



**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:** February 20, 2025  
**Date of Decision:** March 26, 2025  
  
**Zone Case:** 176 of 2024  
**Address:** 824 Peralta Street  
**Lot and Block:** 24-J-432  
**Zoning Districts:** R1A-VH  
**Ward:** 23  
**Neighborhood:** East Allegheny  
  
**Request:** Occupancy for two unit residential  
  
**Application:** BDA-2024-06837

Review/Variance	Section 911.02	Two-Unit Residential
-----------------	----------------	----------------------

**Appearances:**

Applicant: Nathan Hart

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Subject Property is located at 824 Peralta Street in an R1A-VH (Residential One Unit Attached Very High Density) District in East Allegheny.
2. The structure on the Subject Property has one residential unit on the first floor and a second residential unit on the second floor. The structure extends to all property lines, with no available area for on-site parking.
3. The Applicant submitted photographs of separate utility meters, kitchens, and entrances for the two units.
4. The Applicant explained that the age of the electric meters indicate that the Subject Property has been used for two units since the 1950s.
5. The Applicant noted that several other structures that are used for more than one residential unit are in the proximate area of the Subject Property.
6. The City of Pittsburgh's 1997 Zoning Map indicates that the zoning district designation for the Subject Property was, at least as of 1997, R4 (Residential Multi-Family), where two-unit uses were permitted.

7. The Community Alliance of Spring Garden East Deutschtown submitted a letter of support for the request.
8. No one appeared at the hearing to oppose the request.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. Pursuant to Section 911.02, two-unit residential uses are not permitted in R1A-VH Districts.
2. The Applicant presented credible evidence that the use of the Subject Property for two residential units has existed, without a Certificate of Occupancy, since at least the 1950s and predated both the 1997 R4 District designation and the current R1A-VH District designation.
3. Use of the parcel for two residential units has not had a significant impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
4. Consistent with the evidence that testimony presented, and the legal principles relating to nonconforming uses, the Board concludes that the use of the Subject Property for two residential units predates the current Zoning Code provisions and is legally nonconforming.

**Decision: The use of the structure for two units is legally nonconforming and may continue.**

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.