



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: January 8, 2026
Date of Decision: February 16, 2026

Zone Case: 134 of 2025
Address: Monongahela Street
Lot and Block: 55-P-82
Zoning Districts: R1D-H
Ward: 15
Neighborhood: Hazelwood

Request: Construction of two-unit residential structure

Application: BDA-2025-09147

Variance	Section 911.02	Two-unit residential use not permitted in R1 District
----------	----------------	---

Appearances:

Applicant: Krish Pandya, Matt Brind'Amour

Findings of Fact:

1. The Subject Property is an unaddressed lot, identified as Parcel No. 55-P-82, in an R1D-H (Residential One Unit Detached High Density) District in Hazelwood.
2. The Subject Property is on a corner of Monongahela Street and an unimproved portion of Grover Way. On the interior side, it abuts the parcel located at 203 Tullymet Street. At the rear, it abuts the rear side of the parcel at 205 Tullymet Street.
3. The dimensions of the Subject Property are 60' by 50' (3,000 sf) and it is currently vacant.
4. The grade of the site has a significant upward slope from Monongahela Street towards the rear of the site.
5. The Applicant proposes to construct two attached, three-story structures on the Subject Property, each with an integral garage with access from a curb cut on Monongahela Street.
6. As proposed, the attached houses would extend to the front property line on Monongahela Street, with a 0' setback and would be set back 20' from the rear property line. On

the Grover Way side, a 5' setback is proposed and on the 203 Tullymet Street side, a 0' setback is proposed. Because the houses would be attached, a 0' setback is proposed for the shared interior side.

7. Because the two attached houses would be on the same parcel, the Department of City Planning determined that the use would be a two-unit residential use.

8. The Applicant asserted that it would not be economically feasible to construct a house for a single residential unit under current market conditions in the area.

9. The parcel has been vacant for a significant period of time.

10. The Applicant identified a number of properties in the immediate vicinity of the Subject Property that are used for multiple residential units.

11. 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 a two-unit residential use would have been permitted.

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

Conclusions of Law:

1. The Applicant seeks a use variance from Section 911.02 to allow the construction of two residential units on the Subject Property.

2. In seeking a variance, the applicant is required to provide evidence of some unique feature or condition of the property that prevents compliance with the Code's requirements. Any variance requested is to be the minimum that would afford relief and is not to have any significant impacts on the surrounding area. See Code Section 922.09.E; see also *Marshall v. City of Philadelphia and Zoning Bd. of Adj.*, 97 A.3d 323, 329 (Pa. 2014); *Hertzberg v. Zoning Board of Adj. of the City of Pittsburgh*, 721 A.2d 43 (Pa. 1998).

3. The minimum lot size in R1D-H Districts is 1,200 sf, and thus, the 3,000 sf area of the Subject Property would be sufficient for two lots that would comply with this Code requirement.

4. The Board concludes that the Applicant submitted credible evidence that the area of the Subject Property parcel would allow for subdivision into two lots that would comply with the Code's minimum lot size requirement for the R1D-H District, which would allow for use of the parcel for two single-unit residences.

5. The Applicant also provided credible evidence that the proposed density of two units on the single 3,000 sf lot would be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and would not have detrimental impacts on nearby properties.

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 Section 911.02 to permit the construction of two attached single-family houses on the Subject Property is hereby APPROVED.

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.