



## *Historic & Architectural Review Board*

Meeting  
February 21, 2017 4:30 P.M.

---

### **I. Call to Order**

Barbara Jones: We'll call to order the Tuesday February 21<sup>st</sup> Historic and Architectural Review Board meeting.

### **II. Roll Call**

Barbara Jones: Roll call, please, Amy.

#### **PRESENT:**

BARBARA CIAMPINI, DIRECTOR  
LEE CALISTI, SECRETARY  
BARBARA JONES, VICE CHAIRMAN  
JACKIE JOHNS  
LYNN ARMBRUST  
MARC SCURCI  
LOU DEROSE, SOLICITOR

#### **ABSENT:**

STEVE GIFFORD, CHAIRMAN

### **III. Approval of January 24, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

Barbara Jones: We received the meeting minutes in our mailbox.

Barbara Ciampini: The real ones this time.

Barbara Jones: We did get them. I read them.

Lee Calisti: Me too.

Barbara Jones: So, can we have approval of the meeting minutes?

Marc Scurci: I'll approve them.

---

Barbara Jones: Can I have a second?

Lynn Armbrust: I'll second.

Barbara Jones: All in favor?

Everyone: Aye.

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS:

**239 West Otterman Street**  
**Property Owner: Josh Dronzek**  
**Applicant: GreySignal**  
**Project: Façade**

Barbara Jones: Okay, old business, we have 239 West Otterman Street.

Barbara Ciampini: Bob, excuse me Bob, you're not here for *GreySignal* are you?

Bob Gonze: Absolutely not.

Barbara Ciampini: Okay, I don't think anybody is here for that.

Barbara Jones: So they're not here for that, okay, so we're going to table that item again.

Barbara Ciampini: He just stays tabled.

Barbara Jones: He just stays tabled, okay.

**308 West Otterman Street**  
**Property Owner: Malkin 1, LLC**  
**Applicant: Malkin 1, LLC**  
**Project: Demolition**

Barbara Jones: 308 West Otterman Street.

Barbara Ciampini: Back again.

Zachary Kansler: I don't know if I'm prepared. I was expecting another five (5) minutes.

Barbara Ciampini: You'll be fine.

---

Barbara Jones: This is a fast meeting tonight.

Zachary Kansler: This is the application for *Malkin I* in regards to 308 West Otterman Street. We previously presented an application for demolition on October 25 and again on December 13<sup>th</sup>. The reason for the first lapse of time was to allow for a site plan to be prepared. The site plan was prepared and presented at that meeting. It was then determined that it would be tabled, because the board wanted the applicant to put in landscaping and screening. After that time I spoke with the client, and the clients' of the position that we shouldn't be required to put additional landscaping in on the building—or on the property. We submitted a correspondence to the Planning Director on February 2, 2017. Has that been provided?

Barbara Ciampini: It's been inseeded into this Power Point.

Zachary Kansler: Okay, do I need to provide a copy for the record?

Barbara Ciampini: It's probably a good idea, Lou?

Lou DeRose: Yes we want to incorporate it into the record, but we have it already.

Barbara Ciampini: We have it.

Zachary Kansler: Alright.

Barbara Ciampini: We'll just mark it as Exhibit "A", but I have it so we don't need another one. We don't need any more paper.

Zachary Kansler: It's a three (3) page letter. If it's already in the record I don't feel like I need to go through all of the parts of the record. It's just our position that the specific Gateway regulations in the code as well as the landscaping and screening provisions of the code, don't envision that they be applied on a demolition application for the Gateway District. Also, we don't feel the need to put it in at this time, the landscaping, that being because in the near future after the building has been removed and we've had an ability to evaluate the land and generate additional funds we're going to have future plans that would necessitate the removal of any type of landscaping or screening that we would put in. So, we think it would just be essentially a waste of resources for the business. Also, we don't feel we should be required to put screening in when a building on our street—on Westminster Avenue three (3) properties in this direction here, which would be south I believe, that property was demolished and grass was put in and no landscaping or screening was necessitated by the City for that property, so we feel that we shouldn't be required to do so. At this time we would request that the board make their determination based on the site plan and records already provided and we'll proceed as necessary. Thank you very much.

Barbara Jones: Remind me again, were they planting grass in that open space?

---

Zachary Kansler: Yes, and the site plans are specific as to the landscaping that is going to be done. That is the hole is going to be filled in, it's going to be top soil put down and then it's going to be completely reseeded, so essentially it will look like a lawn. There is already some landscaping on the premises that won't be disturbed.

Barbara Jones: So what you're showing in that drawing as landscape is actually a tree.

Barbara Ciampini: That's the back yard. That's an existing tree.

Zachary Kansler: Yes, that's an existing tree.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, this is the front up where the street is.

Lee Calisti: Top of the drawing.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, top of the drawing.

Barbara Jones: On Otterman.

Zachary Kansler: The darker hashed in area is shared landscaping; mulch, bushes that are presently there.

Barbara Ciampini: And the different color, the dotted part, is already a pad. A pull off pad that's right next to the building.

Barbara Jones: I see it.

Barbara Ciampini: Do you see what I mean? Yes, and you can see the outline of the house and the porch.

Barbara Jones: Mmhmm.

Barbara Ciampini: And for the record, the house at 24 Westminster is not in the Gateway.

Barbara Jones: Right.

Barbara Ciampini: That took Barney, Les and I about 10 years to accomplish. It's a totally different set of circumstances.

Lou DeRose: The board has I guess a couple of issues in front of it; number one should the house be torn down, you have decide that whether that's a wise use of the property, and then number two whether or not you want to implement by requiring it, this landscaping that we've talked about at least two other meetings. As far as the legal argument, I'm not going to have that legal argument.

My recommendation—my advice to you is that you may require that if you want. You have the legal authority to do that on any plans submitted to you. I'd also point out in regard to one thing that Zach said was that West Otterman Street is a very different street than Westminster, so I don't know if that comparison works in this situation.

Barbara Ciampini: Just for the board's edification, the property at 637 East Pittsburgh Street, which was the house that Hose Company #7 requested—they also had a blighted property, and they also requested demolition and if you recall they came in and presented a site plan and this was it. They have a 10 foot buffer in the front of landscaping and they went the additional mile and put in the brick pillars. This is what it looked like after they tore it down, this was the proposal and then this is what it looks like today. And the other property that we did was 226 South Main Street and that would have been the First Evangelical Church parklet. They also went above and beyond what we asked for; the whole property is an open space, landscaped, they build the....what do they call that building?

Barbara Jones: Gazebo.

Lee Calisti: Gazebo.

Barbara Ciampini: They built pathways and they built landscaping and they did the fencing and the pillars. Those are both Gateway projects that never had a building built on them and never had a proposal for a new building. Zach, do you know what your next use is going to be? Are you thinking a parking lot?

Zachary Kansler: It's going to most likely going to be a parking lot, you know, obviously is conformity to the City Code, but obviously we don't want to have to incur additional expense putting in something that we plan on taking out in the next year or so. That's why one of the reasons we would object to that condition.

Barbara Jones: One of the things about putting in a parking lot, that's exactly what the Hose Company did and they just—on Pittsburgh Street they put the fence and the—they went above and beyond to put some attractive features that face the street, and if you were to do something like that with your piece that just meets that you wouldn't have to disturb that when you put the parking lot in and it would already be there. I think that you have blighted property and I think your green space is going to make a much bigger contribution to the City of Greensburg than that building even if you were able to rehab it, but to just leave it as an empty space on Otterman where people are passing every day to put in a few shrubs and something would just enhance it completely, and you could keep it if it was a parking lot and it would offer your buffer from the street.

Zachary Kansler: I think one of the applicant's concerns is that there is only 55 foot of frontage there on the diagonal, and whatever we put in there there's going to have to be curb cuts. That's the only access to the road, so there's going to have to be an in and an out. That greatly limits what we would put in there that would have any potential to be long term.

Barbara Ciampini: I was just going to ask you about that. Zach, do you have access behind your building from this lot that you own next to it. You own a parking lot on Westminster. Do you have access to it?

Zachary Kansler: Yes, there's a parking lot here that we own.

Barbara Ciampini: Right. Do you have access from back there into the lot?

Zachary Kansler: We have access, but it's fenced off.

Barbara Ciampini: Okay, but I mean it's easily accessible. Because my recommendation, just like it was to Hose Company #7 was not to try to get an Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) from Penn DOT and that's what you'd have to go through for a parking lot. Your property is very close the intersection and they would view that as possibly an unsafe situation.

Zachary Kansler: Right.

Barbara Ciampini: The process from Penn DOT for Otterman Street. You already have an existing curb cut there where you're pulling off on the pad, so to just leave the rest of it landscaping and come in off of your existing parking lot on Westminster is most likely the end result of any future parking lot at the 308 location. Do you have an HOP for the existing curb cut?

Zachary Kansler: I can bring to the property owner, but that's above my pay grade.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, access would ring around the back of your building.

Lee Calisti: Okay, so, say you put in a parking lot soon. I'd like to know the time frame for that first of all, but just say you do I agree with what Barbara said and what Barb said. If you're turning off of West Otterman into a parking area there, one of the things I'd be concerned if I was on PennDOT is that it's a sharp angle to turn left from West Otterman into that parking lot, which means that you're going to almost come to a dead stop and you're close to the intersection. So I don't even know if that's a smart thing to do from a traffic standpoint, whether you should be turning off of West Otterman into a parking lot anyway. From our board's position, or at least my thoughts, I would like to see landscaping there because I don't think it's smart to turn off of there. I think it makes much more sense practically and from a safety standpoint to use the back access to a future parking lot. You're far less likely to get into an accident, and like Barbara said if you put some landscaping in now you're not going to get a curb cut, you're not going to take it out, you're not going to have to disrupt it. You're going to just follow the pattern that the other project did. So, if there is a desire from your client to access the parking from West Otterman, regardless of landscaping, I just think that's a bad idea.

Zachary Kansler: Duly noted.

---

Lee Calisti: I think it's sincerely a safety idea. Now that's not something our board is directly concerned about, but I think that gives strength to our argument of requiring landscaping is that we're not asking you to undo something, because we don't think you should be coming off of West Otterman anyway. So, we're not creating a hardship for you by asking you to undo landscaping you'd do now.

Barbara Ciampini: Well said.

Marc Scurci: I have a question. If for some reason your client makes a determination and finds legally that you can turn off of West Otterman as your proposing, do we have an assurances that you'd consider, if that's done hypothetically, that you'd consider some landscaping on either side of that entrance at least as opposed to just a curb and blacktop?

Barbara Ciampini: It would be required.

Lee Calisti: It would be required according to the zoning laws.

Zachary Kansler: I would have to get a variance if I wanted to do what you—

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, it would be required. Once he goes to the Planning Commission the full landscaping requirements would come into play. I mean, this is something that we've been uniformly enforcing on the Gateway District for years now.

Lee Calisti: I think hopefully what you're hearing, Zach, is we're not trying to be capricious or putative. We're trying to protect the character of the City, but at the same time I think we're seeing character attributes of this project that support our position more than what would support your clients' position based on access and all these other concerns that they may have for future use. I'd like to know what the time frame is for that, because we've had other applicants come in the past and say we have future plans to do this in the near future. That near future has come and gone, so we're left in the position of trying to working with somebody because they had near future plans, but in the meantime the City of Greensburg suffers from their indecision.

Marc Scurci: And the precedent is set, and then people coming in will say, they didn't do it, do we have to do it, and it's a cycle.

Barbara Ciampini: Right.

Lee Calisti: And to add to that, I think that what we are asking in terms of landscaping isn't a large expensive, a punitive expense, a disproportionate expense, and if anything else it makes your property look good. It shines well on you as a community member.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, it really would only be 10 feet by, I don't know by 25 feet. I think that's the full width of that lot including the pad was 55 if I just eye it. It might be 25—30 at the max of

that frontage. We're not asking for anything but landscaping. We're not asking you to build the pillars or the wrought iron railing or anything like that.

Barbara Jones: Yes, some green. Some green things that face Otterman just to soften it a bit, because I think you are improving the neighborhood by taking the house down.

Zachary Kansler: Yes, so do we. I think my clients' position is that they already have to spend tens of thousands to get this properly removed and filled, and I think they are at their limit with how much they want to or how much they can invest in it at this time. So that's where their position comes from at this time.

Lee Calisti: Well, I completely understand that argument, but it seems then that because they neglected their property they could have been watching, they could have been following and they could have been maintaining. Why should their neglect be our problem?

Zachary Kansler: Well I think the problems with the property were not items that you could readily see from outside and the tenant has their right for possession of the interior of the property. That's where the issues were emanating from the interior of the property and that's where it became deficient.

Lee Calisti: But still, the property owner has had the ability to own property, gain from owning a property. The fact that this board is asking for landscaping, to me, is irrelevant to the fact that there is a hardship now by your client to pay to fix something. That argument just doesn't hold water, and I can show examples of how it doesn't and how silly their argument becomes, but because they have a lot of money to spend for their hardship that they found themselves in shouldn't negate our ability to recommend to Mayor and Council that improvements be made along the City edge. I don't see them being mutually exclusive.

Zachary Kansler: Okay, and I have no desire to make this adversarial and argue with you about—

Barbara Ciampini: No, we don't either.

Lee Calisti: We don't either.

Barbara Ciampini: Zach, is there anyway—I'm looking at the picture and it's hard to see, but is there any way that some of the landscaping that was along the side of the house can be salvaged and used in the front? I mean there's three bushes here. When John Sabers owned it, he lived there, so he took pretty good care of it. Maybe there's a way to recycle the bushes that are alongside the house. It's kind of hard to see on there, but there's some right here.

Zachary Kansler: I know that the foundation of that building—I've been in the basement, and I know that the foundation comes to all edges. My assumption would be that it would all be destroyed during excavation when they pull that out.



Lou DeRose: How long have you owned the building?

Barbara Ciampini: Probably like two (2) years.

Zachary Kansler: I'm not—I don't think it was for an excessive period of time.

Lou DeRose: Two (2) years is the right ballpark.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, about right there.

Lou DeRose: And you've had one (1) tenant? Multiple tenants?

Zachary Kansler: Yes, we just got him evicted. We had to go through that whole process. He wasn't allowing us to gain entry to inspect and that's where our problem came from, including not reporting that the roof leaked and the ceiling was collapsing. We believe we did what we could to get him out and once we got in we realized just how bad of a state it was, which is all on the record and I don't care to go through it again.

Lee Calisti: Well it is highly unfortunate, and it's a shame that there is a gap in the urban fabric there; what we call missing teeth. You know with no plans to put a building back in its place, it's just really unfortunate that this kind of stuff happens.

Barbara Ciampini: There's even a cute little pine tree on the side according to these pictures. I think you could reuse these landscape materials that exist. You've got a landscape there. There's one (1), two (2), three (3), four (4) pieces of landscaping that are good from these photos. I mean, I don't know how long ago you took these photos. If you got a landscaper in to remove them. I don't know who you selected, but I can recommend a few that have done quite a few blighted properties in the City; he could set it right up for you. You may not even have \$500 in the landscaping if you were able to use the existing landscaping that's there.

Marc Scurci: Is there room for negotiation on this, or are the owners fixed on this?

Zachary Kansler: The owners made their point clear to me, which I'm trying to defend.

Marc Scurci: What were you saying?

Zachary Kansler: The land owners at this point in time, like I said, don't want to sink any more money into it with more work, so that's their position that I've been put in.

Lou DeRose: Which is understandable, but the owners who are lawyers understand the reality of life. If this board says landscaping and the City Council says landscaping, anything beyond that cost them as much as the landscaping would have cost.

Zachary Kansler: I understand your position, Solicitor DeRose.

Lou DeRose: And it wouldn't hurt you a bit to get out there and dig those bushes up.

Zachary Kansler: You're right. I have been lacking.

**\*\*Laughter from the board members\*\***

Barbara Ciampini: Or John. I'd do it for you.

Lee Calisti: You have to change your clothes first.

Barbara Ciampini: We could even recommend landscapers. Seriously, I think you could recycle what you have. You just need mulch; a mulch bed.

Lee Calisti: We get it, okay? We get both sides. I don't think that can be said enough. We get both sides, but our job here is to protect the City and do what we're trying to do.

Zachary Kansler: I understand.

Lee Calisti: So what do you do at this point?

Barbara Jones: Alright, so do we want to make a motion to approve the demolition of the property, 308 West Otterman Street, with the recommendation of added landscaping facing Otterman Street?

Lou DeRose: Is it contingent upon?

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, contingent upon.

Barbara Jones: Contingent upon.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, I'd be specific and say the 10 foot buffer.

Lou DeRose: Yes, I was going to say make it specific. Whether it's 10 foot or whatever it is, I mean I don't know.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, that's what Truck Co. #7 has.....they have a 10 foot buffer of landscaping.

Barbara Jones: 10 foot wide?

Barbara Ciampini: yes.

Barbara Jones: Okay. Make a motion to approve the demolition of the property at 308 West Otterman Street with a contingency of an added 10 foot buffer of landscaping facing Otterman Street.

Lee Calisti: I'll make that motion.

Marc Scurci: I'll second.

Barbara Jones: All in favor?

Everyone: Aye.

Barbara Jones: Opposed? Abstaining? Alright, demolition approved with the contingency.

Barbara Ciampini: Zach, it will go on Council's agenda for March 13<sup>th</sup>.

Zachary Kansler: March 13<sup>th</sup>?

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, and then if you guys was to get a demolition contract, you can conceivably get all the—if you've already cut off the utilities and had them all turned off—you can get a permit on the 14<sup>th</sup>. We'll issue it.

Zachary Kansler: And we have a demolition contractor.

Barbara Ciampini: You have somebody? Okay. Who's going to do it?

Zachary Kansler: Lutterman.

Barbara Ciampini: Oh, okay. He's familiar with the process and he's a former landscaper.

Lee Calisti: Oh yes.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, he's good.

Zachary Kansler: Okay, thank you for your time.

Barbara Ciampini: Thanks, Zach.

## V. NEW BUSINESS:

- Review and approve Downtown/Healthcare District buildings for façade grants
  - 239 West Otterman Street
  - 136 South Pennsylvania Avenue
  - 21 North Main Street
  - 35 North Main Street
  - 39 North Main Street
  - 508 West Otterman Street
  - 2 & 8 North Pennsylvania Avenue
  - 108 West Pittsburgh Street
  - 100 North Maple Avenue

Barbara Ciampini: We are now going to hold a public hearing for a façade grant program for a DCED application.

Barbara Jones: Who is making the application?

Barbara Ciampini: Steve Gifford is going to apply for it through the Greensburg Community Development Corporation. As part of the application we have to hold this public hearing. Here are the potential façade grant properties. The first project is this one that's been on our agenda for a while, *Grey Signal*. Steve's been trying to work with that young gentleman. He was here once.

Lee Calisti: Josh.

Barbara Jones: That was a long time ago.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, so anyway Steve is trying to help him out with his property down at 239 West Otterman. Then there is this building owned by Marshall and Carly Huffman. They are trying to sell their property now, but it's still eligible for a grant at 136 South Pennsylvania Avenue. If you recall, that was their design.

Barbara Jones: Oh, okay.

Barbara Ciampini: Then there's 21 North Main Street, which everyone knows as the old *Isaly's*.

Lee Calisti: The cigar shop.

Lou DeRose: They're in there working.

Barbara Ciampini: Are they in there? Did you know that, Amy? They're in there working.

Lee Calisti: Doing what?

Barbara Ciampini: They're not your clients, are they?

Lee Calisti: I did a study for them, but I haven't done anything since.

Barbara Ciampini: We don't have anything for them either, so I guess we'll be—Chris will be going up to 21 N Main Street tomorrow.

Lou DeRose: Might be clean out.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, it might be. The next is—well one (1) side is—well *Sun Dawg* is already on that side, and then I think he's looking at doing the upper floors of—I forget that gentleman's name— and the *Trice Optical* side.

Barbara Jones: Oh.

Barbara Ciampini: That's 35 North Main. That's *Sun Dawg*.

Barbara Jones: That will be nice.

Barbara Ciampini: This is the building that Lee presented to us last week; the *do Wood Pizza*.

Lee Calisti: They have a demo permit.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, so they could potentially get some grant money if we get the grant funding. 508 West Otterman Street, used to be *Thermo Twin Windows*. It's a cool little building up on the western corridor.

Barbara Jones: It is.

Lee Calisti: Denny Fellers owns it.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, Denny owns it.

Barbara Jones: What are they doing there?

Barbara Ciampini: Nothing yet. Steve is just trying to entice them, and this is a list of potential buildings. Some of these are legitimate projects that have been before us but others will hopefully become projects in the future. Like this one is still a potential project, but yes nothing—he's just submitting potential projects to get grant money for facades of historical buildings in the Downtown and in our Gateway District.

Lee Calisti: We're still working on that one for Roy.

Barbara Ciampini: We're still working on this one.

Lee Calisti: Yes, slowly.

Barbara Ciampini: That's Roy Bodnar, and then this is 108 West Pittsburgh Street. They're still working on plans for this project.

Barbara Jones: Isn't that the new restaurant?

Barbara Ciampini: It's supposed to be a restaurant.

Lee Calisti: It's supposed to be a bar.

Lee Calisti: It changes.

Barbara Ciampini: It changes daily. We don't know. And then the Kuzmkowski building, remember they bought this here for the mansard roof? Have you noticed how nice they fixed it?

Barbara Jones: Yes.

Barbara Ciampini: They did a new roof, they repointed the brick, put the new mansard roof—the metal roof. He's still looking for a tenant. He has some people on the look, but again Steve is looking to help somebody who is looking to come in and do something with those garage doors to really open it up.

Lou DeRose: The old *Sears* automotive.

Barbara Ciampini: Is that what that was? Yes, I showed it to someone who was looking at it for potentially a bar and to take out those garage doors so that they would all open up.

Barbara Jones: That would be cool.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, so there's a lot of things going on in town, but those are the projects that Steve wanted us to talk about at our public hearing with all of the people that attended. I think he just needed a public hearing. Did he say he needed any approvals?

Lou DeRose: That we support of his recommendations?

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, we could say that. I make a recommendation that we support Steve's application for the façade grant program.

Barbara Jones: Second? I'll second it.

Barbara Ciampini: There you go. Now you just have to say, all in favor?

Barbara Jones: All in favor?

Everyone: Aye.

Lee Calisti: I need to abstain since I represent several of those projects.

Barbara Jones: Any abstentions? Lee abstains.

Barbara Ciampini: With that, I make a motion we adjourn.

\*Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.\*