



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: September 18, 2025
Date of Decision: October 23, 2025

Zone Case: 77 of 2025
Address: Tioga Street
Lot and Block: 175-B-57, 58, 60, 61
Zoning Districts: UI
Ward: 13
Neighborhood: Homewood South

Request: Construction of three detached houses

Application: BDA-2025-04074

Variance	Section 911.02 Section 904.07.C	Single Unit Residential not permitted in UI Districts 10' minimum side yard setback required; 8.8' requested
----------	--	---

Appearances:

Applicant: Philip Karanovich

Findings of Fact:

1. The Subject Property is comprised of four vacant parcels (Parcel Nos. 175-B-57, 175-B-58, 175-B-60, and 175-B-61) on Tioga Street, in a UI (Urban Industrial) District in Homewood South.
2. The dimensions of the combined parcels are 125' by 125' (15,625 sf).
3. The parcels extend from Tioga Street to Cassina Way at the rear and the site is proximate to the intersection of Tioga Street and N. Braddock Avenue.
4. Although the Subject Property is located within a UI District, it is approximately 120' from parcels in an R1A-VH District.
5. Other uses in the UI District are a mixture of commercial, industrial and residential uses.

6. A 1923 Sanborn Fire Insurance map depicts five houses on the Subject Property, which were either attached or had limited interior side setbacks.
7. The rear of parcels used for single-family residential units, with frontage on N. Braddock Avenue, are adjacent to an interior side yard of the Subject Property.
8. The Applicant proposes to consolidate and re-subdivide the existing four parcels into three parcels, each with the dimensions of 41.6 by 125' (5,200 sf), and to construct a single-family detached house on each of the new parcels.
9. Each of the three new houses would be set back 8.8' from both interior side property lines.
10. The proposed configuration would reduce the number of parcels and the proposed interior side setbacks would exceed the 5' minimum interior side setback required in most residential districts.
11. The Applicant presented sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the parcels could not reasonably be developed for any of the uses permitted in UI Districts.
12. The Applicant identified several other residential properties on the same block of Tioga Street, within the same UI District, and asserted that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
13. The Homewood Community Development Collaborative hosted a Development Activities Meeting for the application and submitted a letter of support to the Board.
14. No one appeared at the hearing to oppose the request.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Pursuant to Section 911.02, single family residential uses are not permitted in UI Districts and, pursuant to Section 904.07.C, the minimum interior side setback is 10'.
2. The Applicant demonstrated that the uses in the UI District proximate to the Subject Property include a mixture of commercial, industrial and residential uses, and that the proposed use of the Subject Property for three single-family structures would allow for reasonable use of the property that would be consistent with the context of the surrounding area.
3. The Applicant also demonstrated that the size of the proposed three parcels precludes strict compliance with the Code's setback standards and that the 8.8' interior side setbacks proposed would exceed the 5' minimum interior side setback required in most residential districts.
4. 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 variances from Sections 911.02 and 904.07.C to allow the construction of three detached houses with limited interior side setbacks 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.