



**Division of Development Administration and Review**

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning

412 Boulevard of the Allies, Second Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**Date of Hearing:** July 3, 2025  
**Date of Decision:** July 22, 2025  
  
**Zone Case:** 84 of 2025  
**Address:** 158 41st Street  
**Lot and Block:** 49-A-192  
**Zoning Districts:** R1A-VH  
**Ward:** 9  
**Neighborhood:** Central Lawrenceville  
  
**Request:** BDA-2025-04568  
  
**Application:** Change of use from warehouse to office

Variance	Section 921.02.A.4	Change non-conforming use from warehouse to unlisted
----------	--------------------	--

**Appearances:**

Applicant: Todd Demangone, Izzy Hunter, Allison Treaster

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Subject Property is located at 158 41<sup>st</sup> Street, at the intersection with Foster Street, in an R1A-VH (Residential One Unit Attached Very High Density) District in Central Lawrenceville.
2. The dimensions of the parcel are approximately 75' by 50' (3,750 sf).
3. Located on the parcel are a two-story house and a one-story, L-shaped warehouse structure. Loading bays for the warehouse are located on both 41<sup>st</sup> Street and Foster Street.
4. A 2020 Certificate of Occupancy permits the use of the warehouse structure for "Use of 1<sup>st</sup> floor with mezzanine as warehouse in a 1 story structure."
5. The Applicant proposes renovate the warehouse structure for offices and an athletic training space for a sports technology company.
6. The Applicant explained that the space would be primarily used to hold training sessions with athletes, but would also be used for office space and for the assembly and distribution of hardware.

7. The Department of City Planning determined that the combination of uses proposed would be considered an “unlisted” use with characteristics that would be similar to office or retail sales and services uses.

8. As proposed, the training sessions would be by appointment only.

9. No on-site parking was available for the permitted warehouse use and no on-site parking is proposed for the changed use.

10. The Applicant indicated that staff typically work remotely, but that the Subject Property would occasionally be used for in-person meetings.

11. The Applicant asserted that the proposed use would have a similar impact on the surrounding area, as compared to the former warehouse use.

12. The Applicant provided evidence that on-street parking is typically available in the proximate area of the Subject Property.

13. No one appeared at the hearing to oppose the request.

### **Conclusions of Law:**

1. Code Section 921.02.A.4 permits the change of one nonconforming use to another where the proposed use is “of the same general character or of a character that is more closely conforming than the existing, nonconforming use” and is generally consistent with the prior nonconforming use with respect to the impact of the proposed use on the surrounding area.

2. The warehouse use, as permitted pursuant to the 2020 Certificate of Occupancy, is a legally nonconforming use in the R1A-VH District. The proposed unlisted office/retail use proposed is not permitted in R1A-VH Districts would also be nonconforming in that district.

3. The Board concludes that the proposed use will have similar impacts compared to the previous use of the property and will not have any significant impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

4. Consistent with the evidence and testimony presented and the applicable legal standards governing special exceptions, the Board concludes that approval of the requested special exception is appropriate.

**Decision: The Applicant's request for a special exception pursuant to Section 921.02.A.4 to allow the change of use of the structure from the non-conforming warehouse use to an office/retail use is hereby APPROVED, subject to compliance with the general hours of operation and operational details described to the Board.**

s/Alice B. Mitinger  
**Alice B. Mitinger**, *Chair*

s/Lashawn Burton-Faulk  
**LaShawn Burton-Faulk**

s/ John J. Richardson  
**John J. Richardson**

Note: Decision issued with electronic signatures, with the Board members' review and approval.