



Historic & Architectural Review Board

Meeting
September 22nd, 2015 4:30 P.M.

I. Call to Order

Steve Gifford: I would like welcome everybody to the Historic and Architectural Review Board. Today is Tuesday September 22nd, 2015. We need to start with the roll call.

II. Roll Call

Steve Gifford: Roll call, please.

PRESENT:

BARBARA CIAMPINI
LYNN ARMBRUST
LEE CALISTI, VICE CHAIRMAN
MARC SCURCI
STEVE GIFFORD, CHAIRMAN
JACKIE JOHNS

ALSO PRESENT:

LOU DEROSE, SOLICITOR

ABSENT:

BARBARA JONES, SECRETARY

III. Approval of August 25th, 2015, Meeting Minutes

Steve Gifford: Approval for the August 25th, 2015 meeting minutes. We received via email. Did anybody get a chance to check that? Let me preface that by saying any comments, corrections? May I have a motion to approve the meeting minutes as they are submitted?

Marc Scurci: I'll make the motion.

Lynn Armbrust: Second motion.

All approved. Motion carried.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

637 West Pittsburgh St

Property Owner: Makar, LLC

Applicant: Ehab Morcos

Project: Demolition

Steve Gifford: Old business we have one item on the Agenda today. Hannah? Should we start with the power point presentation?

Hannah Morcos: Ok. So, I presented the demolition last month. I didn't get enough information.

Steve Gifford: Is it in the power point presentation?

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah, it's in her power point presentation.

Hannah Morcos: It's for 637 West Pittsburgh St. It used to be a church. Unfortunately, there was vandalism. There was damage from inside and outside. I provided more pictures from inside to show what kind of damage. There is mold. There is no electricity or water. I took pictures from the outside as well. What we are planning to do is to demolish the building. It's going to be a lot, and we are going to put a grass lot. I also put pictures the way it should look after we put the grass and demolish the church.

Steve Gifford: This is the image of what it will look like?

Hanna Morcos: That's what it would look like. I have a contract now to cut the grass every other week, so the same people who cut the grass now will be responsible for that as well.

Steve Gifford: Ok. Any questions or comments from members of the Board? Lee, do you have a thought before I jump in?

Lee Calisti: No, I'm trying to gather my thoughts. Go ahead.

Steve Gifford: So after you turn it into a lot, what do you intend to do with the property?

Hanna Morcos: For now, we are just leaving it as a lot—an empty lot.

Steve Gifford: Have you thought about selling it? Why haven't you listed it to sell it?

Hannah Morcos: At this time, we didn't plan for anything. It's going to be an empty lot for now. We might be sell in a couple of years—ten years? We don't have any plan of selling at this point. It's just going to be an empty lot.

Steve Gifford: Well, I guess from my personal perspective—it's kind of hard for me to accept that you took ownership of the church in that neighborhood and you intended to do something with it and you didn't do anything. It's in the condition that it's in now and you want to remove it and turn it into a grass lot. You have no plans for the grass lot. From my perspective, what I do in town and being a resident in Greensburg— I would much rather have you try to sell it to have someone turn it into a productive piece of real estate than to just have a lawn there. It's really a statement of my belief—not necessarily one that you are going to answer a question. So Lee, at this point I will turn it over to you.

Lee Calisti: I had a similar question. Let's back up a second. You have a contract to mow the grass so the City doesn't have that burden and the neighbors do not have to look at an unpleasant, unkept lot. Ok? Will the neighbors be allowed to use it? Can the kids play there? I guess what I am asking is the same question as Steve is asking—what interests do you have in owning an empty lot if all you are going to do is mow grass? If no one's going to use it, it has no purpose and has no use. If I am a neighbor, I am very interested in why someone wants to own that and why they don't sell it, give it up, let someone else develop it.

Hannah Morcos: The only thing is the building is hazardous now.

Lee Calisti: Oh, I understand that. I don't disagree with that at all. That has been made clear.

Hannah Morcos: It's a liability for me. If something happens to this building—someone even tried to enter this building with the mold and everything and got sick, I am liable.

Lee Calisti: I think that we are in agreement of that so that need not be regurgitated. We are in agreement for that. So that's not the point nor the question that we are asking. As a property owner in the City of Greensburg and as I am a resident property owner in the City of Greensburg, I am curious to know what interests you have in retaining this lot?

Hannah Morcos: It's in a good location. I think in the future we can put it for sale and maybe someone would be interested in buying the lot.

Lee Calisti: Once the building comes down, do you have plans to sell it within a certain time period?

Hannah Morcos: Probably. Yeah. If we are not going to do anything with it, then we are probably going to put it up for sale.

Barbara Ciampini: There's always an option of donating it. I don't know—

Hannah Morcos: That's another option we were thinking before that happened; we were actually going to donate it to a different church. There was someone who came in and was interested. He started to paint the walls and everything— to form a congregation. We said that we would help him with everything and then this happened.

Barbara Ciampini: I'm talking more along the lines of donation to perhaps the Westmoreland County Landbank. So that then we [the City] can partner with them and maybe find some higher and better use than just a grass lot. I think that's exactly what Lee and Steve are trying to say. There is a higher and better use for that intersection than just a grass lot.

Hannah Morcos: I agree.

Barbara Ciampini: I think they are trying to get you to say that—yes, you will look at a future either transfer of property to someone who is going to develop it or perhaps donate it to the Westmoreland County Landbank.

Hannah Morcos: Absolutely.

Barbara Ciampini: We are looking for an end result than just you cutting grass. It's not part of your business plan, and it is just going to cost you money. You're not making any money on it. So it is in your best interest to either sell it or donate it.

Hannah Morcos: You're right. Yeah.

Barbara Ciampini: So that's what they are trying to get you to say.

Hannah Morcos: Thank you, Barbara.

Barbara Ciampini: You're welcome. It is in the City's Healthcare District. I don't know if you have paid attention to that, but we have spent a considerable amount of time studying and planning for that neighborhood since 2012. We are focused on that neighborhood. In my perspective, it is [637 W Pittsburgh] a blight on that corner. It is not going to be a church. It's not going to be anything. It's been empty for decades. The fact that you are now stuck with it without insurance is a reason to remove it, and if you have the funds to remove it, your private dollars can remove it. We are just asking what you are planning to do in the future. Cutting the grass for forever is not the highest and best use for the property.

Hannah Morcos: No. There will be something.

Barbara Ciampini: You just don't know right now.

Hannah Morcos: Yes.

Barbara Ciampini: We can talk. We can talk about that in the future to square that up because I would really like to see you donate it to the Westmoreland County Landbank, so we can—the City and Steve's organization—hopefully find a higher and better use than just a vacant grass lot. Ok?

Lee Calisti: Are you aware or does the City have—let's say, rules or regulations for when a building like that comes down. What happens to any subsurface part of the building—rules for filling it in so that whoever gets this lot next is not left with the foundation or a lot of junk, problems? So they would have to follow that?

Steve Gifford: They have to remove the foundation and the concrete floor and fill it. Not throw the church into the hole and throw dirt on top of it.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes. They will have to follow the specs.

Steve Gifford: Hannah, how much is it going to cost you to remove this building?

Hanna Morcos: They said it's going to be between \$30,000 and \$35,000.

Steve Gifford: You still don't want to try to sell it instead of putting that much money into to turn it into a lawn?

Hanna Morcos: I don't think anyone is going to be willing to take it—to buy it. With the condition it's in now, it is pretty rough. To try to actually repair it, it's going to cost much more than to—

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah. If you are trying to use it for a church, as Hannah tried, you're a new congregation coming in here, and no congregation is going to have that kind of money. Our best bet is to let her proceed.

Steve Gifford: Yes, I don't see it as being another church. I was seeing it as being something that would be—I think we have been in several buildings that have been former churches that have been turned into something that is a for profit endeavor. This one has the potential to be something along those lines. It's just a shame that—

Barbara Ciampini: Maybe, but why hasn't it happened in twenty years? It's been sitting there as a blight on the neighborhood. Maybe it's past rehabilitation?

Steve Gifford: Well, right. I guess where I am going with this is that we give permission for this to be torn down. We give a recommendation that it be removed. Mayor and Council authorize that. Hannah removes it. Where is the stipulation that it is to be put on the market or turned over to the Landbank? Because once it's gone, it's gone.

Barbara Ciampini: Can we make that a condition of the approval?

Lou DeRose: I don't think so.

Steve Gifford: I'd much rather see her negotiate with the Landbank. This is your building. You are going to have it on January first, and then we are going to pay to have it removed.

Barbara Ciampini: It's not going to work that way. If it goes into the Landbank, do you want the Landbank to have it removed?

Steve Gifford: No, she pays for it. She is willing to pay for it and to have it torn down now. I just think that we need to have something that the process is in place for it to be donated before we give a recommendation to remove it so that we are not sitting on a year from now, and she's thinking I still want to do something with it. Now, it's a vacant lot and the weeds are growing up and there is trash there.

Barbara Ciampini: Well, how about if I work with Hanna, and we get the demolition part through. I will work with Hanna. She has been in our office I think six times since the last meeting trying to get to this point. So I work with Hanna that our ultimate goal is to donate the land to the Landbank. It would be a clean slate, and then we are dealing with a part of an assemblage. It's not going to happen probably with just that site, but it's a start on that corner. Rather than her continue to cut the grass. I will put her in touch with Hallie and April Kopas, and we will start that process. Would you agree to that Hanna?

Hanna Morcos: Yes.

Barbara Ciampini: I am not in favor in tabling her another thirty days. We have already done that. I have worked with her for the last thirty days to get where we are today. She's got a liability on her hands. I fought her and tabled it last time. I am done with that.

Lee Calisti: Did you pay for this lot or were you given it?

Hanna Morcos: We paid for it. We paid for the church.

Lee Calisti: Do you remember what you paid for the lot?

Hannah Morcos: We paid around—I can't remember exactly. I think around \$18,000 or \$20,000.

Steve Gifford: It was \$18,000.

Lee Calisti: Ok. So you paid \$18,000 and it could cost you \$30,000 to \$35,000 to take the building down. I'm just looking at what do you get out of it?

Hannah Morcos: It's a bad deal. (laughter from all) I don't know. If you have any other suggestions, I am stuck here with this building. I don't want anyone to get hurt. That's it.

Steve Gifford: Well, I think that we have talked about this long enough. You know how I feel about this, and if you believe that Hanna is going to be able to remove the building and donate it to the Landbank in a reasonable period of time so that we are not looking at it eight years from now being a corner lot that is just sitting there.

Barbara Ciampini: I'll work with Hannah.

Hannah Morcos: Thank you.

Barbara Ciampini: With that said, I recommend that we give approval to raze the building at 637 West Pittsburgh St.

Steve Gifford: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Marc Scurci: I will. Second Motion.

All approved. Motion carried.

Steve Gifford: We recommend to the Board that we move forward with demolition of the structure.

Barbara Ciampini: Hannah, how this will work is that it will be on Mayor's and Council's Agenda. This is just a recommending body. Any time after October 12th after the City Council Meeting, your contractor can get a demolition permit and raze the structure. In the meantime, you and I will communicate about donating the land to the Landbank.

Hannah Morcos: Sounds good. Thank you so much.

Barbara Ciampini: Thank you, Hannah.

Lee Calisti: Hannah, how soon can your contractor start?

Hannah Morcos: Once he gets the permit, he said that he can start right away.

Lee Calisti: He's ready to go?

Hannah Morcos: Yeah.

Barbara Ciampini: He wanted to start on August 31st.

Lee Calisti: Is there anything worth salvaging inside that could be donated to?

Hannah Morcos: Someone called me from Mount Pleasant demolition. They take the old parts. I did talk to the demolition guy that I was talking to. He said, "Let me deal with them." He said he can talk to them, but at this point because there is mold, he has to make sure it is safe for them as well.

Barbara Ciampini: He has to remediate it correct?

Hannah Morcos: Yeah.

Lee Calisti: Ok.

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah. TR Waltenbaugh contacted me from Demolition Depot, so that is how he came to get in touch with you.

Hannah Morcos: Thank you very much.

V. NEW BUSINESS

320 S Maple Ave

Property Owner: Penn West Conference United Church of Christ

Applicant: First Reformed United Church of Christ

Project: Demolition

Steve Gifford: We have 320 S Maple Ave. Introduce yourself, spell your first and last name and the project.

Present:

Reverend Stephen Craft

Reverend David Ackerman

Mary Ann Seminary President, First Reformed United Church of Christ

Stephen Craft: Our project concerns 320 S Maple Ave. You can see that is the picture from Maple Ave. (points to presentation) We would like to take down the house. We are working also with *Shop Demo Depot* and *Greensburg Construction* for that demolition. The house has been in the church's and our conference's possession since approximately 1925. The first note on the deed was 1914 so between that time and 1925 the home was built. It is in poor condition. There are other pictures that show some of the conditions of the inside. There is water damage in the basement. There are wiring problems. There are still knob and tube wiring within the walls and other issues with the brick work. We have been working with TR Waltenbaugh from *Shop Demo Depot*. They can reclaim a large part of the interior. The woodwork and windows The windows are fairly new, and they are more modern. The woodwork is old and original. There are some leaded glass panels that they are also planning on to remove. The foundation is a concrete which would be destroyed, and they do want to recycle all the brick. We were interested in having as much of the building recycled and reclaimed as possible. If you look at the pictures of the back, over time the building has deteriorated considerably. We have just not had the funds to redo it to make it a showpiece. At one time we had nine people working in that building. Now there are only two as the beginning of the summer. Our conference minister and our office manager from our Penn West Conference have moved into our church building at 312 [S Maple Ave] just one door down from there. These are some interior pictures. (points to presentation) The basement has some asbestos insulation problems that we need taken care of, and the folks at Demo Depot are registered to remove that. We had a demolition person who works with Demo Depot named Craig Bennett from Greensburg Construction also looked at the property. He would be ready to proceed pending Council approval. The final page of what you are looking at is a park

proposal. It is a drawing that we had made of what the park would look like. What would be the backyard of this house is a parking lot that our church has been using now since the 50s. It has been redone—I forget when it was redone. We had new drainage added to the parking lot in the mid-1990s. That was before I was in town. We proposed to have a park. These are the plantings that we proposed to put in there—low growth, not out of control. We contract with Anderson Maintenance and Lawn care. They take care of our church yards—our bushes and things like that. They will also take care of this park area. To separate the house lot from the parking area, we propose to build a butler stone wall. Demo Depot is in possession of tons of butler stone that has been reclaimed, and we are very interested in reusing and using recycled materials. That wall will come up to the height of the parking area and then on top of that would be a fence that would meet regulations. I believe that it is 42 inches—to separate the parking area and the actual park area. This would be open to the public. There won't be any barriers from the sidewalk until you hit the parking lot. You can see from the drawing there on the left side. The wall would be the green highlighted area at the top of that section and the various plantings there designed to make it aesthetically pleasing and also work in the two houses on either side. We would propose to keep the grade of that lot the same as the sidewalks that are beside it on either side belonging to the other two properties. We don't want to build any walls or fences between the properties so that everything would like it has always been there rather than something new that had to be separated.

Steve Gifford: Do you need to add anything? That was pretty thorough. Any questions from the members of the Board?

Barbara Ciampini: I know you mentioned that it was open to the public, but is there a seating area, is there something in there that is going to be inviting for the public to enjoy the open space?

Stephen Craft: We didn't plan any seating or furniture of any kind. We didn't want anything that was dangerous or possibly a problem like cement benches or anything like that. We have a lot of people—a lot of walkers in our neighborhood. The sidewalks in between these buildings are used by these residents of the apartment areas so they can access other parts of town. We don't want to block anybody from walking down through there between the buildings. That's a really needed thing in the community. There's a large apartment building that borders the rear of this on the other side of the alley. This would be a nice place too. From time to time there are children living in that area. They do play in our church yard. They could use a bit more space that is handier for those buildings. I think it would beautify the street as well. The front of the house—the façade is becoming pretty dilapidated. The porch is getting bad. We just don't want to put any more resources into fixing it up because it still remains an eyesore despite that.

Steve Gifford: The same question that I had for Hannah. Is there a reason why you didn't try to sell it?

Stephen Craft: Because of the parking area. It is necessary for our church functions.

Steve Gifford: How many spaces are there again?

Stephen Craft: Six. Six spaces on the right side of your picture there. We park three cars facing the other way down the other side.

David Ackerman: You could actually have nine spaces.

Stephen Craft: Yes, nine spaces total but six that match the spaces in the lot between.

Barbara Ciampini: And then you tandem park the other three?

Stephen Craft: Yeah. On Sundays, we park them in as close as we can get.

Lee Calisti: How long has the church owned this property?

Stephen Craft: The church was in possession of it from 1925 until 1962, and we sold it to our Penn West Conference which is our adjudicatory body. They have been in possession of it until now.

Lee Calisti: So you have had it since 1925 between the both of you?

David Ackerman: Yes, the Penn West Conference has had it since 1962. That is correct.

Lee Calisti: Ok. How long since it's been occupied?

Stephen Craft: Only a couple of months. They moved their offices into our building just this summer.

Lee Calisti: So you had it occupied until just recently? It must be in stable condition for it to be occupied?

Stephen Craft: Stable but poor.

Lee Calisti: It's not a hazard yet?

Stephen Craft: No, not yet. But we were foreseeing future expenses. The cooling system is shot. The heating system is in need of upgrade. There were just a lot of other problems. Mold was another problem. Things of that nature.

Lee Calisti: As the owner of it, does the entity pay taxes on this land or are you tax exempt?

Stephen Craft: No. We are both tax exempt bodies.

Lee Calisti: So you are currently not paying taxes on this property?

Stephen Craft: No.

Barbara Ciampini: No. They never did.

David Ackerman: And also the very practical nature of the conditions of the building, as Pastor Stephen mentioned, our office staff has diminished greatly over the years. We are a fraction of what we once were. We truly don't utilize the space in the building. It simply wasn't practical for us to maintain, heat, cool a building of this size when it was just a fraction of the space in it that we were actually using. Moving into First Reformed United Church of Christ has been a much better usage of space, resources. It has been a better stewardship of all of those things all around.

Steve Gifford: So I feel like sitting on a Board in New Kensington where we were approving houses to be removed and commercial buildings be removed just to create a lawn for whoever knows what might be happening—maintain six or seven parking spaces whenever downtown Greensburg has parking lots and meters. I am just having a hard time on the same day removing two buildings.

Barbara Ciampini: There is a possibility of doing a subdivision and subdividing off your parking and maintaining ownership of that and possibly trying to sell this house that sits between two other homes. If it was a house right next to your church, I could see an expansion of your church campus like we had done for the Lutheran church and the Presbyterian church. But because this property is nestled in a street scape, it's posing a problem. If you haven't even tried to sell it maybe that is an opportunity. I do know that the gentlemen down the street who bought Bill Rudolph's building is planning on—he's spending a lot of money. He didn't spend a lot for the house, but he is down there working. He plans on moving in there and living there. He's doing a lot of work.

Steve Gifford: That building was in bad condition.

Barbara Ciampini: Oh it looked like really bad. Maybe there is an opportunity that we are missing here that should garnish you some proceeds from an actual sale from a portion of the lot. Not the whole lot.

David Ackerman: That may be so; however, I am not certain that given the fact that again you would eliminate parking to the building. The fact that this would be a liability issue to us until it is sold. That also is a significant concern.

Barbara Ciampini: I just don't see the comparison to the church before and to this. That building has been vacant for 20 some years. Hanna's church. I think that there may be an opportunity. You might be onto something, Steve. On this particular property that maybe we should try to find a buyer. It's a beautiful older home. There might be somebody out there who wants to restore it.

Lee Calisti: Well, what I am hearing is that it was occupied recently so it's not unsafe. It has not been vandalized. It's not condemned by the City of Greensburg. It is not a hazard. It is just not convenient for you as a property owner to put more money into it.

David Ackerman: Absolutely.

Lee Calisti: Ok. But then I don't see how that benefits the City of Greensburg in having a missing tooth because it's just not convenient for you to put money into this building. But you are not willing to sell it and give it to someone else who may be willing to. I just don't find that to be suitable reason to take a building down of this character just because you don't either have the money or you don't want to spend the money to maintain it.

Steve Gifford: You are asking a lot. The whole reason is trying to maintain the character and improve our community.

Lee Calisti: It's a completely different situation than our previous applicant because there we have a building that's past the point of no return. It's hazardous, it's dangerous and although we hate to see buildings come down, we are left with no option. But in this case, we have a building that was occupied up until a couple of months ago. Now we are not asking your church, your body to spend money when you don't want to, but it seems unfair to the rest of the City of Greensburg just because you don't want to spend that kind of money or don't have that kind of money that you can just take a building down in this kind of a neighborhood.

David Ackerman: Yeah. I hear what you are saying. Respectfully too, the hope was to create a space that was aesthetically pleasing.

Lee Calisti: But that doesn't matter. You could make it the greatest park possible. You could invite everyone to come play with it and it could be a lot of fun. It's a missing tooth in the urban fabric of South Maple Avenue, and we are losing a house that has really great character in exchange for a park. To me, the added benefit does not outweigh the loss.

Steve Gifford: If I had to guess based on your presentation, your comment, the parking probably is more valuable to the church than the greenspace.

Barbara Ciampini: It is the whole value. It is the value of the lot. It is the value.

Steve Gifford: I mean the building has value.

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah, but I mean to the church. You preface that with to the church. So that's the only value to them is the lot.

Steve Gifford: And to subdivide it off—then you're selling off a house that has no parking for residents.

Barbara Ciampini: Well, that's all through the downtown. If you are going to be an urban dweller—

Steve Gifford: Right. But I wouldn't put this property in a disadvantage by accommodating the church wanting to have seven free parking spaces. I don't know. I'm in a position where I can't vote to tear this down. Either we are going to deny it, and they go to Mayor and Council and ask for them to overturn our opinion. They might receive it, and at least we feel that we stood up for what we are here to do. Shame on the church for removing a building that's relatively structurally sound and it can be updated. I'm sorry for being so blunt, but I have seen buildings in town that are far worse that people have made productive. You mentioned Bill Rudolph. We are also talking about the Horning Printing on Pittsburgh St. next to Lynn's store. It's happened in town and for an organization that is part of our community to just keep seven parking spaces just seems very difficult to ask, to approve. I don't know if there is any more reason to have more conversation about it. Should we just vote? Or Barbara, what do you think?

Barbara Ciampini: No, I would just give some advice to the church. Maybe there is an alternative process to solve your problem with not wanting to put money into this historic older home. Maybe there is an opportunity to find a buyer that none of us have looked into. There might be someone out there willing to buy the building and not have parking. I don't know. You might be right, Steve.

Steve Gifford: Deb Henry would buy it. The attorney in town.

Barbara Ciampini: She might buy it.

Steve Gifford: She would buy it. There you go. There's a lead for you. She's a neighbor. She might be interested in buying it. There may be others. You didn't try to sell it to a new property owner that wants to keep it up or make it better.

Lee Calisti: One more statement. If this was going to be replaced with a structure of equivalent or greater value and/or that given over to a tax paying property owner, then I could start to argue for bringing down a structure that is vintage. But in this particular case, it's a lose/lose except for you. You guys win. The City of Greensburg and the neighbors continue to lose. I don't see how I can vote for that.

Stephen Craft: I would counter that if we are unable to upkeep the house and unable to sell it, its condition will continue to deteriorate and it will look like these other buildings. We are being proactive in saying that we can reclaim the material now. There are a lot of valuable things in the house now. The structure itself can be recycled. We are not talking about demolishing it and throwing it in a landfill. We are talking about reusing it for other structures and other homes in the area.

Barbara Ciampini: But you really haven't looked into trying to sell it.

Stephen Craft: No. The building beside us has been up for sale for over a year. They dropped the price over \$40,000 already.

Barbara Ciampini: Maybe there is an opportunity for both properties for someone to purchase, and as Lee just said, in that case if they are going to purchase both properties and create a larger assembly with the idea of building something new there that takes up both sites, then we get a new building even if we have to tear down two older homes. That's what we're looking for.

Stephen Craft: I think that's overestimating the value of that area. I don't see that.

Barbara Ciampini: I respectfully disagree with that statement

Stephen Craft: We have witnessed businesses coming and going and leaving almost as quickly as they start.

Barbara Ciampini: That's not been our experience in the office. Our occupancies permits for businesses are up. In fact, we have a new business owner sitting here behind you in the audience. So that isn't necessarily the truth. You don't have accurate facts.

Steve Gifford: Any other thoughts? I'm really sorry for my tone that I have because you caught me on a bad day and to have two buildings being proposed to be removed in the same meeting whenever we're an organization who is trying to improve Greensburg is just very difficult.

David Ackerman: We believe that the proposal would be an improvement, and I know that it may not seem like it but if things continue the way they are, things could become problematic not only for us but for the city. We hope not but that could happen.

Lee Calisti: Let me make one more statement about this. I don't mean to keep harping on this either, but I guess I'll be the bad cop today. First of all, the City of Greensburg has a property maintenance code in place, so you are bound as a property owner to maintain the property whether you have the funds or not. Right? That's the law, and we are all bound to that law. You have to maintain the property according to the property maintenance code or you are going to be in violation whether or not you have the money to do that. So then at that point, it is advantageous to you that if you cannot maintain the property, to sell it. Nobody would hold onto a property just to stick it to the City but people try. As a church, you're not going to do that are you?

David Ackerman: Right. That's not what we wish.

Lee Calisti: You can't say we don't have the money to maintain the building, so we have to take it down. That's not a logical argument. If you don't want the property, that's fine. If you do not want to invest in the property, that's fine. We are not asking you to. We are just asking that someone else have the opportunity to maintain the property and see it maintain its current character or something better. A small park with some landscaping is not better. We know you think it's better. I just don't think it's better. I don't see how the City wins and we have to make a decision for the good of the whole community.

Steve Gifford: Ok. I think at this point we are done with our conversation. Any other comments?

Marc Scurci: Do we want to ask if the church is willing to look at selling the property as it is with the house?

David Ackerman: The problem with subdivision—again, you [Stephen Craft] were hoping to maintain the parking spaces and have that parking for First Reformed. If you subdivide it and remove the parking from the building, I'm thinking that is going to be a difficult thing to be able to do. I hear you saying—you haven't tried it, maybe it's possible, but it's going to be tricky.

Marc Scurci: Maybe you could consult with some real estate people and get a different opinion or read on that.

Stephen Craft: I'm sure that's possible but those spaces are close to our church. We have an elderly population and walking from one of the public lots down the street would be a great challenge for some of those folks so having parking would be close to our building.

Barbara Ciampini: You are just going to find the right buyer. There is a right buyer for every property. I just don't think that enough effort perhaps has been put forth to look at that avenue. In fact, no effort has been put forth. I think that's what you are hearing from

a majority of the Board. That needs to be looked at to see if someone is willing to buy it. Maybe they are willing to buy it and pay for the subdivision and not have parking or allow you to use the parking on Sundays? Maybe they only park there during the week, and you use it on your special services. Whatever it might be. I don't know.

Steve Gifford: I just thought of something. What they can sell the house for they can buy leases from the City of Greensburg to replace the parking. Correct?

Barbara Ciampini: That's true too.

Steve Gifford: You guys charge what? Fifty-five?

Barbara Ciampini: There are spaces. Those are all solutions that could possibly come out of more study and the potential of trying to sell the structure.

Steve Gifford: Ten years, you get eight spaces in town. If you sell the property and everybody wins, you know? So, whatever. I don't know. What do you want to do Barbara? We can table it and then they are going to come back with the same proposal.

Barbara Ciampini: No. I think we have spoken. We look for a recommendation to deny it.

Steve Gifford: Ok. So I make a motion to deny the request to remove the house and create a park. So I made the motion, do we have a second?

Lee Calisti: I'll second that.

Steve Gifford: All in favor? Aye. Any opposed? Any abstained?

All were in favor. Motion to recommend denial passed.

Barbara Ciampini: As Steve stated, the denial recommendation will go to City Council. If you want to bring this up again, that is the Board that you want to bring it up to. Otherwise, they are going to take this recommendation and deny it. Normally, they take the recommendation of this Board. My advice to you is to try to see if you can find a buyer, and we will try to help you in any way that we can. Steve mentioned a potential buyer who is actually an attorney in town, and we can give you the contact information for her. She's been looking for quite some time, and she wants to stay in town. She wants to own a building.

David Ackerman: Thank you. May we have your contact information?

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah, we'll give it to you.

Lee Calisti: We thank you for your time.

Barbara Ciampini: Thank you.

250 West Otterman St

Property Owner: Jawdat Nikoula

Applicant: Bean and Baguette

Project: Signage

Steve Gifford: Alexa, good to see you again. You can go ahead and describe your project.

Alexa Bevan: I'm Alexa from *Bean and Baguette*.

Bob Gonze: We are here to build something in the City of Greensburg. Another fabulous business for eating, dining and enjoying the City. This request is for the signage that will go on the building. We are proposing two areas of signage at this time. One is that we plan on retrofitting the existing light box and putting a double sided sign on the face of an existing box right now. The box exists, the frame exists, and the interior guts are basically destroyed. It was an interior light box. We have no intention of interior lighting the box. We would put an aluminum face over with full color printed and laminated decal with the Bean and Baguette logo that is evident in the picture. We would also—like I said, it is double sided—the aluminum face on both sides of the existing box. The plan is to paint the poles to clean it up. Then we would put a projecting sign on the building over the front entrance—the walkway. It would be a similar logo but just the logo in that area to identify the entrance of that restaurant.

Marc Scurci: Could you zoom in on that logo on the sign?

Steve Gifford: The big one?

Barbara Ciampini: What can't you read at the bottom? It has "*a Mediterranean twist*". Is that what you couldn't read?

Marc Scurci: I just couldn't see it from here. That's all. It's not negative. I just couldn't see it.

Steve Gifford: It looks good. It's a good design.

Lee Calisti: I like it.

Steve Gifford: It's a great addition to our neighborhood.

Barbara Ciampini: There's no demolition.

Lee Calisti: Good graphics.

Marc Scurci: Is that Bean as in coffee or Bean as in baked?

Alexis Bevan: Bean as in coffee.

Marc Scurci: Ok.

Barbara Ciampini: I make a recommendation that we approve this lovely presentation.

Steve Gifford: Motion is made. Do we have a second?

Marc Scurci: I'll second.

Steve Gifford: Mark. All in favor? Aye. Any opposed? We recommend approval of this.

Lee Calisti: Wonderful. Hope you are very busy.

Barbara Ciampini: Thank you, Alexis. How are things going down there?

Alexis Bevan: Slow.

Barbara Ciampini: Yeah. You're getting there. You'll get there.

Alexis Bevan: We're waiting on the permit.

Barbara Ciampini: Ok. Have you submitted it?

Alexis Bevan: Our architect did finally submit it.

Barbara Ciampini: Ok. Took it to Code.Sys.

Alexis Bevan: So we are waiting to hear from them now.

Barbara Ciampini: Ok. Perfect. We're good.

Lou DeRose: I think that I asked you last time. You are keeping some of the rental parking spaces.

Alexis Bevan: Yes, we are just going to push them to the back.

Marc Scurci: Is there going to be a bakery in there as well?

Alexis Bevan: We are going to do as much baking as we can.

Barbara Ciampini: Good.

Lee Calisti: Awesome.

Steve Gifford: Fantastic. Thank you.

Barbara Ciampini: Thank you. Yeah, you will be able to put your signs up any time after October 12th. Ok?

Alexis Bevan: Ok. Thank you.

Barbara Ciampini: Bob, we will get a permit for you. Thank you. Good luck.

Meeting adjourned 5:15 PM