

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

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

| Logistics  | Stakeholders   |
|--|--|
| Project Name/Address: 1334 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave Alternative Site Plan | <b>Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident):</b><br><br>Hill District Consensus Group<br>Hill District Collaborative<br>Hill CDC<br>Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh |
| Parcel Number(s): 2-G-51   |  |
| ZDR Application Number: PLI-LAP-2024-00549                           |  |
| Meeting Location: Zoom   |  |
| Date: 06/16/2025   |  |
| Meeting Start Time: 6:00pm   |  |
| Applicant: Tricia Henning; Orbital Engineering                       | <b>Approx. Number of Attendees: 17</b>   |
| Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): Planning Commission            |  |

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

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Registered Community Organizations</b></p> <p>Hill District Consensus Group: Has not had any interactions around this project since the October 2024 DAM.</p> <p>Hill District Collaborative: Has not had any interactions around this project since the October 2024 DAM.</p> <p>Uptown Partners: First heard of this project in May of 2023 and again in October in 2024. They do not approve of surface parking and are not supportive of this project. There has been no engagement from Orbital Engineering with Uptown Partners.</p> <p>Hill CDC: The Hill CDC has had prior interactions with the applicant for this site, but they’ve not received a proposal for the alternative site plan to their Department Review Panel, and they only support projects that have gone through this process.</p> <p><b>Applicant</b></p> <p>Jonathan Kayman presented brief history of the applicant’s attempt to get the structure demolished. Shared details on community engagement, documented safety and code enforcement issues, and Planning Commission review to date. The applicant team is back today to share a very conceptual site plan as an alternative to the original proposal of demolition leading to a possible parking lot.</p> <p>The applicant presented a concept for a four (4) story structure that connects to the existing building at the corner of Stevenson St &amp; Fifth Ave. The concept is mixed-use, with retail on the ground floor and three floors of office above, which is planned to be occupied by Orbital Engineering. This proposal allows for the existing parking lot to remain. Once demolition is complete, there will be an effort to further develop and refine the plans at this location, and they envision a vigorous community engagement process.</p> |
|--|

Input and Responses

| Questions and Comments from Attendees   | Responses from Applicants  |
|---|--|
| <p>Hill CDC: We request that the applicant submit their projects to the DRP process. Thank you for this information.</p>  | <p>This is a two-step process. The first is demolition, and the second step will be reimagining this site, and we expect a vigorous community engagement process once we move forward.</p>   |
| <p>Mikayla Sheckler, Uptown Partners: During the Planning Commission meeting and meeting today, I gather that the main concern was around safety for employees and their vehicles. Is this still the main reason?</p> <p>In a Sewickley Herald article published in March of 2025, it publicly states that the founder of Orbital Engineering plans to relocate his company's headquarters to Sewickley from the city of Pittsburgh. From this, we gather that Orbital will not have their HQ in Uptown in the near future, is that correct?</p> <p>I feel like we are very transparent in our process, but just to reiterate, safety concerns don't make a lot of sense if employees will soon not be at this site.</p>  | <p>This is the main reason, and we believe that should be aligned with one of your core values, which is safety.</p> <p>I cannot comment on this, but I will say that working through this process with your organization has not been particularly easy.</p> <p>I believe you were present at our prior presentations, and you would have heard that numerous residents were concerned to walk by this property and about the rodents in the property. They thought of it as a safety and public health concern. I appreciate your perspective, but I don't think that is an accurate representation of what was said at those meetings.</p>  |
| <p>Dr. Brittany McDonald, Uptown Partners: We made it clear that what we wanted to see was a plan to fix the damage of the building, or a redevelopment of the building. What we've been met with is 'the building is being knocked down to extend our parking lot.' I'm curious where these meetings were with all of these concerned residents, because I was at the last DAM. The main issue is that there should not be demolition on 5<sup>th</sup> avenue for surface parking. In order for demolition to occur, there needs to be plans for redevelopment. You did not come back to Uptown Partners to discuss this building that you're showing.</p> <p>I don't appreciate you saying that 'supposedly safety is a core value to Uptown Partners.' What is really a core value of ours is maintaining the commercial corridor that we do have and making sure that we uphold the public realm zoning. You all did not come to Uptown Partners and discuss any of this, otherwise we would not be opposing this so strongly.</p> | <p>You've misstated what I've said at the Planning Commission meetings and previous other meetings. I had said at PC that we were not demoing the property for surface parking. We were demolishing the building because it was a safety hazard, which is a core value of Uptown Partners. I said that we were committed to leave it vacant, as grass, or as gravel, depending on what PC wanted to do. Then, we'd come back to reimagine what it was going to be. We never said that this building was going to be sold, we may be redeveloping it. I said clearly that we did not know what we were going to do with it yet. What you're asking us to do is not required by the code, by law, or to get the demolition permit. We're looking forward to engaging when we know what we are going to do for certain and believe there is an opportunity to do something that is beneficial to the community and my client. To say we have any other intentions than what we've said publicly is offensive and not appreciated.</p> <p>We can agree to disagree. We've been to Uptown Partners meetings and whatever happens there you're in disagreement with, so let's not say that we have not been to these meetings because we have.</p> |

| Questions and Comments from Attendees   | Responses from Applicants   |
|---|---|
| <p>When you're at these meetings you've never proposed an actual development.</p> | <p>Right, this came out of the Planning Commission meeting that Mikayla attended, and we were directed to propose a concept for future development.</p> |

**Planner completing report:** Austin Herzog