

Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 06/24/2020)

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

Logistics	Stakeholders
Project Name/Address: 2329 Wharton St (Multi-Unit Residential)	Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident): South Side Community Council (SSCC) Local Review Committee (LRC) Area residents, neighbors, business owner(s), and stakeholders Applicant team DCP staff
Parcel Number(s): 12-G-164-0-1, 12-G-155, 12-G-160, 12-G-165, 12-G-168, 12-G-170, and 12-G-178	
ZDR Application Number: DCP-ZDR-2022-11848	
Meeting Location: Zoom	
Date: November 17, 2022	
Meeting Start Time: 6pm (actual start time for this presentation was approx. 6:45pm)	
Applicant: Greystar [developer, represented by in-house team as well as attorney from Buchanan Ingersoll Rooney]; Hord Coplan Macht (HCM); Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc (CEC)	Approx. Number of Attendees: 36
Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): Zoning Board of Adjustment for dimensional variance due to building length exceeding 500’ maximum; Planning Commission for Project Development Plan review	

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.

Applicant introduced the variety of teams and individuals supporting this current project's development team.

Applicant team provided historical context to development efforts at this location at 2300-2400 Wharton Street. Applicant attorney said they had previously represented a different developer, Edwards Communities, which had previously sought to build a similar project at this site. As part of that earlier project, they had met in 2016 with the South Side Community Council a couple of times and needed two zoning approvals, one for 60 ft in height with five stories and another for building length variance. At the time, the Interim Planning Overlay District (IPOD) for the Riverfronts was in place and needed a variance proposing a building over 500ft building length maximum. The Zoning code has since been amended from its interim overlay district to become the RIV district and height requirements have changed but adopted that same building length maximum of 500 ft. Applicant stated it is seeking a variance to allow the building length to exceed 500 ft. This proposed project is the same height as the Edwards Communities proposal and no zoning variance approval is needed specifically for height.

Applicant said the earlier project fell through in large part because of a railroad spur. The railroad would not vacate it and so there was litigation and the matter was resolved recently. Greystar is picking up the project and has created an updated design.

Greystar's development office based in Philadelphia is guiding the project. Applicant representative from Greystar shared their firm's prior experience working in Pittsburgh and doing community engagement, referencing this will be its second project in Pittsburgh, and noting prior work on the to-be-constructed redevelopment of the Giant Eagle in Shadyside that will incorporate apartments above it. Greystar provides property management services to about 1,400 units in Pittsburgh and a very large number of units throughout USA.

Greystar said they have been working with the seller of the land since 2019. Applicant emphasized the site's connectivity to bike network, bus lines, and the Birmingham bridge, and showed visuals identifying these and an aerial of the existing site context with area transportation routes and amenities. Emphasized intent to make buildings fit into architectural language of neighborhood and to connect the building with the public space and making the development feel part of community.

The architectural team highlighted its experience from being the architectural firm working on the Glass House in Station Square, for which they said they had engaged the community and Riverlife.

Applicant distinguished the current proposal from the prior Edwards Communities proposal in some regards. Previous design was a courtyard building. Instead of four courts, this design will have three courts, which will be bigger, and the last one will be open and connected to the street.

Applicant said residents from this building and courtyard will have a view of city skyline. Applicant described street grid in area (23rd and 24th street being blocked by railroad tracks) and the densely vegetated and wooded, tree-filled land that largely blocks visibility of the subject site from the shoreline. Referenced neighborhood access points to the riverfront trails.

Applicant showed massing view of proposal with site context aerial. Showed city view towards west. Described how people coming over Birmingham Bridge will be looking into the building's courtyards. Courtyards are internally connected, so residents can go from one court to another court along main passages and then go to main courtyard and onto 23rd St, which serves as an important connector to the bike trail using the ramp there.

Showed visual listing site features and amenities, including "bike repair station," "dog-friendly amenities," "enhanced site lighting," "live transportation info screens to promote public transit," "10' pedestrian-friendly sidewalks on all streets," and it also referenced other nearby existing amenities. This visual also showed the intended architectural style for different sections of the building, including a "Neighborhood Transition" section along Wharton, which intends to pick up on the architectural styles of the unique row houses, rooftops and variety of building scales in this section of the neighborhood. The image also identified an "Industrial Waterfront" building section facing the river, which is intended to engage with Pittsburgh's industrial and steel history along the shoreline. The facade closest to neighborhood will be masonry and have similar fenestration to row houses. Applicant said that unlike the prior design by Edwards Communities, they are not replicating townhomes. They will try to break up the lengths of the building facades. There is a section called the "Head Building" as a focal point at the main entrance along S 23rd Street, which will be illuminated, and there is also an entrance along S 24th, intended to generate activity on those streets. The building will be a podium building with off-street parking underneath the courtyards. Identified other nearby community amenities.

Showed the Plan at Ground level identifying locations for structured parking, lobby/mail/package room, bike storage, residential walk-up units, and more. Identified fire lane at northern edge of property and location of street parking and plantings. Showed Plan for Levels 2-5, including the courtyards and pedestrian connector route, and grand stair to

connect to S 23rd street. Intent of grand stair to courtyard is to encourage more resident engagement with the street and with the public realm as they use nearby community amenities, and it reduces residents' overreliance on just internal elevators to enter/exit building. This draws on lessons from Glass House.

Applicant emphasized intent to stagger and break-up the mass of the building.

Showed south elevation (along Wharton St) and renderings and stated intent to make it feel smaller and pedestrian scale by breaking it into three smaller pieces: head house on left; then in the middle a detailed brick façade that takes brick to the top of building; and then another piece that includes some brick façade but has brick step down from top level, and a corner tower element at Wharton and S 24th St. Corner tower is a gateway element. Referenced projecting bays with dormers on part of facade to break up the roof line. Uses intentional variation in its brick and siding colors. At ground level are 2-story units with intent to generate direct pedestrian activity and connection to neighborhood, and these are set back to allow for landscaping on building edge.

Showed west elevation (along 23rd street) and renderings and pointed out key visible features of building, such as head house, with sculptural roof form clad in Corten steel to allude to steel history of Pittsburgh, iconic floating box element looking at Birmingham bridge, and the visible courtyard. Head house conceived of as industrial grid-like building, with rooftop amenity space. Top has sawtooth roof form clad in earthy brown Corten steel material and north-facing clerestory windows to bring in light to amenity space. Sawtooth forms are reflective of old industrial buildings of area. Also incorporate the Corten steel material to frame main residential lobby entrance. The "floating box" cantilevers over the base and projects towards skyline with balconies. Would see the floating box from Birmingham Bridge. Residents in courtyard could see out to skyline and neighbors could see in. Intend to have lush landscaping and water feature/pool in courtyard. Plan to have a cascading set of stairs that will connect from courtyard level down to street, in order to provide easy access to walk a dog, go for bike ride, etc. Applicant shared additional details about façade design.

Showed north elevation (facing river) and renderings: designed to recall industrial heritage with sawtooth forms and corrugated materials. While neutral color for majority of façade to allude to industrial panels of old waterfront buildings, includes accent colors for playfulness, and will have views towards city skyline. Intent is to break up façade with stepping forms to provide multiple corner units with corner glass living rooms overlooking river and views to city skyline. Views are more vertical in proportion here to break up horizontality of building. Interior corridors daylight onto windows that allow all residents access to views of riverfront.

Showed elevation facing east towards 24th street, with corner tower and secondary garage entrance and where will have service areas for building.

Showed building sections showing where will have walk-up units, residential floors, parking, and service areas.

Showed neighbor views "before and after" from two different angles.

Showed a draft site plan and an aerial image of existing building, and identified the new proposed building length as being shorter than the length of the 579 ft existing building. Will eventually go through Planning Commission but as a preliminary first approval will need to get dimensional variance from ZBA for an additional 66 feet in building length above the 500 feet limit. Described how the RIV district's 500 ft building length limit was meant to keep connectivity towards the rivers and mirror the average size of a block, but noted that this area is different than a normal city block since as get closer to river it gets wider. City block between 23rd and 24th street is wider than a typical city block. The developer also needs the project to meet certain density thresholds to make project financially feasible.

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<i>[RCO contact emphasized the ZBA variance request the applicant is seeking for everyone's awareness]</i>	
Railroad will still be running, right?	Railroad behind will still be running. There is a railroad spur that will not be there. [showed on screen]
Will apartments be about same size as those in Glass House? I understand those in Glass House are small.	They'll be approximately the same size. There's a range – some very large units in Glass House and some smaller ones. Similarly, we will have a range.
Do you have a matrix detailing the mix of units?	We can put that together and send around.
Is there an elevator in the building or is everything walk-up?	There will be multiple elevators in the building
The pool connects openly with S 23rd Street. How do you prevent non-residents from coming in and using pool? [other attendee:] It looks nicer than Ormsby pool and you might get some takers	Our property manager is highly attuned to such issues. Normally we have gates there for code reasons, that's typically the way we manage that, but we haven't designed that yet.
The other two courtyards – one is greenspace? The other I can't see what's in there – maybe it has ornamental pools? Are those finalized?	Haven't finalized those yet, still at early stages of design, but normally have a variety of activities based on what we think people like, the weather, and the size of the courtyards
This looks really nice. Thank you.	
Thanks for presentation – looks good. I'm an architect and neighbor. What type of construction are you proposing? Platform?	Podium. 4 levels of wood frame over one. We might have to lift up the concrete over amenity space to get bigger spans but generally 4 over 1.
Fully sprinklered?	Yes
When the last group was here, there was a grade change from left to right of 4-6 ft from one end of Wharton Street to another. You're showing it like it's tabletop flat. How are you handling that grade change?	Can hardly perceive grade change on Wharton Street but it's slight. Most of grade change will be addressed through the parking garage, with parking a bit taller on one end vs the other end. We want residential platform to be level so that it doesn't create problems for accessibility.
Around the base, where parking is exposed, you show it as black/dark/meshed. Maybe solid? Assume those need to be louvered? Open garage for ventilation?	Yes, open garage. And can see walk-up units. [showed rendering of Wharton Street facade]. We want to see a lot of life on street. We take architecture down to fool the eye

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
	so it looks better. We do need a lot of parking. But want to design it architecturally to scale the openings at more residential scale. Louvers would secure the garage but we'll be careful about how we light it and what a pedestrian would see at ground level when walking by. We will spend lots of time on that, since that was a real concern we heard from previous design. This is especially important on Wharton Street, which more of a pedestrian-focused street. [Showed image again of parking garage openings under courtyard along S 23rd Street]
I'm worried about the spill-out of light [along 23 rd Street]	Plan is to break up [garage openings along S 23 rd St], not leave a black hole. Want to make it feel like an amenity space. May incorporate landscaping too.
At other project over by Homeland Security building, they were going to bring a wall up 3 feet and then set a louver on top, to reduce opening size and make it look smaller and less visible to look through.	Yeah, a knee wall can also stop head lights from shooting out onto the street. We want each building to have their own vocabulary, so we'll do different things to screen cars, headlights and lighting. We want residents and neighbors to feel comfortable walking around.
I'm looking at your brick detailing on Wharton Side and parapet condition. At the parapet wall, it seems like an opportunity to do something a little less modern and more contextual rather than the flat tops.	Yeah, it's a good point to articulate [the brick roof line on Wharton Street facade.] We know neighborhood already has lots of cornice and historic elements, so we want to be thoughtful.
How will trash and recycling be managed?	All will end up over on 24th Street by bike storage, similar to how other design managed it. We will have a couple cores – one at main entry and one on 24th street. Will have residents do their move-ins on 24th street, where there will be a large elevator. The fire stairs are also a great way for residents to get down and go for walk and with dog, and it puts less pressure on elevators. Post-covid, we have found people want to do that. Many of the corridors will have views out to the river and will be day lit and we will have some stairs embedded near there, and we want those to be comfortable for people to use. We have experience with need for generous amount of room for servicing. We've thought about sizing of bike storage, dog washing area, and those need to be laid out thoughtfully since can be spaces that get people together.
There is a problem in the city with the fact that lots of buildings do not recycle. Do you have an active recycling program? Or problems with commercial pick-up of recyclables?	I'll check with the property management team about what you said related to companies having issues picking up recyclables. Our standard is to have two chutes – one for trash and one for recycling, with separation, and two different dumpsters for each and have a company come and take both, specifically one for trash and one for recycling. Renters want this and are focused on environmental issues and we see this as easy to

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
	accomplish. We will also have other deposit sites [in the building closer to west and middle end of Wharton street on south side of building] so renters don't have to walk so far to deposit waste.
Can you show the parking matrix sheet? It references 0.8 and 1:1 ratios. Are you taking reduction because of the biking? Can you clarify?	Maximum allowed by zoning code is 1:1 ratio of one parking spot to one residential unit, so we're not hitting the maximum or changing that or asking for a variance. We're not using bike parking to reduce that, since it's a maximum. We're approximately 0.8-0.85 in our ratio, and we're finalizing the exact ratio.
I know one purpose of RIV district is to reduce amount of parking provided, as an incentive to reduce driving. I think that works better for other cities but not as well for us in Pittsburgh, though it is aspirational. It looks like you're technically about 80 parking units short in your project, if every unit has one car (which would also assume units with two people also have one car). Can you confirm how many parking spots short you are, given the range listed here? I see on street parking, but is that not going to be part of RPP or will that be free street parking? How do you view on-street parking?	We are still finalizing the matrices for exact unit counts and exact parking counts. Our approximation, as of now, is in range of 365-375 units with 280-290 off-street parking spaces. With street parking, we're working with DOMI to figure out exactly what that would be and how it would work.
No guest parking?	Normally what we do is there are a couple spots for guests near the lobby. Normally we try to keep guest parking as on-street spaces directly in front of lobby. Guest passes are managed normally by residents in coordination with the property manager.
That's a concern, and other nearby neighbors may have comments. You're in an area without public parking, so spill-over will be absorbed by neighbors and their street parking directly around you, so I can see stress there.	
As to rooftop equipment / mechanical units – will you do wall-packed units or put condensing units on roof, which would add to height of building?	Typically we do a split system, similar to other projects like this, and have them set back from the street approximately 30 feet. They're small compressor units set in a row, basically following the corridors of the building.
If you put in the large city mutual systems that are 7 or 8 feet tall, neighbors and those living up on the Slopes might not like seeing those. If instead they are 2- or 3-foot units sitting on a curb, that's what we like.	If went up on Incline and look down at Glass House, the equipment is like dots and disappear from the view up there. We'll keep low profile so that they'd be hard to see.
Signage variances? Planning anything large, like a 30-foot sign plan? We're very conscious about signage on South Side	Signage isn't proposed at this time and we haven't considered it, but that would be separate

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
On last project [with Edwards Communities], there was conversation about additional traffic this would generate. Lots of concern from neighbors and others who visit here. Adding 300+ vehicles around rush hour and throughout day will make it busier. With recent changes, on 23rd Street going south and approaching Birmingham Bridge motorists have to turn right (no more cutting straight through). S 24th Street has a turning light but it is backed up due to cars coming from the south hitting Carson and trying to turn. Some neighbors have shared concerns about added traffic. Will you produce another traffic study with your project as the model? Have you talked about other solutions? One idea was opening up the bike route under Birmingham Bridge and reconnect with grid as another vehicle outlet to keep traffic moving through neighborhood? Have you discussed with DOMI?	We love this location because we are connecting the community to the river and it is an extremely walkable community, with so many amenities nearby: employment, shopping, groceries, restaurants, entertainment. This all means less vehicle dependency, which is a goal of the City and a goal of the RIV district. That's what we're shooting for here. In terms of traffic volume, we're in close discussions with DOMI on a weekly basis. Our trips do not trigger the need for a traffic impact study since we're below that threshold. So we're working with DOMI to produce a transportation memorandum, which will have a primary part discussing multimodal activities and amenities we're providing and encouraging non-Single-Occupancy Vehicle use. We continue to work with DOMI to make sure they get what they need and cover all bases of how there is impact on surrounding neighborhood network. The Carson Street improvements overall have had a major positive impact. At the S 23rd St intersection, while it previously allowed full movements, there were many concerns with its safety given its proximity to Birmingham bridge and the back-ups there and user confusion there that created problems. At S 24th St intersection, the addition of a protected-Left Turn phase and flashing yellow arrow, makes it more easily understandable for drivers. We are talking to DOMI and feel that intersection with its improvements has good capacity to handle the number of trips discussed. We estimate it will likely be less than 70 directional trips (leaving in AM, entering in PM). In PM, many vehicles will likely use S 24th street, and we see a capacity there to handle the traffic volumes we're projecting for this site.
I hear you. In the 8am-8:45am range many mornings, I regularly drive along Sarah Street, make a left onto S 24th St, and then left onto Carson to get across Birmingham Bridge and that strip of 24th between Sarah and Carson is backed up solid. A lot of that is because of back-up from vehicles coming from the river side as well. Clearly the timing and modeling on Carson Street did not address it, though we mentioned a project like this might be coming. I don't know if we should be involved with DOMI or just aren't getting the right numbers. Right now, it's not functioning well and people are upset. More work has to be done there. Conversation should be started again about opening Wharton Street to cars and not just bikes under Birmingham Bridge. [Zoom chat by other attendee: "100% agree"]	Opening it up to all traffic, and not just bicycles is a long-term conversation with DOMI. The bike connection that was done previously there was a major improvement. Everything with the safety improvement project on Carson is new. When there is a new project and new or modified signal, the standard is to implement it, collect data, review it, and make adjustments. I assume City will continue to review. The addition of protected permitted left turns, which didn't exist before, is a huge improvement. Same with turn restrictions at S. 23rd St, since it removes congestion problems at that location that used to wrap up with the Birmingham Bridge. DOMI has agreed that the anticipated peak hour trips for this site are going to be accommodated within that system. We'll keep working with DOMI for anything they request.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
[Zoom Chat:] “That section of 24&Sarah is also going to have greater traffic when the UPMC facility opens”	
[Zoom Chat:] [Community member] is absolutely correct about the traffic. We live directly behind the proposed building. The changes are not conducive to flow, it is backed up on 23 to turn on the bridge. We drive this daily	
[Zoom Chat:] “The changes to left turns is only applicable to people driving on Carson, not people driving on the numbered streets (like 24th).”	
[Zoom Chat:] “Summer months are good for walking and the amenities that were talked about but winter and times like now where it's dark early create more traffic.”	
When consider change from Urban Industrial to RIV, the intention was to bring neighborhood closer to river, and one intent was to build up riverfront façade to communities. I do lots of work on trails – cleaning, maintaining, advocating for them. I’m not seeing benefit as trail user from this project. I was hoping you’d beautify it, address overgrown shrubs and garbage, and maybe have a decorative fence or other things. But just a lone fire access driveway and some trees is disappointing to me. We hear from neighborhood about need for more ways to get to river and nobody is proposing that. One way to do that is to extend S 24 th Street over railway as bike/ped bridge. We have 18 th . S 9 th Street is closed so we have to use S 4 th St. You’re telling your residents they’ll have to walk a number of blocks to get to trail. Maybe if you’re seeking more units and length, you could also build a bridge to have residents access the trail directly? It’s very within the box of development and since the building is near the river, we would love to see you help us fix and beautify the trail and riverfront edge. The building portion doesn’t do as much for us as a community. That’s my statement.	We’ll look into that. I appreciate all the feedback and we’ll work with DOMI as well to relay all your concerns and work with them on ways to alleviate traffic and we are happy to be conduits of concern.
[Zoom Chat:] [Community member] is correct on trail access	
I’m the owner of RiverPark Commons 1, RiverPark Commons 3, and also the parking lot on S 23 rd street, so I surround the property on three sides. I welcome and applaud your project, it’s exciting and needed. I’ve been here 22 years now. My question is about S 24 th street. The challenge with 24 th St is not necessarily access to Carson, but there are cars parked on both sides of street, and so	Thank you. We noted that and we’ll work with traffic engineers to see if we can find any solutions to that issue.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
only one car at a time can use it. If coming out, have to wait for one car to go down before other car can go up it. Not sure if DOMI is paying attention to that. It is an issue, but the fact that cars are parked on both sides of the street and really there is only one lane of traffic to go in/out makes it difficult. On 24th Street, River Park Commons 1 welcomes a lot of trucks and they need to come down that street and make their turn into rear of building. That's my major concern. I don't have a solution for that issue. If no solution, we will have a major problem.	
I do want to see you there, because having those warehouse buildings creates problems for property with drag racing and people who are homeless. If you're there, it will be populated. It's the last piece from Birmingham Bridge over that is to redevelop, but there is a need to figure out the way for cars. Can't just say you'll look at it since will turn into a fight with residents. It's an issue that will create a problem. We need to sit down and think about it and not just leave it to the City. If I can be of assistance, I'm here for you.	Thank you.
My concern is access. I'm a resident and property manager and am very familiar with that block. I was surprised to hear that your changes are exempt from a traffic study – that is a deep concern of mine and of other residents. If there is cooperation with DOMI, I hope there would be an opportunity for residents to give testimony to current status of things, let alone increased impacts. It is a very captive block. There are a lot of very attractive things in your presentation, but I think traffic impact of people getting in and out is underestimated or understated relative to existing infrastructure. I've discussed with a number of neighbors – we want to see change and development, but want it done responsibly. Adding to what has been said by others.	Thank you.
I'm an attorney and advise SSCC. The site is in the RIV-IMU?	Yes
We haven't dealt with a lot of projects in the RIV since its inception. This fits under the ceiling but isn't there also an opportunity to push ceiling higher than current design?	Yes, with bonus points we could go above [in height], but we're not going higher.
In terms of your density and parking, it's anywhere between half a spot per unit to one spot per unit?	Yes

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
Only zoning issue that doesn't fit into RIV-IMU is extra 66 feet from east to west?	Correct
If you were to add another floor on another portion and pull back the 60 feet, could you keep the same density of units with less parking and fit entirely within the RIV envelope?	I don't think that's something we could do. It would cause problems. The zoning hasn't changed that much between the two proposals, since RIV overlay was in place when Edwards was approved, and that was precursor to what we're dealing with now.
[Building length issue] is caused by 24 th street being on slightly different grid from 23 rd ?	Yes
With on-street parking, one option is maybe it would be folded into RPP and another is that would be folded into Parking Improvement District similar to what happened on Jane Street between 20 th and 21 st St.	
With west entrance to common space, long term it will be advisable to have some kind of gate-keeping function. If completely open to public, I could imagine undesirable traffic being attracted to that location. Thanks for your presentation.	We'll definitely have a gate, we just haven't designed what that looks like yet. We want residents to feel they can use it and not feel gate is too enormous. But there will be a gate for security and for code reasons for the pool so children don't run up and use it, etc.
We're single-family homeowners living here since mid 1990s. We have deep concerns related to traffic and parking. The earlier points brought up about 24th Street were important – there is already congestion. The 25th and 24th street area is parking permitted. There is not much parking available for people without RPP. And the parking that is dual on 24th Street is apartment residents. And often when I come home, you cannot turn into our parking space without waiting for another car – risky and tedious. I echo earlier concerns about parking and traffic flow. Traffic will go directly past our house. People speed down Sidney Street and use it as cut-through.	
[Attendee provided in Zoom Chat:] "914.02.B Uses Requiring Parking Demand Analysis Uses requiring parking demand analysis have widely varying parking demands, making it difficult to specify a single requirement. The off-street parking requirement for such uses shall be established by the Zoning Administrator based on estimates of parking demand, which may include recommendations of the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), data collected from uses that are the same or comparable to the proposed use, or other relevant information. The Zoning Administrator may require that an applicant submit a parking study that provides analysis and	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
justification for the proposed number of spaces to be provided. Parking studies shall document the source of data used to develop the recommendations. The Zoning Administrator will review the submitted study along with any other traffic engineering and planning data that are appropriate and establish the minimum and maximum off-street parking requirement (including bicycle parking) for the use proposed.”	
Who is your target for residents?	We target a variety of people and depends on unit size, but we see anywhere from 25-year-olds to 45-year-olds as typical target market for these types of projects.
We don’t need more college students living here in group projects so they can afford rent. We have quiet residential neighborhood behind you. I’m impressed with you giving people views, but one of our big objections, and particularly to attendee who commented on extended building height. We have unobstructed views of the river and city, and your building takes away that view. We understand the need for growth and your group is more user-friendly than the prior people, but it is of deep concern to us because we like looking out our windows and people on Sidney Street have decks and your building will obstruct our views to give those residents better view than we have. If you could just drop your building down to make a carve out for our view.	I appreciate your comments. This is not student housing, is not designed for student housing, and we have whole other student housing division within Greystar which is not part of this project. Understood, thank you.
[RCO contact]: I’d like to share about an agreement previously made with Edwards Communities, which was put in writing, that the units would never be able to be considered for Residential Permit Parking (RPP). From guidelines, I think a complex like this cannot be part of RPP, but they were agreeable to put it in writing for us. There may have been an earlier question about signage for RPP on South 23 rd and S 24 th -- being that the complex is on those blocks, it would not be considered RPP, so signs would not go up for that. But hearing about S 24 th and the problems of two-side parking, that’s probably due to it not being part of RPP. I want to be clear it would not be eligible for RPP.	Thanks. There was a letter made as part of the conditions for the Edwards Communities project approval. We plan to do the exact same thing as Edwards did before for that.
I am an advocate for high-performing low energy buildings. With so many units, it seems like this is a great opportunity to reduce carbon use in buildings in Pittsburgh. Not sure of Greystar’s position on this. Any energy use standards you are seeking that would go beyond code?	We’re not finalized on that. Pretty confident we’re not receiving LEED. But we previously have pursued a variety of others on other projects, which we may explore, such as Green Globes or Fitwel. We haven’t gotten to that point yet.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
I'm not advocating LEED, though I am LEED-AP. Passive house is an opportunity to be leader in Pittsburgh. Even if not pursuing certification, still good to pursue higher level of performance. With covid, pursue high ventilation rate. Important to have a healthy long-lasting building. I know it's early in design process but wanted to plant that seed. With so many units, I don't think you'd pay that much more in development cost to make it high performing.	We'll work with HCM on this. Higher performing building is better for tenants, better for owners over long term, and better for operations in terms of reduced utility costs, so we'll work to look at that and make as high performing as we can. Appreciate the passive house comment too. Sometimes there are certain things in those requirements where if we don't do the one thing we don't meet it, but other things we can still put into building and improve performance without getting certificate.
I am a resident on 2400 block of Sidney Street. Re: parking, from pre-covid to post-covid, most people are still hosting guests at home and there are more cars on the street and more limited options available for residents here. Your target market is within age range I fall into and I bought a home in this neighborhood since it's quiet and the neighborly people. What you plan is a good thought but need to truly consider traffic congestion. S 24th St is my one route in and out. I live by a studio with events on weekends, which adds competition for evening hour parking. No one here has opened opportunity to how neighbors and businesses could take advantage of the parking you have in your project for your residents. Many of us are open to those conversations if we could figure out how to serve people now who are currently relying on street parking. I'm often on South Watch meetings, and with parking enforcement so low, this will add to frustration, especially for residents like me who don't have a garage or landing pad and depend on open areas of parking. This is part of south side that has some opportunity since in that nestled part, and with this development, when guests come by, they may take a spot near my home, without repercussion. Part of appeal of here is night life and city appeal, especially for folks in that demographic age range of your target market and which I fall in. We appreciate that quiet we have. As look at enforcement, potential opportunity to extend RPP from Sidney St all the way up from 23rd to Carson St going south. Currently that one across from City Vets is only for metered parking and not available to RPP or permit parking KK area, which seems off to me, and we as residents should have access.	Thanks for comments and nuances of parking universe there with metered parking and with RPP.
Can somebody talk about projected timeline for approvals? Construction? when live project?	In terms of timeline, we're looking at construction starting in late 2023 and anticipate duration of about 20-22 months to finalize construction and have residents moving in. In late 2025 we expect to finish construction.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
Could you speak to your process with Planning Commission and project development plan in the RIV? <i>[RCO contact expressed interest in this question too and noted community will be responding to request for variance; sought clarification about variance length]</i>	Yes, we will go to Planning Commission. We are working now on project development and the design review and that entire package. There is no date scheduled yet for our ZBA hearing, and we hope to get in front of ZBA in early January if possible. We'll be following up with City after this to get to that point. After ZBA, it will probably be a couple months later going before Planning Commission. The additional 66 feet of building length is not for entire width of building. Along Wharton Street the building length is about 538 feet. The variance we seek is 66 feet, but that is just the maximum at furthest points. The measurement for Edwards proposal was straight down, whereas ours is more angled. At ground floor it's 560 feet and because of terraces shown at renderings, they extend out above and that makes 66 ft from 23rd to 24th at longest point.
<i>[RCO contact:] After this meeting, the community will have 30 days to provide feedback on this and we'll gather up comments to send to Zoning along with DCP notes. [Also sought clarification from DCP staff on DAM requirements and if this is one and only DAM meeting in light of project development plan to be reviewed by Planning Commission. Expressed desire to work hand in hand with Greystar for community buy-in.]</i>	We would be happy to come back to speak to the community before the Planning Commission hearing. The Edwards Communities project did that last time (presenting to community before the ZBA hearing and again before Planning Commission). The new DAM / RCO ordinance changed things some with process. Not an issue to come back.
<i>[DCP staff shared that while only one DAM is typically required (assuming no substantial changes to the plans or substantial new additions), DCP strongly recommends ongoing and frequent engagement, including coming back for another meeting, and thanked applicant for stating their plan to do so before going to Planning Commission. It's possible the follow-up meeting might be an informal meeting.]</i>	Thank you. Just to recap, this is almost identical dimensionally, in terms of impact, to project that was previously approved, and we're happy to get this project viable again. Thank you for your time and recommendation. If community questions/comments, SSCC can please feel free to reach out to us.
There were questions raised in the chat about whether we are saturated with apartment units. For example, SomeraRoad is building an apartment complex at South Side Works. Has Greystar done research to determine need for apartments like this? <i>[The question verbalized out loud references the Zoom chat comments listed below:]</i> <i>[Zoom Chat:] When does it become over saturation with apartment units? There are over 1500 apartment units in this general area already.</i>	We haven't contracted with a third party to do a formal analysis, but as part of our analysis in preliminary phases, we review supply and demand in each market we enter. Looking at Pittsburgh generally and South Side specifically, there is significant housing demand. It's caught us that there is little vacancy of apartments in Pittsburgh. Normally we see 5% vacancy in most markets in apartment buildings, and in Pittsburgh most buildings are 2-3% vacant. The amenities of the trail, of bike routes, of E. Carson, and more, also will be used by tenants. We are seeing more and more tenants working from home, which will relieve some of those traffic concerns raised earlier, as

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<i>[Zoom Chat:] Yes good point. The apartments being built by hoffbrau are already adding more. Is there that much demand for more luxury apartments here?</i> <i>[Zoom Chat:] There is demand for housing, "luxury" or not. Today's luxury is tomorrows affordable</i>	they often leave at different times than people who don't necessarily work from home.
When I think back with Edwards Communities, in places where they had built apartment buildings, the housing around the facilities probably was updated. We have a lot of student housing that may not be as well maintained as those of us who live in our homes. Because there was the kind of competition with these apartment buildings, some of the housing had considerable renovation. I'm not sure if that would happen here, but they had mentioned that.	
[Zoom chat summarized aloud, see full chat referenced below]: <i>Good point. Has there been any feedback on the Glass House complex and how that has worked out? I know that area is quite different from this with a large parking lot and less traffic concerns.</i>	As only the architect, I don't know too much of how Glass House worked out. It's a different developer. They have a massive parking lot. They have a podium structure similar to us. The street structure is not as dense as this, but I know it's leased up well if that's the question. We've looked at several sites in Pittsburgh and [the city] is having a residential boom now.
How is parking handled? People pay extra for parking?	At Glass House they do pay for that parking. It's structured parking. The project is in the flood plain. [Acknowledged that at Wharton Street project would have payment of parking.] Whenever we pursue development, concerns about traffic issues arise and so we confront this every day. On the one hand, neighbors don't want more traffic, but on the other hand, they want more parking in our apartments. The more cars we put in our building, the more traffic there is likely to be. So we try to balance that. More and more tenants don't want the parking and pay the extra expense, and are more willing to ride a bike, take the bus, take Ubers, work from home and choose location where have ability to do all those things without a car. We do believe this location gives tenants ability to access a number of different amenities.
Definitely a lot of walkable amenities in this neighborhood for sure. Are any units considered affordable housing? No overlay requirement in this district, correct? [appears to be referring to Inclusionary Zoning]	Not at this time, nothing designated as such. We try to offer a variety of sizes so that people looking for relatively lower price point will have some options in that way. Correct

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
Would these residents be able to apply for residential parking and park on street? Thanks	No. As I referred to earlier, Edwards Communities agreed to not join a RPP program. And Greystar would honor and document that as well as part of any condition to approval.
[Zoom Chat, read aloud:] To [community member's] point -- they might not be able to apply for RPP, but I am concerned that this will not be enforced effectively, especially in evenings and weekends. [RCO contact responded:] We're continuing to work on that [with City.] By time this is built, maybe we'll have strong enforcement throughout South Side.	
[Zoom chat, read aloud:] What is the price range for apartments?	We have what we'd like but market bears that out and it depends on unit type. General expectations: smaller units range from \$1500-\$1800, and then for largest two bedrooms would be \$2800-\$3000 per month.
These are all strictly apartment rentals, no condos for purchase? So wouldn't be someone coming in to buy and stay long-term. Will it be a standard one year lease?	Correct, all rentals. Variety of leases from 6 months to 15 months, sometimes longer but rarely. Depends on pricing and other factors.
Do you do short-term rental with AirBnB and does it happen now in Glass House and will you do something like that here?	We don't own Glass House and we didn't develop it. Just the architecture team worked as architectural consultants on it. I have not done AirBnB. Usually there are one or two units held as guest suites for people who live in the building, e.g. at Thanksgiving someone wants their parents to visit and stay in other suite. Other than that, we do not plan on doing any short-term stay or AirBnB component.
Will there be on-site staff and security, or third party security walking around and monitoring property? Will property manager be required to live on property?	We do not require property managers to live on site. We have people on site usually 24 hours a day. We do offer a discount for property management team to live on site and therefore usually one or two of them do. Go through an extensive security plan with property management team. Go through each door and what is open, who has access, etc. to ensure building is secure. At property manager level, figure out what time to have security officer come around. Usually in a context like this in the city, we have someone we hire to do security walking around at night, but we're far from making those decisions. Greystar manages multiple properties in Pittsburgh, in addition to properties managed elsewhere, and is familiar with what is required to make tenants feel safe and comfortable.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
Do you plan security cameras? Where? On outskirts of building?	We put cameras at strategic places where people can enter, like the lobby, where stair towers come down, where cars can come in. We do not have a full security plan so I don't want to tell you exactly where we're putting them. We put in a lot of cameras in – it is relatively expensive, but it is important for security of our own building and for our tenants.
[Zoom Chat, read aloud:] How do you avoid a bad party situation such as occurred on the North Side [In verbalizing the chat comment, RCO contact also added a clarification:] your place is different from AirBnB but have there been other locations/problems?	We avoid this by having a lease that is strongly worded and we have property management on site, so we very rarely have those issues. We have public amenity spaces designed to be used by tenants who invite people over. We encourage people to use those public spaces to host guests, and those amenity spaces have cameras.
[RCO thanked all, and shared opportunities to share public comment and to give feedback/comments to the RCO] [DCP Planner shared email addresses to provide public comment to ZBA and to Planning Commission.]	Thank you all.

Other Notes

The 2329 Wharton Street address was included per the applicant's use of that proposed address in their ZDR application (address may still need to be finalized). Applicant team committed to returning to a future meeting of the South Side Community Council to provide an update to the community about their project in advance of their hearing before Planning Commission. Applicant team also offered to distribute a matrix of the volume of residential units by unit type once that is finalized.

Planner completing report: TS