

**Historic & Architectural Review Board**

Meeting

February 17th, 2015 4:30 P.M.

Steve Gifford: Good evening, everyone. I’d like to call to order the City of Greensburg Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB) for February 17th, 2015.

**PRESENT:**

STEVE GIFFORD, CHAIRMAN

LEE CALISTI, SECRETARY

BARBARA JONES, VICE CHAIRMAN

MARC SCURCI

BARBARA CIAMPINI

LYNN ARMBRUST

JACKIE JOHNS

LOU DEROSE, SOLICITOR

Steve Gifford: We have two items on the agenda tonight. Vicky may I please have a roll call. The next item on the agenda is the approval of the January 20th, 2015 minutes.

Marc Scurci: I’ll make the motion to approve last month’s minutes

Lynn Armbrust: Second.

All in favor. Meeting minutes approved.

Steve Gifford: We have old business and there are two of those and the first item on the agenda is 206 East Pittsburgh Street. There is no new business to discuss at tonight’s meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **206 East Pittsburgh Street:** Owner – Ashley Ralston - Applicant – Ashley Ralston – Project-Signage
2. **112 College Avenue:** Owner – Greensburg Property Partners LLC – Applicant – Anthony Fiume – Project – New Development Review

**Item #1**

**206 East Pittsburgh Street**

**Property Owner – Ashley Ralston**

**Applicant – Ashley Ralston**

**Project – Signage**

Ashley Ralston: I am the owner of the *Pawn and Jewelry Exchange* and it is currently at 641 East Pittsburgh Street. The sign is a proposal for our new location. An illuminated sign that will showcase our business and project out from the building. It will be doubled sided so traffic coming down East Pittsburgh Street and going down as well. *Sign a* *Rama* is going to be designing and helping to install this and the dimensions are here. Does anybody have any questions?

Steve Gifford: Just to clarify you say it’s an illuminated sign, the light will be shown on the sign or is it internally lit?

Ashley Ralston: Internal.

Steve Gifford: Can you tell us which parts will be illuminated when the lights are on?

Ashley Ralston: All what you see is green and yellow. Then you have the black brackets and then everything will be illuminated.

Steve Gifford: Okay. Any questions from the members of the board?

Barbara Ciampini: Only the letters are illuminated is that what you are saying?

Bob Gonze: The green will be opaque it will not be lit, the yellow and the white will be translucent and the lighting will come through on just the letters.

Marc Scurci: Are these on timers and come on a sort time of the day? Or are they lit all the time?

Ashley Ralston: Is there a regulation? You tell me. Right now it is dusk to dawn I believe and it’s illuminated when it starts getting dark through the night and it shuts off during the day. Are there City requirements?

Steve Gifford: I think that is the best and you’re not wasting electricity and the daytime does not need to be illuminated. So dusk to dawn would be appropriate. Any other questions or comments? I think we understand the project, very good description so can I have a motion to recommend approval of the project?

Lee Calisti: I make that motion.

Barbara Ciampini: I second it.

All were in favor.

**Item #4**

**Address – 112 College Avenue**

**Property Owner - Greensburg Property Partners LLC**

**Applicant – Anthony Fiume**

**Project – New Development Review**

Barbara Ciampini: Let the record show that Barbara Jones just arrived and should be marked present for the meeting.

Daniel Berkowitz: I am representing the project at 112 College Avenue and I have together with me tonight my partners Nat Morgan, Deanna Seruga and Zack Ellis. Deanna and Nat are the owners and we are the group. We will see this through for delivery through August. I’ll be delivering tonight and I know this is the third time that you’ve seen the presentation. We’ve made some modifications on your appreciated advice and counsel and we also have the architect here tonight to answer any questions you might have about the renderings. I’ve spoken with Steve and we have things to show you tonight because we want to give the full presentation but if we want to move through to the new stuff then I’m open to that, too. First of all you can see the lot and parcel that we are talking about. It is five separate properties at the corner of Brown and College Avenue and it’s close to the new *SHU Dance &* *Visual Arts Center* and this is a satellite view of that same parcel. This is the specific lot and block plot of the parcel. The alley that separates the two we have been dealing with the appropriate authorities to get that taken care of and that is in motion. This slide is just renderings of the existing properties. This slide is both front and back view of what we will be demolishing as we move forward with the process and get approval from the City.

Steve Gifford: These are all the images that you showed us last month.

Daniel Berkowitz: That’s correct. And just as a note, all of the properties have been boarded up and secured. We are working with the fire department and they asked if they can run some drills through them and we are getting the appropriate insurance so they can do that. These are just some views of the actual parcel. We have a view of the train station and the church. This is a rendering that shows the building as it will be on top of the existing properties to give some idea how it will look on the parcel itself. Lee did make a comment at the last meeting and I know it’s not a jurisdiction of the HARB but it’s a second stairwell might be needed and so we have gone back and added that so you will see this floor plan is compliant.There will not be any additional changes to the exterior of the building throughout the process. This shows how the building will sit along with some landscaping that we are proposing and we are working on a more specific landscaping. This is a list of the building materials which has not changed since the last time we presented it to the group. This is a compliant rendering which now shows the central column which has two stairwells for egress from both sides of the structure. This is the revised front rendering and I think you will see that we’ve taken everyone’s comments to heart and if you have any questions please feel free to ask me. The next rendering is from the rear of the building so you can see how it will stand and we will have landscaping to the side separating the existing property. The next rendering goes to the view of the parking lot and how it will play with the existing houses that are on the street and some proposed landscaping as well. The next view is a bird’s eye view of how the property will sit on the parcel so you can get an idea how it orients itself. The next view is a specific rendering from the street, so if you’re heading down College that’s an idea of the perspective of what you’ll see. This is a detailed rendering of the door, and I know that was a question at the last meeting. It has a little more detail about it and it will have a transom above keeping with the other doors, so this is the rear access door. This gives the sense as your passing the *Dance and Visual Arts Center* heading towards the Seton Hill Campus a view of the building’s exterior and also the opposite direction as your heading down the street, just a view of the front and as well as how it sits with the existing homes. This is a similar view coming down the street with the exposure of the side of the building. Here is a view that puts it in place with the houses that will exist and I know that was a question that you wanted to see so this is a rendering that takes a view of the parking lot from the homes that will stay. And this rendering shows a more detailed view of that parking lot. We also included some specific detail on types of landscaping that we will incorporate; I know in talking with City Planning they wanted a bit more shrubbery to separate the buildings so we will work with them through that process. This landscaping is keeping with the area and appropriate for the weather and we added some color. This should look nice throughout the seasons. We do have some exterior features, we are going to have wall wash lighting that will sit between the exterior windows that will project from the ground up to light the building at night and these are flood lights that will attach to the exterior of the building to make sure the parking lot is well lit. We have the coach lights that will sit next to the entry ways as an accent and to provide lighting to the building and they will all be all dawn to dusk timers because I heard that is the way the City wants it. If you need to see specific slides and or if you have any particular questions we are happy to answer them. We really try to take into account the comments of this board and appreciate your advice and counsel greatly. It’s an important project to us as it is to the City and I thank you for that.

Steve Gifford: I think just to summarize and if I forget anything from the January meeting just for the purpose of recording it and so the public understands where we are today. Some of the changes and suggestions that the HARB had made from version one and let’s call this version two. There are a couple different things. One was the version one had two tone palette on the façade and we made a suggestion that it should be a solid color and the material would be brick which was proposed and we are showing that on version two. We also talked about the window size and facing and also the shapes of the windows. If you remember there were windows that had the brows on top; there were three span windows; two span windows and the façade did not have the symmetry that we look for in new development. So version two has come back with a more unified appearance and I think the muntins were another issue. That’s also been corrected. The front doors didn’t stand out. We asked to have the doors a little more preannounced and the second thought was a primary entrance and people seeing it has a primary entrance and that aspect has been increased with the transoms and the trim and the size and the placement of the doors. The next item we talked about were the front porches and making front porches that were a little more pronounced and I might not be using the correct language and that any board member who may be able to articulate it better can jump in. We asked that the porches to be a little more residential in character and more pronounced and fitting for the building. Version two does have a front porch that could be a start of that and I’ll encourage the other board members make a comment. And in version two the railings and the steps have been addressed. So having said that, oh, the landscaping issue. We now have a better understanding to where they will be placed and also the composition of the different shrubs planted. The Planning Commission has a greater role in approving the site for the landscape plan and for us we are just looking at the colors and textures and varieties. Does anybody have any questions?

Barbara Jones: It’s much more comprehensive. I am grateful for the changes. I think it’s more symmetrical and I am pleased with the balance of the windows. I like the porches better but it’s still not porches that people will sit out on. I do like the integration of the planters at the end and a little bit of greenery to soften it. I wish there could be something more on the street and I know you’re really tight to the sidewalk and you don’t have any setbacks. The addition of those planters really helped and maybe if you had some planter boxes, window boxes would help soften that up also. I like the blue doors; I like that color a little bit of a pop of color. My questions is about the windows do I see like little panes of glass is that what they are, or they are more opened, or is that just the design?

Daniel Berkowitz: I am going to have Ken our architect come up and answer the questions about material.

Ken Kulak: I am the architect for CMS services. The comment on the windows the windows are set with muntins and the muntins can be easily applied within the window on the pane itself or as an application for the window. I like them as an application outside the window because they are more prominent and not hidden by the glazing.

Barbara Jones: Okay.

Ken Kulak: It’s just the amount of division to the muntins and the window.

Barbara Jones: I do like the addition of the brick and the porch.

Ken Kulak: I’m not sure on the site how much is left from the porch space to the sidewalk. If there is anything that can work with a little softening to the space, I’m not sure though.

Barbara Jones: What is the material on the porch surface, it looks like to shades of gray.

Ken Kulak: That is just the shadowing.

Barbara Jones: So is that concrete?

Ken Kulak: Yes concrete.

Marc Scurci: Where is the up lighting going to be?

Ken Kulak: I understood the up lighting will go sort of set in between these areas, in between the porches.

Marc Scurci: It will be ground level?

Ken Kulak: Probably ground level.

Marc Scurci: Just in front of the building?

Ken Kulak: Yes, not the back

Steve Gifford: Any more comments or questions?

Barbara Ciampini: Thanks for the additional renderings it is much more clearer as a project to see the outcomes of what you are going to construct on the site.

Steve Gifford: I think we understand the proposal the second version that was a very good presentation and thank you for agreeing to work with us on making this project the best that it can be. I need motion to recommend approval of the project.

Barbara Ciampini: I make that motion.

Marc Scurci: I second.

Steve Gifford: For the record I have to abstain from the vote because our office was involved in the predevelopment work.

The vote was 6 to recommend and 1 abstention.

Barbara Jones: I make a motion to adjourn.

Lou DeRose: Before we leave I’d like to have an executive session to discuss a legal issue.

Public portion of the meeting adjourned at 5:15PM