in historic preservation law and practice. On May 3, 2023, he quoted the applicant telling the historic review commission nothing appeared to have collapsed from the outside of the building and appeared to be generally sound. The applicant said the building was in the way of the overall development goals. He stated the applicant repeated this information in the June 7, 2023, HRC meeting, saying it was not structurally deficient. It was a concrete pad with block walls around the perimeter and will be there for another thousand years, except the roof will probably fall off. He stated the applicant made the case that there was no legitimate reason, historically speaking, for approving the demolition of fully 50% of the architectural fabric that comprises the historically landmarked Tito Mecha Zizah house. He also stated there was no economic hardship presented. He then noted in hearing this case over three sessions in 2023, the HRC failed to apply the relevant section of the historic preservation code in making its decision. He said witnesses were able to hear about the commissioners' opinions and feelings on the proposed project, but there was no mention of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of historic properties. He said in the city of Pittsburgh's historic preservation law, there is a requirement that the HRC rely on those standards and guidelines in rendering decisions for certificates of appropriateness. In lieu of design guidelines and standards created for individual properties and historic districts, the commission shall use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation after a property is nominated for historic preservation until it develops guidelines specifically for a structure, district, site, or object. These guidelines cover the treatment of all work requiring a building

demolition or site permit. He asked the commission to reconsider what its obligations are with respect to public process and the law with regard to historic properties in the city of Pittsburgh.

Ms McElhaney recognized Rona L Peckich.

Ms Peckich stated she represented the Tito Mecca Ziza families. She said she tried very hard to work with everybody, being as kind and as nice as she could. She stated, for her, the hard part about it was that the garage, actually built by her family, is the historic part of Rolling Rock Beer. She noted her letter in which she contacted Anheuser Bush, who were quite excited about hearing this, had no idea. She stated she thought the property was done as one designation, one entire property, not two separate buildings. She said it is a responsibility to stand behind the word of what we are told. She stated the HRC didn't want to be involved. They didn't like her family. And, they weren't very kind. When the city got involved, they realized how important this property was. Unfortunately, now, the most historic part of the property is going to be taken down. She said she wanted to speak on behalf of her family and asked the commission to reconsider that.

Ms McElhaney saw no other hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked for comments from commissioners or a motion from the floor.

Ms Ngami was concerned about the percentage of affordable housing only being 5%, considering its context and location. She thought the number seemed a bit low. She also worried that people were bringing up the fact it isn't meeting the legislation for historic preservation. She stated she would have to abstain from voting on this because it was next to a project she was working on.

Ms O'Neill wanted to clarify the scope of what they were looking at. HRC made a recommendation. The Planning Commission was not necessarily making a recommendation on the historic status of the property. She didn't think that was within their purview. She then asked if someone could clarify this property had not been designated historic and was not otherwise within a historic district.

Mr Tacaks stated it was years ago.

Ms O'Neill asked if it had been designated as an individual landmark, and then HRC reviewed and approved the demolition of the garage and this reuse.

Mr Tacaks said correct, yes.

Ms O'Neill stated they didn't need to retread something that HRC had already reviewed and approved and wasn't within the commission's purview. They were mostly looking at the status of the proposed development, and she wanted to confirm that for the record.

Ms Moradian stated the HRC gave a conditional approval. The applicant should provide additional information on how they want to demolish the garage, along with a drawing to the HRC.

Ms O'Neill asked if they would have to go back to HRC with that.

Ms Moradian said this was one of the conditions for approval.

Ms O'Neill verified, whether the commission approved or not, would they still have to go back to HRC with that information?

Mr Tacaks stated that was correct. He clarified it was a materials handling plan on how the material was going to be taken off, handled, stored, and then readied for reuse. Another meeting was not necessary. No vote was necessary by the HRC. It was simply preparing and handing the materials handling plan to them.

Chair Burton-Faulk verified what Mr Tacaks was saying, when they go back to the HRC, they are just looking at the final details. There is no vote.

Mr Tacaks said that was correct. They won't actually go back before the HRC. It would be similar to an NPDS permit, or in this case, the DOMI permit. They would not come back before Planning Commission. Once they received the DOMI permit, they would submit that to staff and that would satisfy the condition.

Ms O'Neill wanted to clarify it was not just submitting to HRC. Staff would review to make sure it was compliant with the HRC recommendation approval. She wanted to be clear it is staff approval and the submission alone doesn't meet that requirement.

Mr Tacaks understood.

Mr Wu asked, when the site plan was done, was there any analysis of ways to work around the garage in the proposed development?

Mr O'Connor stated yes, the architects and engineers both tried to work with the topography. The issue is the location of the garage on the site behind the building that they are saving. He said essentially, they could save one or the other, but they couldn't save both because the topography is both 50 feet from front to back and also side to side. That was the only place they could access the

building for the garage. They tried very hard with multiple site plans to save the garage. He stated they even offered to tear it down and move it to the other side of the street and things like that. In the end this is the agreement they came to with the HRC, to reuse the brick. He said they will take it down, they will put it back up, and it will now be an entry to the new garage. It will kind of serve the same purpose. There will be a plaque there. They will be working with Ms Peckich on the terminology on the plaque for her family, memorializing that. He stated they did a lot of work both with the HRC, Uptown Partners, with the family, and the rest to come to this accommodation. It was the best they could do over working almost a year with all of these groups to come to this accommodation. Ms O'Neill wanted to clarify her earlier comments. She asked if HRC reviewed this. Her personal view, not the opinion of the commission, was she didn't think it was necessarily within their purview. Their decisions are appealable if somebody feels that they are incorrect, but it's not necessarily the Planning Commission's job to review HRC decisions that aren't otherwise required to come before the commission like a historic nomination. All the historic background and work that's been done notwithstanding, her review today was limited to the future project because the rest has been addressed by HRC.

Chair Burton-Faulk echoed Ms O'Neill's comments as a commissioner, also.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there was any further comment from any additional commissioner. If not, was there a motion based on the information in the application and the analysis of facts of record the City Planning staff recommended approval for new construction of a 254-unit, transit oriented, six-story, mixed use development in the Uptown Public Realm District B (UPR-B) zoning district with the following conditions: 1. The Historical Review Commission shall approve the final details of the garage demolition; 2. The Department of Mobility and Infrastructure shall approve all DOMI permits in the construction management plan before issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and 3. The final construction plans, including site plans and elevations, must be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator before issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

MOTION:

Based on the information in the application and analysis of the facts of record, the City Planning Staff recommends approval for a new construction of a 254-unit transit-oriented 6-floor mixed-use development in the Uptown Public Realm District B (UPR-B), zoning district.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

ABSTAINED: Ms Ngami

CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2023-00693 and DCP-ZDR-2023-11179 - 4644 Forbes Avenue Minor Amendment to the Carnegie Mellon University 2022 Institutional Master Plan, and new construction of the CMU Richard King Mellon Hall of Sciences North Oakland

Mr Fraker presented for staff the minor amendment to the CMU Institutional Master Plan and for construction of a new campus academic field. The minor amendment is for revision to the setback on Forbes Avenue from 10ft to 4ft 11in to allow for an upper story overhang. The ground level will retain the 10-foot setback as provided in the IMP. The new construction is for a roughly 345,000 square-foot campus building that will serve multiple uses and be home to the CMU Richard King Mellon Hall of Sciences. The uses will include educational classroom, laboratory research, and cultural services. There will also be ground floor restaurant use and accessory parking below. The storm water management plan for the project was currently under review. There were no Zoning Board of Adjustment requests for the project. The applicant will comply with the IMP campus reforestation plan, and will be replanting trees on site and providing the remainder of the required trees on a separate site on campus. The project will include many improvements to the public grounds on Forbes Avenue, including plaza space for leisure in front of the building, a continuous planter pit for trees along Forbes Avenue, and shaded places for pedestrians' refuge within the wide setback in front of the building. The project will also make way for future improvements along the S Neville/Boundary Street Corridor, which will assist in making this area more accessible to pedestrians and cyclists. The applicant will be working with DOMI on implementation of the sidewalk in this area. In the future, the Oakland Plan

envisioning a safe multimodal connection from Fifth Avenue to the Junction Hollow Trail. The improvements associated with this project will be a first step in the implementation of that important Oakland Plan project. The project was reviewed at Staff Design Review and then by the Contextual Design Advisory Panel. The panel reviewed the project favorably. A Development Activities Meeting was held January 25 with the Oakland Business Improvement District, Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, and Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition. The project was found to comply with the Oakland Plan. In line with Policy D2 and Goal M2B of the Oakland Plan, staff would like the applicant to continue making efforts to include a vertical connection through the parcel that would connect the future multi-user path on S Neville St with the higher elevations of the parcel on Museum Access Drive and Forbes Avenue. The recommended motion was that the Planning Commission approve DCP-MPZC-2023-00693 and DCP-ZDR-2023-11179 for minor amendment to the CMU Institutional Master Plan, and for new construction of the RKM Hall of Sciences Building with the following conditions: 1. That the applicant explore all feasible ways to add a connection through the subject parcel that connects S Neville St with the higher ground on Museum Access Dr at Forbes Ave; 2. That the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure review and approve all DOMI permits and construction management plans prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval; and 3. 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.

Bob Reppe presented slides about the building, having 280,000 gross square feet of usable space, as well as an additional 65,000 gross square feet for parking spaces under the building. It will include teaching, research, and cultural services for the new Institute for Contemporary Art Pittsburgh location, as well as additional outdoor plaza space, integrated public art throughout, and improved connections with the neighborhood. This project is identified as site number 20 in the 2022 Institutional Master Plan for Carnegie Mellon University. The project meets all of those components with one small shaving of area. The project meets the height requirements from the IMP as well as the uses, the step backs, and the mobility and public realm components. A minor amendment to the IMP was being requested to allow for a slight overhang of the second floor. Existing photos depicted a prominent corner as Forbes Ave transitions from the Oakland Civic Center District in a slight bend in the road along the Carnegie Museums as it transitions eastbound toward Squirrel Hill. Currently, the site is predominantly a surface parking lot and a vacant bank building that the university owns and intends to demolish as part of this project. The site is constrained with regard to connections because of a significant amount of grade that the project will need to mitigate. About 75 feet of grade crosses the site from Forbes Ave and S Craig St. down to S Neville St. All service activity to the building will be from S Neville St. The next slides outlined the urban design and massing components of the building. The building will have two primary components. There is the three-story part along Forbes Ave that matches the setback of the existing Carnegie Museum of Art, Barnes Edition, and maintains that setback, as well as the parapet height along the northern edge of the building, creating a large open outdoor space, hopefully, blending with the plaza across the S Craig St connection and into the Carnegie Museum plaza. The second major component of the building is the research tower, which is pushed as far away from Forbes Ave as possible. It also provides very significant views of Oakland and the CMU campus. There are two primary entrances to the building, the academic or campus entry directly from the bridge over the railroad, and the ICA/Craig St entrance at the corner of Forbes Ave and S Craig St. The university also intends to have a ground floor, full-service restaurant open to the public in that building close to Forbes Ave. At that location there is about 16 feet of open space. The next slide showed the setback requirements in the IMP. The design team worked very hard to meet all those requirements as well as commitments the university made to the Carnegie Museum of Art. There is a slight encroachment into the setback on the second floor of the building. On the ground floor the building is fully in compliance with the 10-foot setback requirement. It is only on the second floor where there is a slight overhang partly driven by the geometry of Forbes Ave as it rounds the corner off S Craig St that allowed this penetration of about a 4-foot into that second-floor setback area. It is about 67 square feet in total. Considering the footprint of the second floor is over 8,000 square feet, it is .8% of the floor plan actually in the setback from the museum. The building moves further east and opens views back to campus, especially to Hamburg Hall. For that reason, the team felt it was an appropriate amount. That is why a minor amendment to the master plan was being requested. There are a number of important public realm components to this building. Number one will be the gallery terrace. There is about 6 feet of grade along Forbes Ave from S Craig St to the

bridge over the railroad. While maintaining a fully accessible sidewalk with the street trees along Forbes Ave, there will be three smaller trays with grade between them. The first at the gallery terrace. The second at the restaurant, including outdoor seating on Forbes Avenue. And, the third at the academic terrace off the Forbes Avenue Bridge. The site plan has three important parts. The first along Museum Access Drive is a scallop taken out of the west side of the property to allow the turning radius the Carnegie Museum of Art needs for service vehicles using its loading dock. The second point on the site plan is the garage entry. While the main entry to the parking garage, and daily use, will be off of Neville St, a secondary entrance will be provided off the lower Museum Access Drive, allowing for flexing back and forth between the museum and the university in parking when they have busier days, for example over the winter break or over the Thanksgiving break. The university can open its parking garage for the museum to use. The last major point in the site plan is the area slated for a future sidewalk-pedestrian connection along S Neville St. All public space in the central hub of the building on the ground floor will be open to the general public during normal university business hours. The main entrance to the ICA is off Craig St. The campus entrance is near the restaurant where the building comes closest to Forbes Ave. There will be a pullout along Forbes Ave in the tree lane to allow for pedestrian drop off or for Uber pickups. Other significant components on this ground floor for the university are a series of classrooms and the biology and computational biology teaching labs. A stacking drawing showed how the building components. Both the Mellon College of Science as well as the School of Computer Science are stacked together along S Neville on top of the mechanical in the parking garage that goes down to S Neville St. The larger spaces for the gallery and the MCS Dean Suite are located in the three-story component. The building also includes nearly 75,000 square feet of shell space that allows the campus to be able to adapt and grow to future-proof the science and the computer science research in the building.

Kate Mann presented slides about the building massing and materiality and renderings showing the plaza and changing building facades. In order to break up the height of the building, the tower, which is the seven stories of lab and office space, will be on top of four floors of parking below. The team zoned the materials as they move up the building to give it scale. Standing on the plaza looking directly at the restaurant, the street level is glass with slightly glazed terracotta ribbed-shaped detailing seen around the Carnegie Mellon campus. That will catch some reflection to create a very bright and welcoming entry floor in contrast to the Carnegie Museum. Two materials used in contrast on the facades at the second floor "loop" of the building containing the ICA galleries, and the "thistle" containing the public classroom spaces, grow vertically as Carnegie Mellon's thistle icon grows. One is ultra high performance concrete in a warm white with a bit of speckled aggregate in context with other buildings on Forbes Ave. An accent to that is the copper vertical fins, and the way it changes at the corners when moving up and down Forbes Ave during the day. On the tower there is a simple brick façade using a light, medium, and dark color range, changing the pattern of brick, and projecting the brick to induce some shade and shadow around the office windows, creating a woven Tartan pattern inspired by the Henry Hornbostel detail and the Tepper Business School projections on campus. Finally, the four lower stories of parking, loading dock, and mechanical level are treated with a dark shadowy tone.

Mr Reppe discussed integrating public art throughout the building. On the first and second floors, the existing Miller Galleries will be relocated and rebranded as the ICA Pittsburgh across the street from the Carnegie Museum of Art. There were also be two major components of public art being pursued at the time of the hearing. The first was a significant outdoor sculpture in the plaza along Forbes Ave to work with the Richard Serra and Henry Moore pieces located at the Carnegie Museum of Art. The team was working on a feature art wall inside the proposed building's public atrium. The team will be issuing a competitive RFP and going through the process used for some of their other recent major projects. Accessibility across and through the site worked with the grade along the entirety of Forbes Avenue. The sidewalk will comply with accessibility standards and will be set back from the curb and widened with a raised bed planter along Forbes Ave. The project will have two main ways to get to the lower end of the site. During normal business hours anybody would be able to take the main entrance from Forbes Ave to the elevators down to exit onto S Neville St. There would then be a raised pedestrian crossing across S Neville St to the existing university parking facility. The team hoped to be able to eventually connect to the Junction Hollow Trail that would come up along the university's parking facility. There will be a new sidewalk along the east side of the lower Museum Access Dr which will provide access to the lower levels of the museum garage as well as the elevators and stairs

that connect the lower levels to S Neville St. Planning staff had noted the team was exploring the idea of also creating a set of steps from that lower part of Museum Dr to S Neville St that would ultimately connect with the future pedestrian connection along Boundary St/S Neville St. The team was working with DOMI on a study. Their project will not preclude a sidewalk but, after a lot of the initial grading for it, the sidewalk could come at a future date, hopefully at the building's opening. The team was very aggressive in supporting sustainability for the lab building, currently in LEED Gold under V4. A slide depicted a number of strategies being used to get to that LEED Gold status. In their pursuit, the team was hoping to recapture the title of the greenest lab building in the country, achieved 8 years ago with Scott Hall. They were looking at a whole series of cutting-edge sustainability components by targeting a baseline significantly lower than their current LEED Gold baseline of 159. They were targeting around 103. Significant savings would come from interior lighting, HVAC fans and more efficient fans, and a significant savings in their heating load by using radiant systems, high performance glazing and heat recoveries. Storm water management covered a predominant component on the site. There will be two underground detention areas. One at S Craig St will actually be a detention area for the plaza area, as well as some of the boundary retention along Forbes Avenue. Along S Neville St, there will be an underground retention area for a slow release vault. Also, the entirety of the green roof on part of the second floor and all of the third floor will act as passive storm water management by providing infiltration into the green roof. Concerning the tree replacement requirements for the city, the team knew that any tree over 12in that is removed must be replaced with an equal caliper. As part of the IMP, their commitment went further than the city's requirement. Any trees two inches or more would be replaced at 110%. They were looking at three future projects plus two currently active projects and the trees that would be removed from those projects. The reforestation designated as Area One is already funded and will be starting this summer in the core of the campus. Another reforestation with the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy, designated as 2A and 2B along the railroad hillside, was set to begin next summer. With both of these areas, they will actually have a surplus of over a thousand inches of new trees on the campus. Mr Reppe stated Ms Mann was pushing to make a bird safe building. Birds have a lot of trouble with glass on buildings. The team was working on creating bird friendly glass that includes a frit pattern that birds can see preventing them from careening into the glass. Another issue they committed to was where birds can see through corners of glass. Preventing birds from seeing through those corners would eliminate their mistaking it as a flyway. The team had already committed to any height below 40 feet, and hoped to be able to consider bird friendly glass on the upper levels of the building as well. The team was also working to integrate bike parking in three locations on the site. There will be two major outdoor bike facilities along Forbes Ave, one at the ICA entrance and one at the campus entrance. There will also be a 50-space bike room in the basement of the building that will have direct access down S Neville St/Boundary St to connect to the Eliza Furnace Trail. It also will eventually directly connect to the extension of the Junction Hall Trail along the edge of the university's property. In addition, included in the bike room would be three shower rooms, one of which would be ADA compliant, so that people that bike to campus would be able to shower. They would then go to the elevators all on grade to get to the upper levels of the building and to Forbes Ave.

Cindy Jampole from Trans Associates presented the transportation plan. The parking demand was addressed through a very robust transportation management plan that was approved for the campus as part of the master plan. The scope of the transportation study was defined by DOMI in a meeting with them. Their document was in review at the time of this hearing. The existing 126 parking spaces on the site will be removed during construction and replaced with 110 spaces, which is consistent with the approved master plan that actually allocated up to 500 spaces. The bicycle space requirement was 23, and the project will provide 128 bicycle spaces, 42 outside and 86 inside. Trip generation rates were used and reductions were consistent with the approved IMP. A crash history was created from intersections at Forbes Ave and S Neville St and at S Craig St and Forbes Ave. There will be two access points into the site along S Neville St, a northerly access into the garage and loading area, and one along Museum Dr. A secondary access into the garage will be used for visitors and scheduled museum events. Stop signs will be located on the driveways as vehicles exit the garage and enter the roadway. Slides were presented showing the current multimodal access and paths of circulation from bicycle routes, and bicycle routes resulting from the full implementation of the BRT plan, PGHGo stations, available PRT service routes that pass through the area on Forbes Ave and Bellefield St, and future BRT stations. All trucks entering the loading bays will come from S Neville St. There will be two

loading bays and a trash compactor next to Bay 2. Maneuvering of any trucks will be accomplished on site. The raised crosswalk will connect to the walking path on Boundary St. A summary of some of the more important points of the approved Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan was approved as part of the IMP. It addresses transit passes, coordination with shuttle operators in Oakland, bicycle amenities in infrastructure, carpooling, vanpooling, sidewalks and safety and connectivity. flexible parking passes as needed, coordination with PRT, and work-from-home programs. Much more detail was available in their report. Mr Reppe discussed proposing a permanent encroachment and a vacation of two right-of-way components. The permanent encroachment, working its way through DOMI at the time, would be along S Neville/Boundary St so that no vehicles' movements are on S Neville St itself. The proposed street vacation is to turn over the existing stub of S Craig St at the museum's ticket booths to the Carnegie Museums. That would allow the team to look at alternative forms of paving to make a connected plaza between the Carnegie Museums and the Carnegie Mellon Hall of Sciences plaza. Mr Reppe presented slides of the detailed construction management plan, indicating an off-site construction field office located in an existing university owned building on Henry St. Another separate process will be coming before the commission around May to tear down that vacant building and use that lot for both site material and, potentially, to put a mockup of the university building, showing how the various components would be put together. Most action will be taking place off Forbes Ave which involves moving the eastbound travel lane and bike lane to the former left turn lane into the museum. Service vehicles or truck construction vehicles will enter at Forbes Ave and Craig St and exit at the other end of Forbes Ave towards campus. This would be for the duration of the construction until 2027. In 2027 Forbes Ave will be restored to bike lanes and travel lanes in both directions and the left turn into the museum drive. A through lane and a bike lane in both directions will be maintained except for periodic closures on Forbes Ave over evenings and weekends. Mr Reppe presented their community process both on campus with the community, and then with the various city agencies. At the beginning of the meeting, a number of letters of support from the Oakland Business Improvement District and the Square Hole Urban Coalition.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney recognized Jamilah Ducr, Asst Vice Chancellor of Engage Campus of University of Pittsburgh and Chair of Oakland Task Force.

Ms Ducr offered her support for this project as CMU has presented to the Oakland Task Force. A preponderance of votes were in favor of support. She wanted to be sure that that was logged for the record.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked commissioners for related comments.

Ms Dick had three things mainly having to do with the construction management plan. She asked if there was a proposed space in front of the main floor of the building at the restaurant to pullover for pickup and discharge by access vehicles or accessible vehicles carrying people who utilize wheelchairs. Her second concern was if there was any chance together with this project to improve the pavement for the bridge adjacent to the project. Her last comment was this area is a key major PRT bus route. This is going to be a long construction project until 2027. She urged the team to utilize any kind of accelerated process to keep as much of Forbes Ave open as possible because this is not only a major bus route through Oakland and Squirrel Hill but also to the Mon Valley. She felt the people utilizing this route should not have to suffer profoundly as a result of this construction and asked them to expedite that as much as possible.

Mr Reppe stated there will be a two-car pull out in front at the main restaurant entrance for pickup and drop off. For the sidewalk along the bridge, he said, in cooperation with the Pittsburgh Innovation District, Oakland Transportation Management Association, and DOMI, they were conducting a feasibility study to discuss with the state the next day. He said while the southern side of the sidewalk is closed, they were well aware that now is the opportunity that we may not ever get again to make those improvements. They were looking at ways to widen the edge of the bridge either inbound or outbound for the sidewalk, adding anywhere from two feet to up to six feet of additional sidewalk width on both sides of the bridge. They were moving at a fast pace to get that process going, and hopefully, on day one of the building opening they will have a wider walk on the south side of the bridge. Then, they could eventually transition to the north side. To Ms Dick's comment, Mr Reppe responded the existing bus stop, which will eventually become the inbound PRT station in front of the Carnegie Museums will remain and will not be impacted. The outbound side is very constrained

because of the narrow sidewalk at the northeast corner at Starbucks. They had been discussing the situation with Starbucks's management to cease their practice of leaving their trash cans along the sidewalk and instead put them in one of the side alleys perpendicular to Forbes Ave except on days for trash pickup. He also stated a lane in each direction will be open at all times except when connections in the street for water, sewer, and gas are necessary, emphasizing that would be on evenings and weekends. Traffic would probably be detoured to Fifth Ave., or have one lane, or flagged one lane at off peak hours only.

Mr Quintanilla congratulated CMU on another exciting building added to its great campus. He had two concerns. The first was the location of the restaurant. From a design perspective, he thought it felt that the restaurant should open up to the plaza instead of having the wall the blank wall of the gallery facing the plaza. He thought the restaurant looked too close to Forbes Ave and wouldn't have room for outdoor seating. The main door will be at the corner visible from the intersection. There will be the blank wall of the gallery, but the gallery is inside. He felt if they were reversed it would be a lot more dynamic serving as a connection from the restaurant. His second concern was the composition with all the other gallery buildings and how compatible it will be or if it will overpower the perspective. Taking this proposed building and mirroring the line of the modern building of the gallery and the beautiful detail of the original museum building, this new building is part of an ensemble that needs to connect with the other buildings, not compete with them. He felt the pattern on the tower was a great idea, but it was not that important for the building to have a fabric pattern. It was clashing too much with this ensemble of buildings. It is part of a public plaza that is all about the gallery and this beautiful building. He said he loved the idea of the white and all the colors, but asked if the orange would be too bright and compete against the gallery.

Mr Reppe stated they went back and forth looking at reversing the locations of the gallery and the restaurant. The primary reason was the ICA and its connection to the Carnegie Museum of Art next door was the critical relationship. Ultimately, there are two reasons why they were proposing the current configuration. They thought about the synergy between the Carnegie Museum of Art and the Institute for Contemporary Art Pittsburgh in the new building and the ability to create a center of gravity for art in Pittsburgh at the intersection of S Craig St and Forbes Ave. Also, they wanted the restaurant to be closer to the road. The ICA entrance is about 50 or 60 feet back from Forbes Ave. The restaurant will be closer to where pedestrians are walking and the regular traffic. There will be about 10 or 12 outdoor tables and seating along Forbes Ave, the restaurant seating itself, and also restaurant seating inside the central hub. Potentially, the restaurant could even spill up into the ICA entrance, if it's very successful. To Mr Quintanilla's comments about the museum and the composition, Mr Reppe commented the new building will be partially a civic building and a campus building and marks the termination of the Oakland Civic district. It becomes an interesting ensemble of the very classical architecture of the Carnegie Museum's original building and the very modernist international style of the Barnes Edition built in the 1960s. The proposed building will be a contemporary exploration of both the classical and the modernist ideals of both of those buildings. It is very contemporary but still very civic. As a designer, Mr Reppe noted one of the concerns on the integration of the seven-story tower component was desiring a contemporary expression of traditional materials that would break down the mass and the relentlessness of the windows of a traditional office building. The variegated panels of the tartan plaid unfold as the building unfolds. A number of different panels were considered along with the orange accent color, and a number of different ideas for a patinaed copper color. Ultimately, high performance concrete and green patinaed copper didn't have the warmth and earthiness of traditional materials used in western Pennsylvania. The new penny copper introduces those warmer tones of the granite on the Barnes Edition and the more traditional tan bricks used on the core campus.

Mr Quintanilla commented about the use of materials and architecture within what the word contemporary means. He stated they could either have really good contemporary or they could have kitsch. He stated he understood the intention but didn't think it added to the composition of all the other buildings, which are more civic than this building. He thought civic spaces could be passively active and actively active. It can bring life to a space whether it's being utilized or not. The art is always going to be something that will need access to in order to enjoy. The restaurant, whether you're a paying customer or not, you can engage in that experience and what is happening there. He thought the pattern detracted somewhat from the orange. What is nice about the orange is it is brighter, it is inviting, and it is warmer. That is really important to call out particularly because a lot of

civic spaces aren't as inviting as they could be. He appreciated the added warmth or orange and green, making him feel he wanted to participate in this space. He appreciated Mr Reppe's comments on the Carnegie Art Museum's very overbearing feel and feeling like a trespasser without a pass to go in. The tower behind it is going to have a monolithic overbearing feel no matter what is done. He thought the three-dimensionality of the facade and the skin was a method that could truly break down that monolithic energy, and doing too much calls more attention to the monolith. It should probably be flatter we don't really focus in on that monolith and it goes into the background. He loved the orange part on the bottom but the monolith was staring him down and he couldn't unsee it. He also loved the bird friendly glass and its continued use.

Mr Reppe went back to another view with the bird glass commenting the previous view it may have been a little misleading. From the pedestrian zone a lot of this tower will not be seen. It can be seen in long vistas. He said they were trying to find the right balance between an interesting break down of the mass, following the history of architecture at Carnegie Mellon, and trying to do it in a contemporary manner. He also agreed they want an active restaurant. If the restaurant was located at the corner with the art gallery, people will be sitting outside in this big giant plaza. The Willard White studies showed people want more secluded, smaller places. The corner of Forbes and Craig is intended to be related to the art museum. An important part of this is the programmatic components that are going to be linking the museum and the ICA.

Ms Ngami said she deferred to him on that point. She commented the picture he showed made it starker. She thought the pattern was doing too much by calling one's attention to something that could just be a background element. It was detracting from the beauty happening with the dual textured façade.

Mr Wu asked if trucks would be moving back and forth to the construction staging area through the S Craig St business district, or it would use S Neville St.

Mr Reppe stated trucks accessing the site will be coming up Forbes Ave from the west and onto the site via the construction gate at Forbes Ave and S Craig street. They did not anticipate major deliveries or anything like that coming from S Craig Street. Another construction gate was planned on the southern end along S Neville St. They did not anticipate any construction activity entering the site along the S Craig St Extension or Museum Drive.

Mr Wu clarified his question asking about the staging area itself and if trucks were going to be using Craig St to get to and from the site, noting there was the other site to the north.

Mr Reppe stated the vast majority and the construction staging plan was to bring trucks up Forbes Avenue from the Parkway. The other site was for other trail construction trailers and various sub subcontractors' trailers. They also planned to put a mockup on that site for testing of the building enclosure system.

Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there was a motion from the commission based on the recommended motion with conditions as stated in their reports and read in by Mr Fraker.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVES DCP-MPZC-2023-00693 and DCP-ZDR-2023-11179 based on the applications filed by Bob Reppe on behalf of Carnegie Mellon University, property owners, for a Minor Amendment to the CMU Institutional Master Plan and for new construction of the RKM Hall of Sciences Building with the following conditions:

1. The applicant explore all feasible ways to add a connection through the subject parcel that connects S. Neville with the higher ground on Museum Drive or Forbes Avenue.
2. 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.
3. 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 Wu

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Dash made the commission aware of the resignation of Director Abrams and the appointment of Dr Jamil Bey as the new Director of the Department of City Planning. He thanked Director Abrams for her leadership in expanding staff, especially expanding staff for commissions and allowing them to advocate for greater resource research. He spoke at the last director's report about beginning the work on the Citywide Comprehensive Plan, trying to get funding to do that project, and also working through the consultant selection process through to city council. He stated Dr Bey would begin the next Monday from this meeting to continue a lot of the work under Director Abrams into the future. It will be time to bring him up to speed on the functions of the Department of City Planning and on the work of the commissions and the remainder of the department. As that progressed, Mr Dash wanted to have Dr Bey come and introduce himself at a future commission meeting and to talk to the commission, as well.

Mr Layman wanted to also acknowledge some of the leadership of Director Abrams her critical part in helping build a relationship with the Department of Permits, Licenses and Inspections, who are now roommates with DCP, and also with the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. She helped the department get on the way to what has become a remarkable optimization project around all of their permitting. They are operating and working collaboratively in a way that he had not seen in his time with the departments. He also acknowledged her critical help in finding a way to overhaul their Zoning and Development Review Division, the additional staff for the commission, the capacity to comfortably review plans as they come in, continually supporting the commissions, taking on the zoning code overhaul, and supporting the comprehensive plan, which is a lot of work. Mr Layman was excited to see the continuity brought by Dr Jamil Bey and his relationship with the department, particularly the comprehensive plan, going forward. They were very excited about the future.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 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

April 16, 2024 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

Monica Ruiz
Peter Quintanilla
Phillip Wu

Not Present

Mel Ngami

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00316, Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, Major Lot Line Revision, Squirrel Hill North	2
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-HN-2024-00103, 1020 Brookline Blvd, Veterans Memorial Parklet, Brookline Continued Hearing & Action 1. Zoning Code Text Amendment Council Bill 2023-2197, Add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use in Zoning Districts GT, RIV-MU, RIV-NS, RIV-GI, and RIV-IMU	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from March 5, 2024, and March 19, 2024.

MOTION: To approve minutes from March 5, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

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

MOTION: To approve minutes from March 19, 2024.

MOVED BY: Mr Wu

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill

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

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

None

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00316, Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, Major Lot Line Revision 2 Squirrel Hill North

Ms Krajewski presented the lot line revision first reviewed 04/02/2024. The recommended motion was to approve the revision.

MOTION: Tree of Life Lot Line Revision, 14th Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on April 2, 2024, be approved.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

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

CARRIED.

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-HN-2024-00103, 1020 Brookline Blvd, Veterans Memorial Parklet, Brookline

Ms Quinn presented the nomination. She showed pictures and described the park's layout. The site is a triangular parcel with landscaping and signage. There is a 1917 Schneider 155-millimeter Howitzer on the property. There are also two bronze plaques with the names of 56 Brookliners who gave their lives in the 20th century. There is also a flag pole, benches, and black wrought iron fencing. The first flag raising ceremony of Brookline was held in this parcel in October, 1917, by the Brookline Boy Scouts of America. The real significance of this property is that it is a very well-known community space. Together with the communities of Dormont and Mount Lebanon, the Memorial Day Parade in Brookline starts at Triangle Park (she noted they call it Triangle Park sometimes) and proceeds all the way to Mount Lebanon Cemetery. The parade begins with the lowering of the American flag to half-staff. There is a short ceremony and a five-gun salute, along with a bugler. This parade has been a tradition since 1934. Ms Quinn noted this nomination is very similar to the fire station in Troy Hill that was reviewed, being in everybody's photographs. It's in everybody's memories. And, it's very special to them. For that reason, the recommendation was for commissioners to provide a positive recommendation to City Council. The Historic Review Commission is doing that, as well.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony. Seeing no hands raised, she asked commissioners for comments or a motion for a positive recommendation to City Council.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Ruiz

SECONDED: Ms Quintanilla,

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

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

E. Continued Hearing & Action

1. Zoning Code Text Amendment Council Bill 2023-2197, Add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use in Zoning Districts GT, RIV-MU, RIV-NS, RIV-GI, and RIV-IMU

Legislation will be continued to a later date. No hearing will be held. Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront General Industrial (RIV-GI), and Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts.

Mr Layman noted this item was continued in collaboration with Cn Coghill and Cn Gross and their offices as a broader package of zoning amendments that would encompass the intent of this bill. He made an update in Director's Report Item F. He stated a representative from one of the City Council

offices was expected to appear and read a statement. At the pace of the meeting that day he said they may not be present, and asked that, if they do appear while completing the director's report, they be allowed to jump in and give that statement.

F. Director's Report

Mr Layman informed the commission at a previous hearing the ZD&R team engaged in a process of developing a zoning code amendment to address the Fair Housing Act and to effectively further fair housing in Pittsburgh. The categories included group housing, temporary shelter, and a broader scope. Working with the Law Department, a legal analysis and recommendations were established. They then brought in interested commission members and a broader group of stakeholders, including Cn Wilson's office, and then, reps from the county Dept of Health and Human Services, city community services, and advocates from homeless and fair housing organizations. In a meeting on Thursday, 04/08/24, there was a wide representation who covered agreement on two policy areas, 1. How broad or how narrow to make the various group housing uses, and 2. How to face the challenges, opportunities and barriers around temporary housing uses, temporary structures, or other temporary uses. Staff and commission member volunteers will be leading the "team uses" working group and the "team temporary" working group. After future meetings, they expected to have enough information to make recommendations on both policy areas to staff. The next step will be to have a bill drafted for public consumption and follow up, and public engagement. It would then go back to Planning Commission. A twelve-week extension was given on the time period by council members. He was hopeful they will be able to complete the process and have the new bill to the commission within that twelve-week period.

G. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 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

April 30, 2024 at 2:00 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Dina Blackwell

Monica Ruiz
 Peter Quintanilla
 Phillip Wu
 Mel Ngami

Not Present

Rachel O'Neill

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Daniel Schepke

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00417 Gateway Center Subdivision, Gateway Center, Business District	1
Hearing & Action	

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for April 2, 2024.

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Mr Wu

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

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

ABSTAINED: Ms Ngami

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

None.

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2024-00417 Gateway Center Subdivision, Gateway Center, Business District

Ms Krajewski presented the subdivision into three lots, GC1, GC2, and GC3. The recommendation was to be preliminarily approve the subdivision and schedule final review on May 14, 2024.

MOTION:

Gateway Center Subdivision, 2nd Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on April 22, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled

for final review on May 14, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

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

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

Mr Dash stated Acting Director Bey was confirmed today, and he will be present at a future Planning Commission meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:11 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 14, 2024 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
Mel Ngami

Peter Quintanilla
Steve Mazza
Phillip Wu

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Monica Ruiz

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Will Gregory
Megan McElhaney
Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Joe Fraker
Tiffany Krajewski

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots DCP-LOT-2024-00417, Gateway Center Subdivision, Major Subdivision 2, Central Business District	1
Hearing & Action 1. Council Bill 2024-0221 - 103 -235 SHADY AVE, The Zoning Map Amendment from RM-H (Multi-Unit Residential High Density) to UNC (Urban Neighborhood Commercial), including parcel 84-G239 and a portion of parcel 84-G-258, Shadyside Neighborhood	2

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for April 2, April 16, and April 30.

April 2, 2024 Minutes

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Ngami

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

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

ABSTAINED: Mr Mazza

CARRIED

April 16, 2024 Minutes

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

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

ABSTAINED: Mr Mazza

CARRIED

April 30, 2024 minutes

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

DCP-MPZC-2024-00385 / Council Bill 2024-0221 – Zoning Map Change

- Taylor Berg, Resident of East Liberty
- Adam Peterson PhD, Data Scientist
- Francisco Arreola-Gedlinske, East Liberty resident
- Nancy Levine
- Jack Billings
- Melissa McSwigan
- Rob Pfaffmann

Grant Application Acknowledgment / 3890 Bigelow Boulevard

- Nathan Doherty: Executive Director, Facilities & Support Services

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2024-00417, Gateway Center Subdivision, Major Subdivision, Central Business District

Ms Krajewski presented the subdivision plan of lots, GC1 and GC2 and GC3, for final approval.

Recommended motion was to approval the subdivision.

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

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for comments from commissioners or a motion.

Mr Mazza asked what the reasoning behind the subdivision was.

Ms Krajewski said she would check with the applicant and follow up.

MOTION:

GATEWAY CENTER SUBDIVISION, 2nd Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on April 22, 2024, BE APPROVED and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2024-0221, 103 -235 SHADY AVE, The Zoning Map Amendment from RM-H (Multi-Unit Residential High Density) to UNC (Urban Neighborhood Commercial), including parcel 84-G-239 and a portion of parcel 84-G-258, Shadyside Neighborhood.

Ms Moradian presented the council bill for staff. Council Bill 2024-0221 was referred to the Planning Commission by the city council on March 1, 2021. Cn Ericka Strassburger filed a zoning map and appropriate changes in application DCP-MPZC-2024-00385 to change the zoning district on parcels 84-G-239 and 84-G-258 from RM-H, Residential, Multi-unit, High Density to UNC, Urban Neighborhood Commercial. Per Section 922.05.B.2, Map Amendments: An application to amend the boundaries of the zoning district map may be proposed by the City Council, the Planning Commission, the owner of the subject property or the owner's agent. There is no RCO (Registered Community Organization) on the shared site of the proposed area. Therefore, a Development Activities Meeting was not required. Per Code Section 922.01.C.1 and 922.01.C.2. property owners within 150 feet of the proposed zoning area

were notified, and a notice was placed on site 21 days in advance of the May 19, 2024, hearing date. Under Section 922.05.F, the Planning Commission shall review the proposed zoning map amendment, considering specific criteria. Not all of the criteria must be given equal consideration by the Planning Commission or City Council in reaching a decision.

Mr John Kamin, presented for the property owner. He thanked Cn Straussberger and her office for her community outreach and work with the team to facilitate this rezoning. He presented slides and a site view of the Meridian, currently under construction, and the subject parcels on the corner of Shady Ave and Aurelia St, basically in the Shady Side neighborhood. The corner parcel and a portion of the driveway were never rezoned for the actual Meridian development. The property is surrounded by a mix of appropriate LNC and UNC commercial type uses with a small driveway of LNC that comes up across the street. This piece to be changed to UNC is on the Meridian side of Aurelia St, which creates a small island of RM-H zone. This zone will become UNC exactly as the surrounding property. The difference is the RM-H is very much a high residential density allowing a number of apartment units there. The proposed change to UNC, Urban Neighborhood Commercial, is actually a less intense use than the RM-H zone could allow. Mr Kamin noted, as staff noted earlier, the commission must look at this in accordance with the nine review criteria set forth in 922.05. He noted the property had been vacant for years, and given the zoning and the constraints that existed, the proposed bank will not have a negative impact on the community or be detrimental to the public welfare. He said they believed they had the recommendation of staff. He stated the process was followed appropriately and the code states Council has the right to initiate a map amendment per Section 922.05.B.2.

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

Ms McElhaney recognized Mr Rob Pfaffmann.

Mr Pfaffmann is an architect and planner with 40 years of experience working on many projects throughout the Pittsburgh region. He stated he was involved in an action last year with a group of residents to try to save the church and because of unfortunate communications from the city to the residents we were unable to file a nomination in time. The reason the church was there and the reason for the zoning as it is now go back to the Shady Side Action Coalition working to prevent the residential commercial districts from sprawling out around it. In the 1980s, Mr Pfaffmann went to zoning hearings every week on the issue of expansion of parking into the residential districts. He presented pictures from a packet he put together showing the NexTier Bank and a missing middle residential property that could be built on that site. He thought there was inequity there and thought the residential area should stay. He said there hasn't been an opportunity to have this conversation with the planning department to talk about different ways that the site could be used besides suburbanizing Shady Side. He noted this will be the fifth suburban bank built within the East Liberty area in the last two years. Each one of them has applied suburban models to the city. He stated he was involved in helping get community engagement started on the Meridian, and it could have been extended out to the corner if the city planning process was allowed to look at this more holistically. He stated city planning is about looking at things holistically and not legally. Shady Side is full of missing middle buildings. This is a perfect site to demonstrate new zoning techniques to use as a result of the new comprehensive plan that will be talked about a lot in the future. He asked if we wanted to do this, and suggested putting a Chipotle there, probably without a drive-thru. He spoke about safety, noting he rides his bike over to Baker Square constantly while a number of residents use that as a pedestrian thoroughfare. Any commercial facility with access in and out like a drive-thru or just a parking lot is a real danger to the community in that area. He stated it would be much better if it remained residential and provided the right transition from the Meridian to the rest of the RM-H district on the other side. This is a community issue that has an impact in every UNC district because there is a flaw in that zoning code which allows a one-story building. He stated a former City Planning staff person indicated on her website it was an unintended flaw in the UNC. He proposed to table the map change and direct the City Planning Department to revise the UNC or the RM-H. He suggested they could revise the UNC zone to allow minimum site density i.e. multi-story only. Or, they could revise the RM-H to allow small retail uses within that zone, which many in the community would like to see. These are things seen in the comprehensive plan. He stated the bank signed an agreement taking a risk that they were going to get this zoning in 2022. Mr Pfaffmann said they had to file a right to know request to even find out that it was a bank on the site, and that's not right. It shouldn't take a right to know request to get information about what's happening in our neighborhood, and it *is* my neighborhood. Ms McElhaney recognized Mr Jack Billings.

Mr Billings, resident of Squirrel Hill, Pittsburgh, stated he didn't live in this neighborhood but knew it well. He was baptized and confirmed at Calvary Episcopal Church which is one block away. He was a Boy Scout in Troop 373 that met at Sacred Heart also one block away. He stated he didn't like the one-story drive-through bank proposed for this site, but he was in favor of the proposed map change. He wanted Pittsburgh to have as much mixed-use, walkable density as possible, especially close to major transit lines. This site is close to the busway, to East Liberty, to nearby shops and restaurants on Highland Ave, and is the perfect location to build a mixed use building with shops and restaurants, or a bank on the ground floor and apartments or condos above. The UNC could allow a bank on the first floor and then three more floors of apartments above. Under the current RM-H zoning with current minimum lot size restrictions, no commercial use could be built here, and only a total of 13 apartments could be built on this roughly 10,000 sq ft lot area. Under the UNC zoning, closer to 20 Apartments could be built here on top of the ground floor commercial. He asked why we haven't seen this developed into housing, and the simple answer is because of parking minimums. The city mandates one parking unit for every housing unit to be built, and any multi-family use proposed for the site would require significant off-street parking that would make such a proposal cost prohibitive. He encouraged everyone in the hearing who is passionate about building a better Pittsburgh to fight for getting rid of parking minimum mandates in the city. He stated this will be the third drive-thru bank in this area. The suburbanization of our cities is because of forced suburban modes of transit i.e. large parking minimums on places where they are not needed. He stated his parents used to live one block away from this site in Adler Court, which is a great pre-war courtyard apartment building, impossible to build today with the current parking requirements. Ms McElhaney recognized Ms Melissa Miller McSwigan.

Ms McSwigan felt the process and planning for this site has been segmented all along the way, not allowing for a big picture understanding as well as a public process. She had concerns about the zoning change and echoed some things that Mr Pfaffmann said about allowing for the missing middle in the development and keeping safe and walkable streets. She hoped the Planning Commission will consider the impact of the zoning change.

Ms McElhaney recognized Mr Jon Hanrahan.

Mr Hanrahan stated he echoed Mr Pfaffmann. He opposed the proposed development and the proposed zoning change. He commented on the applicant's comparison of the RM-H zone to the UNC zone, referring to the UNC zone as a less intense use. He thought it was a clever spin on a plan to shoehorn a strip mall bank branch into a dense urban neighborhood. He stated the applicant got it backwards and hoped the members of this commission knew it as well. He said the comment assumes residents as a city want the less intense use instead of more dense housing, and instead the citizens of Shady Side are crying out for what the applicant called an amenity (a bank branch). He stated many bank branches have already been built in this area. The citizens of Shady Side and the city do not need more bank branches. What it needs is more of that missing middle housing or of any kind of housing.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for comments from commissioners or a motion.

Ms O'Neill recommended adoption of the map change. She asked as part of the Shakespeare Giant Eagle Redevelopment Meridian if the adjacent parcel was a rezone to UNC or was this already a UNC.

Ms Rakus verified the zone as a PUD (Planned Unit Development) beforehand. She believed it was a CP (Commercial Planned Unit Development) and was rezoned to UNC prior to the development and approval of the Shakespeare Street Giant Eagle, which is now known as the Meridian.

Ms O'Neill asked if this parcel was under common ownership with the Meridian development.

Mr Kamin verified it is under common ownership. A portion of the parcel that is the driveway going in is under common ownership. The portion of the parcel that is on the corner of Aurelia St and Shady Ave is not.

Ms O'Neill stated it was helpful background in terms of some comments made about looking at this holistically. Being under separate ownership, it would be hard for the commission to compel somebody to work with their neighbor to be one unified development. She thought this is a different situation that how it was being framed. She thought personally, the rezoning was appropriate considering that the property was vacant under its existing zoning district. This now provides some opportunity for different uses, but most importantly, she wanted to be clear they were looking at the rezoning and not reviewing the specific use for this proposed property. They were not reviewing a drive-thru at this meeting. Although she couldn't find the subsection about drive-throughs, she understood drive-throughs are limited.

Mr Layman verified drive-throughs are prohibited in the UNC district.

Ms O'Neill commented to the extent one is proposed, there would be an opportunity for the community to come out. That would require a variance before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. There is an opportunity to look at the project then to the extent there is that

relief requested, but that is not the relief before the commission today. They were simply looking at the rezoning. On a slightly more technical point, she said a little way behind this parcel.

Mr Kamin verified that is correct. He stated they were not planning to change the location of the way.

The way is actually staying as part of the overall Meridian development. He believed it is actually shared and thought it is Melmore Way.

Ms O'Neill stated it was a little unclear on the presentation's map that it is part of the Meridian parcel not the parcel before. She asked if it was already UNC.

Mr Kamin thought part is UNC and part of it was changing.

Ms O'Neill asked if there were plans to vacate that way.

Mr Kamin stated they were having discussion with DOMI about how that way would be utilized for access to their parcel because it was planned to be used as well as access to the Meridian development. He believed they have some loading coming off that. He said they were working through those issues with DOMI.

Ms O'Neill asked as part of that proposed plan with DOMI, they were not planning to change the location of that way.

Mr Kamin verified that they were not planning to change the location.

Ms O'Neill thought this was consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, particularly for the reasons Mr Kamin mentioned. It is an extension of the existing UNC district and the property's prior use or lack thereof kind of lends itself to rezoning. She noted she was not making a judgment call on the proposed use or the proposed design because that was not before the commission that day. She reiterated there will be opportunities, to the extent there is relief requested, for people to comment on that. Personally, she was going to recommend adoption of the map change.

Ms Ngami commented on need to look at what is being developed there. Should a development be proposed there it should come before the commission. felt a bit of tension around the idea of looking at the housing corridor holistically. She was somewhat in agreement with keeping it as UNC but thought the concerns brought before the commission were not what is on the table. She agreed with that and thought it was an issue that needed to be looked at along the lines of what is being developed there. She agreed it made sense to move to UNC because keeping it as RM-H is not particularly providing the change that she thought this neighborhood needs because a proposal has not been set forth. Due to what is available and the information that I see, I am in favor of the UNC. However, I do think that should a development be proposed, there needs to be a sensibility to what it ends up being officially. And, that would come before the commission as well.

Mr Wu asked Mr Kamin to summarize Cn Strussberger's commercial outreach related to the rezoning.

Cn Strassberger stated the focus was on rezoning and the proposed use will come later. Before submitting the legislation, she sought advice through her networks from the informal leader of the burgeoning community residential organization and also with the neighbor on Aurelia St who was very vocal about the Meridian development (their email lists are inclusive of the entire Shady Side neighborhood) as to whether a community meeting would be necessary based on their experience. After answering several of their questions and showing them the proposed rezoning map they both helped to make the conclusion that a public meeting was not necessary at this juncture for the rezoning. that perhaps when we're talking about the actual use of the future property at that juncture, a more robust public process would be necessary. She has continued to rely on those in the community to share information to their network. She estimated at least several dozen from their email list had feedback that resulted in it percolating throughout the community, which then resulted in the comments heard at this meeting.

Mr Wu echoed Ms O'Neal and Ms Ngami's comments about being focused on the rezoning at this point and the use will come later. He thought there was public knowledge about what the use may be and hoped there would be a related public meeting. He thought one of the points made earlier about the UNC being able to create a denser urban fabric was a possibility to be considered.

Chair Burton-Faulk also stated what was before them was not what was being potentially proposed for future development and that the requirements have been met as far as she was concerned for what was in their purview that day. She noted there would be more process opportunity. This is a recommendation

to council and not an approval through the commission. She then called for a motion from the floor based on the recommendations in their report.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission makes a positive recommendation to City Council on the Council Bill 2024-0221, 103 -235 SHADY AVE, The Zoning Map Amendment from RM-H (Multi-Unit Residential High Density) to UNC (Urban Neighborhood Commercial), including parcel 84-G-239 and a portion of parcel 84-G-258, Shadyside Neighborhood.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

None

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:46 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 28, 2024 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
 Mel Ngami

Peter Quintanilla
 Steve Mazza
 Phillip Wu
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Mel Ngami

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Tiffany Krajewski

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots 1. DCP-LOT-2024-00445 –1470 River Avenue Major Consolidation Troy Hill 2. DCP-LOT-2024-00437 – Somerset at Frick Park Major Consolidation Swisshelm Park DCP-LOT 3. DCP-LOT-2024-00429 – Mary Street Major Consolidation South Side Flats 4. DCP-LOT-2024-00435 – Ormsby Avenue Major Subdivision Mount Oliver	1
Hearing & Action 1. DCP-ZDR-2024-01513 – 4612 Filmore Street demolition of two-story structure North Oakland 2.	2

A. Approval of Minutes

None

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Council Bill 2024-0221 Shady Ave Rezoning

- Pamela and Sumio Nakajima
- Abe Stucky

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00445 –1470 River Avenue Major Consolidation Troy Hill
2. DCP-LOT-2024-00437 – Somerset at Frick Park Major Consolidation Swisshelm Park
3. DCP-LOT-2024-00429 – Mary Street Major Consolidation South Side Flats
4. DCP-LOT-2024-00435 – Ormsby Avenue Major Subdivision Mount Oliver

Ms Krajewski presented the consolidations and subdivision.

Public testimony: none.

Comments from commissioners or a motion.

MOTION:

That the River Avenue Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on May 28, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on June 11, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Ruiz

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

MOTION:

That the Summerset at Frick Park Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on May 28, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on June 11, 2024.

MOVED BY: Mr Wu

SECONDED BY: Mr Mazza

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

CARRIED

MOTION:

That the Mary Street Lot Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on May 7, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on June 11, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Ruiz

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

CARRIED

MOTION:

That the Ormsby Avenue Subdivision received by the Planning Commission on May 10, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on June 11, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Mr Wu

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2024-01513 – 4612 Filmore Street Demolition of two-story structure North Oakland

Mr Fraker presented the project for staff.

Mr Bob Reppe and Jameson Fielding gave a presentation of the project.

Public testimony: none

Questions from commissioners or a motion.

MOTION:

That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approves DCP-ZDR-2024-01513 based on the application filed by Carnegie Mellon University, property owners, for demolition of the existing two-story structure at 4612/4614 Filmore Street 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: Mr Mazza

SECONDED BY: Ms Ruiz

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

RECUSED: Ms O'Neill

ABSTAINED: Mr Quintanilla

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman stated they wanted to have the director's report content during the briefing with assistant director Mr Watley.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:19 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 11, 2024 at 2:20 PM, Meeting called to order by Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick
 Mel Ngami

Peter Quintanilla
 Steve Mazza
 Phillip Wu
 Monica Ruiz

Not Present

Dina Blackwell

Rachel O'Neill

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Andrew Dash
 Will Gregory
 Megan McElhaney
 Paul Cancilla

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Katherine Reed
 Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
 Joe Fraker
 Tiffany Krajewski

Index

Item	Page Number
Plan of Lots	1
1. DCP-LOT-2024-00445 – 1470 River Avenue Major Consolidation 2 Troy Hill	
2. DCP-LOT-2024-00437 – Summerset at Frick Park Major Consolidation 2 Swisshelm Park	
3. DCP-LOT-2024-00429 – Mary Street Major Consolidation 2 Scheppke 100 Ross Street Suite 202 412-255-2241 planningcommission@pittsburghpa.gov 2 South Side Flats	
4. DCP-LOT-2024-00435 – Ormsby Avenue Major Subdivision 2 Mount Oliver	
Hearing & Action	

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes for April 2, 2024.

April 2, 2024 Minutes

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Mr Mazza

SECONDED BY: Mr Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED:

CARRIED

May 14, 2024 Minutes

MOTION:

MOVED BY: Mr Quintanilla

SECONDED BY: Mr Mazza

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

ABSTAINED:

CARRIED

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Historic Designation of Pittsburgh Stained Glass Studios, 160 Warden Street, West End Neighborhood

- Theresa Kail-Smith, City Council member, District 2

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00445 – 1470 River Avenue Major Consolidation Troy Hill
2. DCP-LOT-2024-00437 – Summerset at Frick Park Major Consolidation Swisshelm Park
3. DCP-LOT-2024-00429 – Mary Street Major Consolidation South Side Flats
4. DCP-LOT-2024-00435 – Ormsby Avenue Major Subdivision Mount Oliver

Mr Scheppe presented the consolidations and subdivision.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for public testimony.

Ms McElhaney saw no hands raised.

Chair Burton-Faulk opened the floor for comments from commissioners or a motion.

MOTION: That the River Avenue Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2024, be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOTION: That the Summerset at Frick Park Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2024, be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOTION: That the Mary Street Lot Consolidation received by the Planning Commission on May 7, 2024, be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOTION: That the Ormsby Avenue Subdivision received by the Planning Commission on May 10, 2024, be approved and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY: Mr Mazza

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu
CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

None

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman shared an update of the Fair Housing Act zoning code amendment.

Questions or comments from commissioners: None.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:36 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 of June 25, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Mel Ngami
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

-- Commissioner Monica Ruiz

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney
Will Gregory

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: May 28, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approval

Moved by: Ms O'Neill

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

Date: June 11, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approval

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: Ms Blackwell, Ms O'Neill

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence

Received Correspondence (See Attachment B):

DCP-ZDR-2023-09191 – 600 Forbes Ave, Fisher Hall Bridge

- Marimba Milliones, Pres & CEO, Hill CDC

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2024-00474 – Fullerton Street Major Subdivision, Central Business District

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: none

MOTION: Fullerton Street Subdivision, 3rd Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on June 25, 2024, be preliminarily approved and scheduled for final review on July 9, 2024.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Blackwell

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1 .DCP-ZDR-2023-01893 – 3812 Foster Street New construction of five story apartment building Lower Lawrenceville

Staff: Mr Gregory

Applicant: Charles Krimmel

Representatives: Kristen Hook, Jeff Young, Cindy Jampole, Ryan Wotus, Attny Goldberg Kamin Garvin.

Public Comment:

Sarah Trbovic, Exec Dir, Lawrenceville Corp - in support.

Emma Gamble, Lawrenceville United Community Engagement and Program Manager - in support.

Vlad Kaplun, East Liberty resident - in support.

Commissioners Comments: Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Ms Burton-Faulk, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Layman, Zoning Admin - discussion of concerns

Motion: That the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh APPROVED the Project Development Plan DCP-ZDR-2023-01893 based on the application filed by Perkins Eastman on behalf of INCHEON VENTURES LLC, the property owners, 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 plans, including site plans and elevations be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

Additional conditions:

3. Applicant will work with staff to address specific concerns to architectural design related to revisiting eaves, corner treatments, and parking openings or screening. Also, the LCLU conditions were read in.

Moved by: Ms Blackwell

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2024-02961 – 100 1st Avenue Change of use to Multi-Unit Residential and interior and exterior renovations Central Business District

Staff: Ms Moradian

Applicant: Maggie Dudley

Representative: Lisa Carver, Michael Polite, Travis

Public Comment: none

Commissioners Comments: Ms Dick

Motion: Based on the information in the application and analysis of the facts of record, the City Planning Staff recommended approval of interior and exterior renovations for use change to multi-units on the existing building at 100 1st Ave. in the Golden Triangle Subdistrict C (GT-C) zoning district in the Central Business District neighborhood.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

E. **Director's Report**

None

F. **Adjournment**

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

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 of July 9, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Mel Ngami
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Monica Ruiz
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

--

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

No minutes for approval

B. Correspondence

Received Correspondence (See Attachment B):

DCP-ZDR-2023-01893 – 3812 FOSTER ST

- Chris Beam, resident of Bloomfield
- Amy Zaiss, resident of Beechview
- Sarah Trbovic, Executive Director (Lawrenceville Corporation) and Dave Breingan, Executive Director (Lawrenceville United)

DCP-ZDR-2023-01893 – 3812 FOSTER ST

- David V. Auth, MA Arts Management at CMU, JD Candidate at Pitt Law

DCP-MPZC-2023-00941 - 6401 PENN AVE

- David V. Auth, MA Arts Management at CMU, JD Candidate at Pitt Law

DCP-MPZC-2023-00979 - 6401 PENN AVE

- David V. Auth, MA Arts Management at CMU, JD Candidate at Pitt Law

C. Plan of Lots

DCP-LOT-2024-00474 – Fullerton Street Major Subdivision, Central Business District

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: Craig Dunham, Pittsburgh Penguins, Pittsburgh Arena

MOTION: Fullerton Street Subdivision, 3rd Ward, City of Pittsburgh, County of Allegheny, received by the Planning Commission on July 9, 2024, BE APPROVED and the signatures of the proper officers of the Planning Commission be affixed thereto. (No improvements or monuments needed.)

MOVED BY: Mr Mazza

SECONDED BY: Ms Ngami

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: Ms O'Neill

Opposed: None

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-HN-2024-00405 – 160 Warden Street, Historic Nomination of the Pittsburgh Stained Glass Studios, West End

Staff: Sarah Quinn

Applicant: Matthew Falcone

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments:

Motion: That the Planning Commission recommended to City Council.

Moved by: Ms Ngami

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

E. Continued Hearing and Action

1. Zoning Code Text Amendment Council Bill 2023-2197

Action To Be Determined. Text amendment to add Temporary Managed Communities as a Primary Use allowed in the Golden Triangle (GT), Riverfront-Mixed Use (RIV-MU), Riverfront-North Shore (RIV-NS), Riverfront-General Industrial (RIV-GI), and Riverfront-Industrial Mixed Use (RIV-IMU) Zoning Districts

Staff: Corey Layman

Commissioners Comments: Chair Burton-Faulk

Motion: None.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

In favor: None

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

F. Director's Report

None

G. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

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 of July 23, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Monica Ruiz
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

Commissioner Mel Ngami

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: June 25, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approval

Moved by: Ms Blackwell

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

Date: July 9, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approval

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence

General Comments and Concerns

- John Seiffer
- Kathy McCurdy

Council Bill 2023-1698/1723 and DCP-MPZC-2023-00941/00979

- DeAnna Davis, Vice-Chair of the Larimer Consensus Group
- Philip Ameris, President-Business Manager of Pennsylvania Laborers' District Council
- K. Chase Patterson, Chairman of the Larimer Consensus Group
- Senator Jay Costa, Jr., 43rd District

- Maelene Meyers, East Liberty Development Corporation
- Melvin Walls

DCP-MPZC-2023-01692

- Brian Alderman & Katy Watkins
- Jason Davis
- Mellon's Orchard Neighborhood Association (23 signatories)
- Melvin Walls

C. Plan of Lots

None

D. Hearing & Action

1. BDA-2024-00234 – 225 North Shore Drive Install High Wall Signage, *North Shore*

Staff: Paul Cancilla

Applicant: Stephen Zelahy, Advance Sign, presentation

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: Ms O'Neill, Ms Blackwell, Chair Burton-Faulk, Ms Ruiz, Mr Mazza

Staff Comments: Mr Layman, Paul Cancilla

Motion: Postpone until such time information can be gained and it is appropriate to bring it up to the Planning Commission again.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Ms Blackwell

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. Council Bill 2023-1698 and 1723 and DCP MPZC-2023-00941 and 00979 Zoning Code Text/Map Amendment and Preliminary Land Development Plan for the Expansion of Bakery Square Specially Planned District 9, *East Liberty and Larimer*

Staff: Kate Rakus

Applicant: Rev Ricky Burgess

Applicant Team: Todd Reidbord, John Kamin, Abbie Mountain

Public Comment: DeAnna Davis - in support, Dr Daryl Cannedy – in support, Chris Beam – in support, Sarah Providence - questions, Vlad Kaplan – in support, Amy Zaiss – in support, Robert Rubinstein – in support, Cn Khari Mosley – favorable comments.

Commissioners Comments: Ms Blackwell, Ms Ruiz, Mr Quintanilla, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu, Mr Mazza

Additional support letters read in for the record from Larimer Consensus Group, the Village Collaborative, the East Liberty Chamber of Commerce, Senator Jay Costa, Ralph Horgan, Carnegie Mellon University, and from the East Liberty Development, Inc.

Staff Comments: Kate Rakus, Mr Layman

Motion: To hold the applications until the next meeting to refine the conditions.

Moved by: Ms O'Neill

Seconded by: Ms Blackwell

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: Mr Mazza

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2024-00399 - Amendment to the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Specially Planned District 10 (Hazelwood Green) to permit Type E Development and other miscellaneous amendments, *Hazelwood*

Staff: Paul Cancilla

Applicant: Tishman Spire, John Kamin, Austin Gelbard

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: None.

Motion: Approve.

Moved by: Ms Dick
Seconded by: Mr Mazza
In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu
Abstained: None
Opposed: None
Recused: Ms O'Neill
CARRIED

4. **DCP-MPZC-2023-01692** - Zoning Map Amendment to rezone certain parcels along N. Negley Avenue bound by Rural Street and Rippey Street from RM-M (Multi-Unit Residential, Moderate Density) and R2-M (Two-Unit Residential, Moderate Density) to RM-VH (Multi-Unit Residential, Very High Density), *East Liberty*

Staff: Paul Cancilla

Applicant: AE7, Robert Max Junker, Eric Jester, Craig Riegelneegg

Public Comment: Alneda Richardson – in support, Randall Taylor – in support, Brenda Love – in support, Daniel Green – in support, BJ Samson – in support w/concerns, Diana Haidar – not in support, Leslie Thyberg – not in support, Richard Gardner – not in support, Kristen Garbarino – not in support, James Endress – no in support, Christopher Beam – in support, Joy Guillot – in support/but not spot zoning, Francoise Guillot – not in support, Meredith Knight – in support, Emily Nagin – not in support, Christopher Marx – in support w/caveats, Bea Thomas – in support w/concerns.

Commissioners Comments: Ms Blackwell – concerns, Ms Dick – question, Ms Ruiz – comments, Mr Wu – comments, Mr Quintanilla – comments.

Letter of correspondence submitted the day of the meeting from Richard Schwarz of the Bluefield Garfield Corporation entered for the record.

Motion: Approve.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Ms Ruiz

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Chair Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

5. **Council Bill 2024-0525 and DCP-MPZC-2024-00482** - Zoning Map Amendment referred to the Planning Commission by City Council to rezone certain parcels generally bound by Hamilton Avenue, Dunfermline Street, Tioga Street, Cinibar Way and Zenith Way from R1A-VH (Single-Unit Attached Residential, Very High Density) to LNC (Local Neighborhood Commercial), *Homewood South*

Staff: Paul Cancilla

Applicant: Cn Mosley, Rebecca Mizikar

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: Mr Quintanilla – question.

Motion: Approve.

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Chair Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

E. **Director's Report**

None

F. **Adjournment**

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

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 of September 3, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk

Secretary Holly Dick

Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza

Commissioner Peter Quintanilla

Commissioner Monica Ruiz

Commissioner Mel Ngami

Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator

Andrew Dash

Paul Cancilla

Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner

Katherine Reed

Maryam Moradian-Mosleh

Tiffany Krajewski

Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: July 23, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Ms Ruiz

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence September 3, 2023

- Jeff Gernand, KCI Technologies Inc.

Council Bill 2023-1698/1723 and DCP-MPZC-2023-00941/00979

- Val Parm, Village Collaborative
- Lori Moran, East Liberty Chamber of Commerce
- Michael Griscom
- Ralph Horgan, Carnegie Mellon University

DCP-MPZC-2023-01692

- Michael Griscom
- Kendall Pelling
- Maelene J. Myers

Nominate Members for the Community Data Justice Collaborative

- Prince Matthews, Sr., MPA; Communications Manager; Black Equity Coalition & POISE Foundation

Fair Housing Amendments

- EngagePGH (9 responses)
- Carmen Brown
- Jeremy Kazzaz

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00555 – 1212 Smallman Street - Heinz History Center, Strip District, Major Consolidation

Staff: Ms Krajewski

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments:

Staff Comments:

Motion: Preliminarily approve; and schedule final approval for Sept 17, 2024.

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

D. Continued Hearing & Action

1. Council Bill 2023-1698 and 1723 and DCP MPZC-2023-00941 and 00979

Zoning Code Text/Map Amendment and Preliminary Land Development Plan for the Expansion of Bakery Square, Specially Planned District 9, *East Liberty and Larimer*

Staff: Ms Rakus, Sr Planning Mgr – recommended approval of PLDP and positive recommendation to City Council of amendment with 6 proposed conditions of approval.

Applicant: Mr John Kamin, counsel for applicant; Mr Todd Reidbord, Walnut Capital Bakery Square; Ms Abby Mountain, Strada Architecture

Staff Comments: Ms Angie Martinez, DOMI; Mr Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator staff;

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: Mr Quintanilla – questions & comments; Ms Dick – questions; Mr Wu – comments; Mr Mazza - comments

Motion: Approve and positive recommendation

Moved by: Ms Blackwell

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

E. Hearing and Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2024-01125

5869 CENTRE AVE Interior and Exterior Renovations to expand existing warehouse, residential storage use. *East Liberty*

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Mr Jeff Michelson, Desmone Architects

Public Comment: none

Commissioners Comments: Ms Ruiz – questions; Ms Ngami – comments; Mr Quintanilla - comments

Staff Comments:

Motion: Approve with one condition

Moved by: Ms Ruiz

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

2. Fair Housing Legislation

Zoning Code Text Amendment to update Group Residential uses and definitions to ensure Zoning Code compliance with the federal Fair Housing Act.

Staff: Mr Layman, Zoning Administrator - positive recommendation with change to remove dormitories from the UCE

Public Comment: Ms Carmen Brown, resident – opposed to personal care home; Ms Mary Beth Cringle, resident – questions; Ms Joyce Meggers Moore, Stanton Heights Community Org – questions; Ms Pomaj Chakmam Yajalaji, Chief of Medicine, Land Management and Land Stewardship with the Iroquois Confederacy of Aborigine-American People – comments; Mr William Anderson, Chair Allegheny County Democratic Black Caucus, Chief of Staff Democratic National Committee Black Caucus - comments; Ms Andrea Boykowycz, resident – comments; Ms Ikhana-hal-makina, Grand Inca, Chief of Iroquois Confederacy of Aborigine-American People – opposed; Ms Melica Terry, resident – opposed; Ms Kim Salinetro, Pres Banksville Civic Assn – opposed; Mr Kota-ki-bey, Cochief of Iroquois Confederacy of Aborigine-American People – opposed; Ms Alison Keating, resident – in support.

Staff Comments: Mr Layman - comments

Commissioners Comments: Ms Burton-Faulk - comments, Ms Blackwell – comments & questions, Ms Ngami – comments; Mr Quintanilla – comments; Ms Dick – comments; Mr Wu – comments; Ms Ruiz - comments

Motion: Recommendation with condition

Moved by: Ms Ngami

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

F. Director's Report

Mr Andrew Dash, Deputy Director City Planning provided an update to a prior briefing that presented some amendments relative to implementing the City's housing needs assessment.

G. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

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 of September 17, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Mel Ngami
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla

Not Present

Commissioner Phillip Wu

Commissioner Monica Ruiz

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:37 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

None

B. Correspondence September 17, 2023

Fair Housing Amendments

- Jo Anne Tippet
- Sam Kriegler
- Michael Schmidt
- Jeremy Kazzaz

DR-2024-05047 933 Penn Ave

- Candice Comar
- Ivor Hill
- Ted Lyon

DCP-ZDR-2024-03127 1096 Goodman St

- Barb Warwick, Pittsburgh District 5 City Councilmember

Nominate for the Community Data Justice Collaborative; The City of Pittsburgh & Black Equity Coalition (BEC)

- Prince Matthews, Sr., MPA; Communications Manager; Black Equity Coalition & POISE Foundation Poise Foundation

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00555 – Heinz History Center, Strip District, Major Consolidation

Staff: Mr Schepke

Public Comment: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Dick
Seconded by: Mr Mazza
In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill
Abstained: Ms Ngami
Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2024-00001 – 135 51st St New Construction of Fifteen Townhomes, Central Lawrenceville

Staff: Mr Fraker
Applicant: Mr Jeff Campbell, Rothschild Doyno Collaborative
Public Comment: Mr Dave Brinyan, Exec Dir Lawrenceville United – in support
Commissioners Comments: Ms Dick
Staff Comments:

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Ms O'Neill

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2024-03127 – 1096 Goodman St Conditional Use for environmental site remediation work to cap exposed slag material and restore exposed slag areas to vegetated meadow condition, Swisshelm Park

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Ms Lilly Freedman - Mgr Devel Proj URA; Mr Dana Klann - Civil & Eviron Cosultants

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: Ms Dick – question, Mr Mazza - question

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms O'Neill

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill Mr Quintanilla

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2024-00399 – SP-10 (Hazelwood Green) Signage Amendments to the Hazelwood Green PLDP, Hazelwood

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Mr John Kamin for Tishman Speyer; Bill Kolano – Kolano Design

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments:

Motion: Approve of changes to signage amendments

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

None

F. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

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 of October 1, 2024

In Attendance

Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick

Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Monica Ruiz
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present - Commissioner Dina Blackwell
Commissioner Steve Mazza

Commissioner Mel Ngami
Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Vice-Chair O'Neill.

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: September 3, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Wu

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Mr Wu, Ms Ruiz, Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla

Recused: Ms O'Neill

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

Date: September 17, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla, Ms O'Neill

Abstained: Mr Wu, Ms Ruiz

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence _____, 2024

Housing Needs Assessment Zoning Text Amendments

- Jonathan Kamin

DCP-ZDR-2024-05047-933 Penn Ave

- Candice L. Komar
- Jo Ann & Ted Lyon

DCP-ZDR-2021-11656 - 2932 WYLIE AVE

- Marimba Milliones; President and CEO, Hill CDC

C. Hearing and Action

- 1. DCP-ZDR-2024-05047** - 933 Penn Ave, Renovations to convert existing 8-story building into a multi-unit building with ground level retail, *Downtown Business District*

Staff: Mr Fraker

Applicant: Mr Chip Desmone - Desmone Architects, Mr John Kamin – Counsel for the development

Public Comment: Mr Ivor Hill, Ms Candace Tumor, Mr Ted Lyon

Commissioners Comments: Ms O'Neill – questions and comments, Ms Ruiz – questions, Mr Wu - question

Staff Comments: Mr Fraker read conditions per request by Ms O'Neill.

Motion: Approve with conditions subject to the additional condition that the applicant continue to work with the neighboring property owners regarding the design of the rooftop.

Moved by: Ms O'Neill

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu, Ms O'Neill

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

- 2. DCP-ZDR-2024-01437** – 7853 Lock Way E, Conditional use for construction of new pump station for PWSA Bruecken Station, *Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar; Highland Park*

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Ms Sonja Svihla, Ms Mora McLaughlin, and Mr Anthony Gallina - PWSA, Ms Heather Dodson and Mr Andy Mitchell – Brown and Caldwell, Mr Matt Conti - EvolveEA

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: Ms O'Neill - comments

Motion: Recommendation to City Council with conditions

Moved by: Mr Wu

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Dick, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu, Ms O'Neill

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

1. Director's Report

None

2. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

.

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 of October 15, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza

Commissioner Monica Ruiz

Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

Commissioner Mel Ngami

Commissioner Peter Quintanilla

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: 10/01/2024 minutes

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Blackwell

Seconded by: Wu

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence October 15, 2024

Council Bill #2024-0984 - Fair Housing Zoning Text Amendments

- Carmen Brown
- Lois McCafferty
- Jason Bower
- Mary Beth Gasior
- Erin Ruggiero
- Michelle Cerminara
- Doug Cerminara
- Marie Senko

Council Bill #2024-0701 – Community Homes

- Caroline Mitchell, Esq.
- Mary Beth Gasior
- Lois McCafferty

- Nicholas Eggers
- James Noschese
- Erin Ruggiero
- Marie Senko

Housing Needs Assessment Zoning Text Amendments

- Jon Salmans

DCP-MPZC-2024-00596 - North Oakland Rezoning

- Carolyn Verga; Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning, University of Pittsburgh

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00612 - 700 Hargrove Street - Major Consolidation, Mount Washington

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments:

Staff Comments:

Motion: Preliminarily approve; and schedule final approval for October 29, 2024.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-LOT-2024-00598 - 4107 Willow Street - Major Consolidation, Central Lawrenceville

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments:

Staff Comments:

Motion: Preliminarily approve; and schedule final approval for October 29, 2024.

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

D. Hearing & Action

1. DCP-ZDR-2024-03753 - 450 Melwood Ave (The Melwood)

Interior renovations to convert an office building into a multi-unit residence. Square, Specially Planned
North Oakland

Staff: Ms Moradian.

Applicant: Mr Cliff Levine, council for the project – overview of project; Mr Jonathan Hudson, partner and principal – approvals, meetings attended, stakeholder outreach; Kelly Coey - Dir of Development, and Dan Robinson - Development Coordinator with Hudson Companies; Jack Williams, architect – slide presentation

Staff Comments:

Public Comment: Mr John Rhoades – in support.

Commissioners Comments:

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms Blackwell

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2024-03752 – 435 Melwood Ave (The Parker)

New construction of multi-unit apartment, *North Oakland*

Staff: Ms Moradian.

Applicant: Mr Jonathan Hudson, partner and principal – approvals, meetings attended; Jack Williams, architect – slide presentation

Staff Comments:

Public Comment: Connor Scanlon – generally in support and questions; Andrea Boykowycz, Exec Dir OPDC – comments

Commissioners Comments: Ms O'Neill – comments; Mr Wu – comments; Mr Mazza - comments

Motion: Approve with a condition attached

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. BDA-2024-04301 – 200 Lothrop Street

New High Wall Signs for UPMC Presbyterian Hospital, *Central Oakland*

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing item.

Staff: Mr Fraker.

Applicant: Mr Sean Logan, UPMC and Mr Bill Kolano, Kolano Design – slide presentation

Staff Comments:

Public Comment: Andrea Boykowycz, Exec Dir OPDC – comments; Connor Scanlon – request to add Hospital to sign in Rendering 2.

Commissioners Comments: Ms Dick - questions

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Wu

Seconded by: Ms Ruiz

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

4. Council Bill 2024-0701 Community Homes

Zoning text amendment to Community Home uses in residential zoning districts, *Citywide*.

Staff: Mr Layman, Zoning Administrator

Public Comment:

Commissioners Comments:

Staff Comments: Mr Layman – After a meeting held this morning with the administration and at the request of the councilperson, Council Bill 2024-0701 has been held for four weeks in order to find some common ground to work together. If the following hearing scheduled for November 12th is relocated to a different location due to the number of people, DCP will make sure to announce the new location as soon as they have that information.

Motion: None

Moved by:

Seconded by:

In favor: None

CONTINUED FOUR WEEKS

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman – new meeting room at 412 Blvd of the Allies is occupiable

F. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

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 of October 29, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Mel Ngami
Commissioner Monica Ruiz

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:29 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: October 15, 2024 minutes

Motion: Approve

Moved by: O'Neill

Seconded by: Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence

Council Bill 2024-0701 – Community Homes

- Alexis Retcofsky
- Gale Schwartz
- Bob Mallory
- Ronette Cooley
- Jennifer Cypher
- Darvi Longo
- Kim Rieder
- Ashley Woollett
- Diane Abramowicz
- Marie Senko
- Jennifer Long

DCP-MPZC-2024-00596 – North Oakland Rezoning

- Marian Block, Metropolitan-Shadyside Condominium Association
- Peter Bastulli
- Connor Dickey

- Kathleen D. Gallagher, President, Bellefield Area Citizens Association
DCP-MPZC-2023-01692 – N Negley Avenue Rezoning
- Andrew Bryk
- David Reinwald
DCP-MPZC-2023-00441 – Esplanade
- Gina Cazden

C. Plan of Lots

1. **DCP-LOT-2024-00612** - 700 Hargrove Street - Major Consolidation 2 Mount Washington
2. **DCP-LOT-2024-00598** - 4107 Willow Street - Major Consolidation, Central Lawrenceville

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Ms O'Neill

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. **DCP-LOT-2024-00622** - 21st and Smallman Street - Major Subdivision, Strip District

Staff: Mr Scheppke

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Preliminarily Approve.

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms O'Neill

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

D. Hearing and Action

1. **BDA-2024-00234** - 225 North Shore Dr - Install new high wall signage, North Shore

Staff: Mr Fraker

Applicant: Steven Zelahy, Advance Sign Company, North Shore Developers

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms O'Neill

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. **DCP-ZDR-2024-05827** - 529 LIBERTY AVE -

Interior and exterior renovations to existing multi-unit residential, Central Business District

Staff: Ms Moradian

Applicant: Killian, Jessica – Beacon Communities; Gerard Schmidt - LGA Partners
Public Comment: None
Commissioners Comments: None
Motion: Approve
Moved by: Mr Mazza
Seconded by: Ms Dick
In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu
Abstained: None
Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

3. DCP-MPZC-2024-00596 – N Oakland Neighborhood rezoning -

Rezoning North Oakland neighborhood to UC-MU and UC-E, North Oakland

Ms O'Neill recused from this hearing item.

Staff: Mr Gregory and Mr Christian Umbach - presentation

Public Comment: Ellen Eichleay, resident – comments; Eduardo Miranda, resident – comments; Katherine Elescko, resident – comments; Kathleen Gallagher, resident – comments; Chris Beam, resident – comments; Richard Grosso, resident – comments; Robbie Kaplaun – comments; Roxanne Stewart, resident - comments

Commissioners and Staff Comments: Mr Gregory – comments re trees; Ms Burton-Faulk – clarity no proposed or current projects, changes re comprehensive plan; Ms Dick – verified this is City Council approval; Mr Wu – request re height limits; Mr Umbach and Mr Gregory - addressed heights; Mr Wu – questions re creating nonconformities; Mr Gregory – addressed nonconformities; Mr Mazza – questions re construction; Ms Burton-Faulk – further opportunities for input from public after Planning Commission; Mr Mazza – comments re stay engaged

Public Question: Mr Miranda – question re what will be proposed

Motion: Approve update to Oakland Land Use Plan, and positive recommendation to City Council on zoning map amendment proposal.

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Wu

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

4. DCP-ZDR-2019-05349 - 214 S Craig Street - New construction of two-story restaurant North Oakland

Staff: Mr Gregory

Applicant: Mr Ryan Indovina - Indovina Architects

Public Comment: Mr Tom Longstaff, resident – comments re food waste, rodents, and odors; Mr Indovina – addressed concerns

Commissioners Comments:

Staff Comments:

Motion: Approve with one standard condition

Moved by: Mr Wu

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

E. Director's Report

None

F. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

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 of November 12, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Phillip Wu
Commissioner Mel Ngami
Commissioner Monica Ruiz

Not Present

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:31 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: None
Motion: None
Moved by:
Seconded by:
In favor: None
Abstained: None
Opposed: None
CARRIED

B. Correspondence

DCP-MPZC-2023-00441 – Esplanade Master Development Plan

- Jared Stelmach
- Jamie Moore
- The Board of Directors; Manchester Citizens Corporation
- Jason C. Brown, Henry Buhl, Jr., and Voice President of Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh
- Brian Tumelty
- Shriniwas Padwad
- Katie Shenot
- John Kubilus
- Virginia Landis
- Matt Galluzzo; President and CEO Riverlife
- Renee Rosensteel
- Diana Bucco; President of the Buhl Foundation
- Emilie Goralski
- Jessica Jackson
- David N Colaizzi

DCP-ZDR-2023-04749 – 4107 Willow St

- SARAH TRBOVIC
- Dave Breingan

DCP-MPZC-2024-00482 - Homewood

- William Conturo

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00622 – 21st and Smallman Street - Major Subdivision, Strip District

Staff: Mr Schepcke

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Ms Blackwell

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-LOT-2024-00621 - 258 McKee Place - Major Consolidation, Central Oakland

Staff: Mr Schepcke

Public Comment: None.

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Preliminarily Approval with final review 11/26/2024

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

D. Hearing and Action

1. BDA-2024-00856 - 304 Jumonville St - Construct four-story addition for multi-unit residential and rooftop commercial space accessory to ground floor commercial, Bluff

Chair Burton-Faulk read in the hearing and actions items and recused from the first item, 304 Jumonville St. Mr Dash presided over the comments, motion, and rollcall vote.

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Loren Wright, Danielle Mazzer - architects

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Blackwell

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. DCP-ZDR-2023-04749 – 4107 Willow St - New construction of six-story residential building, Central Lawrenceville

Staff: Mr Fraker

Applicant: Bill Sittig, representing Indovina Associates Architects - community process; David Gefsky, Dan McNamara, Camp Eight Capital - Intro; Ryan Indovina, Indovina and Assoc Archs – slide presentation; Ann Klein, Trans Associates

Mr Dash presided over the public comments.

Public Comment: Dave Breingan, Exec Dir Lawrenceville United - comments; Sarah Trbovic, Exec Dir Lawrenceville Corp – comments and curb cut concerns

Commissioners Comments: None

Motion: Approve with three conditions

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2024-02267 - 262 McKee PI - New construction of six-story residential building, Central Oakland

Staff: Mr Fraker

Applicant: Jon Kamin, Goldberg, Kamin & Garvin – intro; Tom Price, Strada Arch – slide presentation; Todd Reidbord, Walnut Capital; Cindy Jampole, Trans Associates – transportation study summary

Mr Dash presided over public comments

Public Comment: None

Commissioners: None

Motion: Approve with three conditions

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: Ms Ngami

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

4. DCP-MPZC-2023-00441 - West North Ave, Beaver Ave and Kroll Dr - Esplanade Master Development Plan, Chateau

Chair Burton-Faulk recused from this hearing and action item. Vice Chair O'Neill presided over this item. Mr Quintanilla commented his employer Michael Baker is part of this project but it is in a different department from Mr Quintanilla and will not impact his ability to hear this item.

Staff: Ms Rakus

Applicant: Lucas Piatt, Piatt Companies and Esplanade Partners, LP – intro: Jim Holcomb, Esplanade Partners – planning process; Jim Holcomb, Esplanade Partners and Piatt Companies - slide presentation; Philip Albrecht – project design; Steve – stormwater plan; Philip Albrecht –site access, sustainability development plan

Mr Dash presided over public comments.

Public Comment: Jamie Moore, resident – questions; Brian Tumelty, resident – in support; Rev Brenda Gregg, Project Destiny, Inc – in support; Devon Donner, resident – in support; Dr Rahmon Hart, Iodify Foundation – in support; Tom Churchik, Paramount Construction – in support; Adam McGurk, Get-Go – in support; Gabby Toborg, resident – in support; Linda Hansen, resident, Manchester Citizens Corp & Manchester Historic Society board member – in support; Dr Fredrick Manion, resident, Manchester Historic Society cofounder – in support; Steve Hansen, resident – in support; James Robinson, Jr, resident, Manchester Citizens Corp member – in support; Stanley Lowe, resident – in support

Commissioners Comments: Mr Wu – comments; Mr Mazza – comments; Mr Quintanilla – comments; Ms Ruiz; Ms O'Neill - comments

Motion: Approve with one condition

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms Nagmi, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None
Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

E. **Director's Report**

Mr Dash announced move to the new 412 Blvd of the Allies space 11/18/2024.

F. **Adjournment**

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

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 of November 26, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick

Commissioner Dina Blackwell
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Phillip Wu
Commissioner Mel Ngami

Not Present

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Monica Ruiz

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:57 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: October 29, 2024

Motion: None

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

Date: November 12, 2024

Motion: None

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Ms Dick

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence

DCP-MPZC-2023-00441 – Esplanade Master Development Plan Aerion A. Abney

- Michael Glenn, Jr.
- David Pharr, Sr.
- Kevin L. Jenkins
- Jonathan Zito
- Lisa Bujaky
- Quintin Bullock

C. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2024-00621 – 258 McKee PL - Major Subdivision, Final Approval of proposed Lot Line Revision

Staff: Ms Krajiwski

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Dick

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

D. Director's Report

Mr Dash

E. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

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 of December 10, 2024

In Attendance

Chair Lashawn Burton-Faulk
Vice-Chair Rachel O'Neill
Secretary Holly Dick
Commissioner Dina Blackwell

Commissioner Steve Mazza
Commissioner Peter Quintanilla
Commissioner Monica Ruiz
Commissioner Phillip Wu

Not Present

Commissioner Mel Ngami

City Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
Andrew Dash
Paul Cancilla
Megan McElhaney

Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
Katherine Reed
Maryam Moradian-Mosleh
Tiffany Krajewski
Joseph Fraker

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Burton-Faulk

A. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes

Date: November 26, 2024

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

CARRIED

B. Correspondence December 10, 2024

DCP-MPZC-2023-00441 – Esplanade Master Development Plan

- Lisa Bujaky
- Quintin Bullock
- Jonathan Zito
- Aerion A. Abney
- Sam Patti
- Michael Glenn Jr.

Transit Oriented Development Zoning Map Amendments

- EngagePGH – 41 comments
- Janessa Walter
- Owen Cantor
- Polish Hill Civic Association Board of Directors
- Marisa Packer
- Claude LaVallee
- Pete Fein
- Stacy Desai
- Snehal Desai

- John Rhoades
- Neil Desai
- Corbin Curtis
- Dmetri Black
- Jack Billings
- Alexander Payton

Housing Needs Assessment Zoning Text Amendments

- EngagePGH – 98 comments
- Maddy McGrady
- Colleen Shuda
- Alexander Payton
- David V. Auth
- Lucas Godshalk
- Dmetri Black
- Corbin Curtis
- Dan Villarreal
- Vlad Kaplun
- Mark Buehrle
- Amy Zaiss
- Chris Beam
- Lena Andrews
- Pamela Austin, Strip District Neighbors
- David Vatz
- Melvin Walls
- Daniel Tasse
- Jeff Ruby
- Nicholas Rizzio
- Human Rights City Alliance
- Corbin Curtis
- Dmetri Black
- Paul Heckbert
- Connor Hayes
- Mikael Glamheden
- Stephanie Flinn
- Angela Echols
- Connor Dickey
- Neil Desai
- Vlad Kaplun
- Fineview Community Organization
- Scott Bricker, Bike Pittsburgh
- Palma Austin
- Christopher Beam, Pro-Housing Pittsburgh
- Elizabeth Beam
- Jack Billings

C. Plan of Lots

1. **DCP-LOT-2024-00664 - 8510 Frankstown Avenue** Major Consolidation, East Hills

Staff: ?????? No audio

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Preliminary approval 12/10/24 with final approval 01/14/25

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla

In favor: ?????? No audio

Abstained: None

Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

D. Hearing and Action - Part 1

1. BDA-2024-04164 - 55 27th Street New construction of multi-unit apartments, *Strip District*

Staff: Ms Moradian

Applicant: Brandon Guy, President and Founder of Steel Street Captial Partners; Kinsey Becker, Oxford Development codeveloper; Jonathan Glanz, Architect, LGA - presentation

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: None

Staff Comments: None

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Ms Dickl

Seconded by: Mr Mazza

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

2. BDA-2024-02381 - 433 Wood St Demolition, Renovation, and Stabilization, *Central Business District*

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Mr Andrew George, Collect George Architects - presentation

Public Comment: None

Commissioners Comments: Mr Mazza – questions about structure; Mr Quintanilla – questions about what is left after removal; Mr George – response; Mr Wu -question on width of area

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Mazza

Seconded by: Mr Dick

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Abstained: Ms O'Neill

Opposed: Mr Quintanilla

Recused: None

CARRIED

3. DCP-ZDR-2024-07915 - 800 Fort Duquesne Blvd Complete demolition of one-story structure, *Central Business District*

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Mr Damon Rhoades, Project Engineer, Larson Design Group - presentation; Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, Steven Needum, VBA and Nicole Graycar, CD²

Public Comment: None

Commissioners: Mr Mazza – questions about remediation; Mr Needum – response

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Mr Quintanilla

Seconded by: Mr Wu

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

E. Hearing and Action - Part 2

4. DCP-MPZC-2024-00224 - 4720 5th Avenue Central Catholic High School Institutional Master Plan, *Squirrel Hill North*

Staff: Mr Cancilla

Applicant: Mr Matthew Stosle, President, Central Catholic High School – presentation; Mr Mike Smith, ADG Architects – IMP slides

Public Comment: Mr Reppe, CMU Architect – in support
Commissioners Comments: None
Motion: Positive recommendation to Council
Moved by: Ms Dick
Seconded by: Mr Quintanilla
In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Mr Mazza, Mr Quintanilla, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu
Abstained: Ms O'Neill
Opposed: None
Recused: None
CARRIED

5. Transit Oriented Development Zoning Map Amendments *Polish Hill, Lower Lawrenceville, Sheraden, Crafton Heights, Beltzhoover and Mount Washington Neighborhoods*

Staff: Mr Dash, Mr Portugal

Ms O'Neill explained what comes next after Planning Commission hearing.

Public Comment: Dan Yablanski, Digital Organizing Director, Pittsburghers for Public Transit union of transit riders and workers – in support; Kim Salenetro, Chief of Staff, Cn Kail-Smith – pause on legislation until it can be vetted properly; Marciana Rossi, resident, Sheridan – opposed; Terry Hannis, resident – opposed; Mary Kronz Kozakiewicz, resident – opposed; Susanne Pace, resident – Herron TOD zoning legislation – asked for an umbrella continuance be considered & remove the Bethoven parcels: Lorraine Callen, resident – opposed; Fr Thomas Granc, Pastor St Augustin Church – opposed to church inclusion in the legislation; Hannah Woodroffe, resident – opposed & echoes continuance; Ricky Kolling, resident – opposed; Leslie Clague, resident – opposed; Santa Claus, The North Pole-ish Hill – opposed; Dana Dolmy, resident – called for full investigation - opposed; Erin Knowlen, resident – opposed; Eric Gill-Kanish, resident – opposed; Caleb Gamble, resident – opposed; Jack Allto, resident – in support; Samantha Stowe, resident – opposed; Marisa Packer, resident – opposed; Stephanie Tecza, resident – opposed; Pomaj-chakmam-yajalaji, Chief, Tuscarora Nation of Aboriginal-American People, Chief of Medicine Land Management/Land Stewardship with the Iroquois Confederacy of Aboriginal-American People – opposed; Jacob Clinger, resident – in support with contingencies; Tal Smith, resident – opposed; Augustine Pionati, resident – opposed; David Williamson, resident – opposed; Claude LaValee, resident – opposed; Katherine McConnell, resident – opposed; Andrew Hussein, resident – opposed; Rosemary Saunders, resident – opposed; Tim Kaulen, resident – opposed; Carmen Brown, resident – opposed; Shawn Kichline – comments; Christopher Beam, on behalf of Pro Housing Pittsburgh – in support and comments; Morgan Shaw, resident – in support; Stacy Desai – confirmed receipt of letters, opposed; Bethani Cameron, on behalf of Mobilify – opposed; Manohar Yarlagadda, re lot 4-R-272 – requested to be removed; James Murray, Chief of Staff, Cn Deb Gross – echoed concerns of residents, read into the record testimony from the councilwoman; Dave Brien, Exec. Dir, Lawrenceville United – in support; Allison McGeary, property owner – opposed; Jack Billings, resident – in support of map amendments and broad rezoning; Sophia Collin, resident – opposed; Kyle Gracie, resident – opposed; Sarah Jovovic, Exec. Dir., Lawrenceville Corporation – in support; Ajalib-chanal-K'in, a descendant of the original beings, the first inhabitants stewarding the Americas including the islands – opposed; Allison Knights, resident – opposed; Chris Rosselot, Policy Director, of Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group – in support

Commissioners: Ms Ruiz – hearing public testimony, needs rework; Mr Mazza – needs more work; Mr Wu – agreed with other commissioners; Ms Dick – in favor, proposed a condition on the transit-oriented development saying that serious consideration should be given to specific geological and infrastructural difficulties in a particular area before it is implemented; Ms Blackwell – in favor with Ms Dick, comments clarifying who created this document, PC is reviewing and voting on whether or not it should be passed to city council for final vote, PC did not create it as a commission; Ms O'Neill – needs to be additional community involvement and information provided and warrants more discussion; Chair Burton-Faulk – in favor of tabling and holding for additional conversation, dialog and clarifications.

Mr Dash – aware of the conditions of the sites, heard from residents, willing to continue conversations to ensure what is being proposed.

Chair Burton-Faulk – get clarity on exactly what that looks like, some meetings with Council of impacted residents and maybe Council in that area leading some conversation.

Ms Ruiz - want to make sure that every resident in those areas are brought to the meeting and coordinated with and will be present to bring input of these infrastructural issues to the conversation as

well as the historical input as far as how that space has been developed in the past and how it can be changed moving forward.

Chair Burton-Faulk – maybe that can be led by Council; then their Councilperson can reach out to the those impacted. Are we confirmed that there should be a little more work between now and bringing it forth in January as it relates to communication and discussion?

Mr Mazza – January is too soon. Need a timeframe to make sure everything is done before coming back.

Ms O'Neill – what is the notice requirement for this.

Mr Layman - recommended continuing to the next meeting in January and advise staff to work with community partners and council members to coordinate any necessary additional community input and discussion and request that we have a little bit of flexibility built into the process because it requires coordination from the other side as well.

Mr Wu – agreed with other commissioners with possibly considering a different approach is it fails a second time.

Chair Burton-Faulk – made clear if the commission decides to hold, it's not necessarily a fail, they are asking for a hold and then asking staff in the interim to work with council and community organizations. Because there's already been robust engagement, They want to ensure that there's additional engagement.

Motion: Hold with condition to continue to work with community organizations and council in the interim before bringing it back in 2025.

Moved by: Ms Blackwell

Seconded by: Ms O'Neill

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

6. Housing Needs Assessment Zoning Amendments Zoning text amendments related to Inclusionary Zoning, Accessory Dwelling Units, Parking Reform, and Changes to Minimum Lot Sizes/Minimum Lot Size per Unit in Residential Zoning Districts, *Citywide*

Postponing and holding until January 14, 2025.

Motion: to postpone.

Moved by: Ms Ngami

Seconded by: Ms Ruiz

In favor: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Ms Ngami, Mr Mazza, Ms O'Neill, Ms Ruiz, Mr Wu

Abstained: None

Opposed: None

Recused: None

CARRIED

F. Director's Report

Mr Dash stated they are nearing the Comprehensive Plan and will need a commitment from a commissioner over multiple meetings over the next two years to be able to give the commission perspective concerning recommendations as they move through what the vision of the city will be over the next 25 years, relating not only to the commission's role in the development review process but also the commission's role relative to future plans, their adoption proceedings, and their role looking at the future. Staff will be following up and detailing that further, and want the commission to consider amongst yourselves who the best representative from the commission would be.

G. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

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.