

## Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 01/24/2024)

*This report created by the Neighborhood Planner and included with staff reports to City Boards and/or Commissions.*

Logistics	Stakeholders
<b>Project Name/Address:</b> 1006 Cedar Ave	<b>Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident):</b>  East Allegheny Community Council Board East Allegheny Residents Applicants DCP
<b>Parcel Number(s):</b> 23-M-213	
<b>ZDR Application Number:</b> BDA-2024-07247	
<b>Meeting Location:</b> Virtual on Google Meet	
<b>Date:</b> December 11, 2024	
<b>Meeting Start Time:</b> 7:00 pm	<b>Approx. Number of Attendees:</b> 8
<b>Boards and/or Commissions Request(s):</b>  <b>HRC</b> [Historic Review Commission]; To be reviewed for historic preservation aspects.	

### How did the meeting inform the community about the development project?

*Ex: Community engagement to-date, location and history of the site, demolition needs, building footprint and overall square footage, uses and activities (particularly on the ground floor), transportation needs and parking proposed, building materials, design, and other aesthetic elements of the project, community uses, amenities and programs.*

During this virtual meeting, the applicants gave us an overview of the history, the function(s) of the building, and the proposed renovation plan and design, and the timeline for it.

The applicants moved into the aforementioned property the summer of 2016, and have been active in the community ever since in various ways. They take pride in their house, have been repainting, landscaping, and maintaining it over the years. They plan to continue to invest in the house over the next few years as well. They presented various photos as evidence, and multiple drawings [from 2016 and for 2024] for the convenience of the audience's visualization.

As for the roof deck work, a persistent water leak led to the removal of the original rooftop deck and roof. The actual condition was much worse than the applicants had anticipated. The situation was worse than expected. *5 utility knife slits from the original construction resulted in extreme water damage creating great instability in the roof & ceiling joists. The damage caused so much destruction that (the) scaffolding had to be erected inside of the house to prevent workers from falling through the ceiling.* As a team, they- along with their GC- prepared the construction drawings right away to redesign and repair these. As the applicants reach out to schedule a DAM, they find out that somehow the HRC was not triggered in the system. Their request for a DAM initiated a manual flag by the neighborhood planner which then triggered a review of the application by the historic review planners.

The applicants then present the project proposal. They start with the original rooftop deck design that was approved by HRC in 2016, *with the stipulation that the cedar platform be removed and the rooftop deck be recessed further into the roof.* The footprint of the deck is 12 by 20. The cedar wood deck has 2.5" pickets and an exterior door. As per the HRC's requirement, the deck was inset further into the roof line- which is the only difference from the drawings. Then they present the new design proposal. Their intention with the redesign is to keep the original footprint while

mirroring the deck that has recently constructed at their sister property 1004 Cedar Ave. Those changes include adding a small covered roof area, and changing the material into composite. By changing the material into composite, the pickets ended up going from 2.5" to 1.5". Additionally, they added a transom about the exterior door to align more closely with the traditional historical standards, and relocated the AC condensers over about 2' and cut them into the roofline so that they were less visible. They presented the additional drawings and photos to make these proposals clearer. One of the photos from a major street does show a tent which the applicants call out and explain that it is temporarily placed only for the workers' weather protection purposes. The applicants then present some comparative analyses, showing neighboring properties having similar features, some having received HRC approvals at different times. They also shared the letters of support from their neighbors. One of their neighbors didn't understand what a DAM was and wasn't inclined to provide a letter of support for the DAM.

EACC then opened up the floor for questions.

### Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
. One of the applicants [owner] is a member of the EACC board. Do you recuse yourself from any board discussion about this project?	. [From the applicant in question] I am and I have communicated that to you via email.
. Would you mind sharing a copy of this presentation with the board?	. I will.
. Are you requesting a letter of support from EACC?	. We are, yes.
. And, when would you need that [the letter of support] by?	. Whenever you guys can give it, we will submit it to them. This is the next step, before we go for the hearing.
. Thank you two for doing all this. I understand it's just a City process, but I appreciate you doing everything right by the city and the community. And, I don't think you need to wait for our letter of support to go through HRC. So, just go ahead and schedule it. [DCP confirms it.]	. Okay.
. I spoke with them before about the project and I think they are doing things within the historical boundaries and established strategies. Any work they do will only help maintain those. I appreciate you very much!	. Thank you!

### Other Notes

During and after the presentation, Q/A and other discussions around the Development Activity, EACC board members showed their general support for this project, contingent upon a discussion during the board meeting. They invited the participants to send their questions between the DAM and the Board Meeting, if any.

Planner completing report: NT