



**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:** June 12, 2025  
**Date of Decision:** July 19, 2025  
  
**Zone Case:** 74 of 2025  
**Address:** 1901 Brighton Road  
**Lot and Block:** 22-D-109, 50, 48, 44, 42, 41, 40, 39, 37  
**Zoning Districts:** UI  
**Ward:** 25  
**Neighborhood:** California-Kirkbride  
  
**Request:** Chicken Coop  
  
**Application:** BDA-2025-04274

Variance	Section 912.07.B(17)	Poultry-keeping is permitted as an urban agriculture with animals (accessory) use, only when there is an occupied residence; chicken coop proposed without an occupied residence on the same parcel
----------	----------------------	---

**Appearances:**

Applicant: Claire Fox

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Subject Property is located on Brighton Road in a UI (Urban Industrial) District in California Kirkbride.
2. The site is comprised of 9 adjacent parcels with common ownership and uses.
3. The Applicant is Pittsburgh Community Science Workshop (PCSW), an organization that provides science programs for youth.
4. PCSW uses a one-story structure on Parcel No. 22-D-109 for educational classroom space.
5. PCSW manages the community garden that is located on the adjacent Parcels Nos. 22-D-50, 48, 44, 42, 41, 40, 39 and 37.

6. In conjunction with the community garden use, the Applicant proposes to install a chicken coop on Parcel No. 22-D-37.
7. The dimensions of Parcel No. 22-D-37 are approximately 195' by 40' (7,800 sf).
8. The site of the proposed chicken coop on Parcel No. 22-D-37 is approximately 200' from the one-story classroom space structure on Parcel No. 22-D-109.
9. No occupied residence and no structure other than the chicken coop would be located on Parcel No. 22-D-109.
10. As proposed, the chicken coop would be covered, well-ventilated and designed to be predator resistant. An outdoor roaming area will be provided and will be sufficiently enclosed and screened from the street to protect the chickens from vehicular traffic and from other predators and to contain the chickens on the property.
11. Clare Fox, who appeared on behalf of the Applicant, explained that the chickens would be kept within the henhouse and the associated fenced outdoor roaming area. To the extent possible, the chickens would range freely within the confines of the coop and fenced area but would be prevented from leaving the property and/or crossing the road.
12. The Applicant acknowledged that no occupied residence is located on Parcel No. 22-D-37 but asserted that several PCSW employees, and participants in PCSW's educational programs, live in the proximate area of the Subject Property and could respond if any chickens were to fly the coop.
13. The Applicant indicated that signage could be installed on the coop structure with contact information for PCSW and those individuals in the immediate area who are responsible for the chickens.
14. No one appeared at the hearing to oppose the request.

### **Conclusions of Law:**

1. Section 912.07.B permits, by right, the accessory use of urban agriculture with animals, subject to the standards set forth in that section.
2. Section 912.07.B(17) requires that the keeping of chickens, ducks and goats is permitted only where the property is also used for an occupied residence.
3. Ms. Fox seeks a variance from this requirement to allow a henhouse on property without the required occupied dwelling to guard the coop.
4. The Applicant presented credible evidence and testimony that, in the context of this site and the existing PCSW and community garden uses on the adjacent parcels, providing signage and contact information for those responsible for the chickens would be a sufficient alternative to the occupied dwelling requirement.
5. A variance to allow signage with contact information on the coop as an alternative to an occupied dwelling will not have a significant impact on the surrounding neighborhood and should effectively mitigate any potential off-site impacts.

6. Consistent with the evidence and testimony presented, and the applicable legal standards governing variances, the Board concludes that approval of the request is appropriate.

**Decision: The Applicant's request for a variance from 912.07.B(17) to allow a chicken coop that is accessory to a non-residential use is hereby APPROVED, subject to the conditions that the Applicant complies with the other requirements of Section 012.07.B and that signage shall be posted on the coop with contact information for PCSW and those individuals in the immediate area who are responsible for the chickens.**

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.