

**HARB BOARD MEETING**  
**July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2008 4:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

STEVE GIFFORD, CHAIRMAN  
LEE CALISTI  
NANCY STEWART  
BARBARA JONES  
PETE CICCAGLIONE

**ABSENT:**

BARBARA CIAMPINI  
TERI LUTZ

Steve Gifford: Did everyone get a chance to review the minutes from June? If so can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Pete Ciccaglione: I make a motion to approve the minutes.

Lee Calisti: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

ITEM #1 707 W. Otterman St.-owner Fred and Philip Petrella-Raze building.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

ITEM #2 206 North Main St. Owner-Dave Casale-Applicant-Eileen Billey-Project-Sign.

ITEM #3 660 East Pittsburgh St.-Owner-Bob Davis-Applicant-Jeff Wicker, Johnny' B's-Project-Sign.

ITEM #4 206 North Main St.-Owner- Dave Casale-Applicant-Strassburger, McKenna, Gutnick & Gefsky-Project-Sign.

ITEM #5 655 East Pittsburgh St.-Owner-Francis Murrman-Applicant-Michael Ser-Project-Sign.

ITEM #6 655 East Pittsburgh St.-Owner-Francis Murrman-Applicant-Dino Denicola-Project-Sign.

ITEM #7 226 South Main St.-Owner-Redevelopment Authority Of Westmoreland County-Applicant-Greenlight Engage/Gabriel Felice-Project-Façade/Murals.

ITEM #8 419 W. Pittsburgh St.-Owner-Westmoreland Dermatology-Applicant-Westmoreland Dermatology-Project-Third Floor Addition.

ITEM #9 404 E Pittsburgh St.-Owner-Union Real Estate Co. of Pittsburgh-Applicant-Union Real Estate Co. of Pittsburgh/Save a lot-Project-Façade/Sign.

**ITEM #1-707 W. OTTERMAN-OWNER-PHILIP AND FRED PETRELLA-PROJECT-DEMO**

Fred Petrella: I am the owner of 707 W. Otterman St. and I also own the adjoining property on the right and I would like to raze the house through the Redevelopment Authority. I'd like to make a parking lot.

Steve Gifford: Is there any comments or questions?

Lee Calisti: Who is going to operate the parking lot?

Fred Petrella: Me, it's for the adjoining building, the Karate school right at the corner of Hamilton and Otterman St.

Lee Calisti: Do you have any planned landscaping or any kind of improvements?

Fred Petrella: Not yet I don't. I am just trying to go through the procedure and then go from there. I wanted to start with the demolition.

Steve Gifford: The building that is located to the left, do you own that property as well?

Fred Petrella: No I don't.

Steve Gifford: Is that currently occupied?

Fred Petrella: Yes.

Steve Gifford: Is there a sidewalk that separates the two properties?

Fred Petrella: Yes there is a small walkway up through the two homes.

Steve Gifford: Is it is a parking lot I would imagine that you would have to submit plans to the Planning Commission.

Vicky Williams: How many spaces are you going to have Fred?

Fred Petrella: Well right now I just want to take the building down and maybe 5 or 6 spaces.

Vicky Williams: Okay, you will have to go through the Planning Commission for a Site Plan and show landscaping and the number of parking spaces.

Fred Petrella: Wonder if I only have 4 spaces?

Vicky Williams: Then you do not have to proceed through the site plan process.

Fred Petrella: Do I have to go through them first before I get approval on the demolition?

Vicky Williams: No, this board will handle the approval of the building and then you can apply for a site plan for the parking lot for the number of spaces.

Steve Gifford: Yes we just handle the approval of the demolition. Since you are using Redevelopment funds for this project, is that correct?

Fred Petrella: That's what I was anticipating.

Steve Gifford: Okay, you will follow their process for getting permission as well.

Fred Petrella: Alright. That's not through you?

Steve Gifford: No. We are just the first process for a request to demo the building. You will get the demo permit here at City Hall, Code Office.

Fred Petrella: Okay.

Nancy Stewart: Is this a brick building or a shingle building?

Fred Petrella: It's an old frame building with that brick on it. You can see it's deteriorating around the windows and roof area.

Steve Gifford: The only concern I have is with the residential structure being so close to the parking lot that whatever you do to prepare the surface that you also make sure there is enough of a barrier in case a car would happen to drift or go out of control and hit the house.

Fred Petrella: That would be taken into consideration.

Barbara Jones: I would really like to see some landscaping because it will be just a big hole in that neighborhood. Even just at the beginning if you can put in some trees or something.

Fred Petrella: Oh yes I will plant something even without trying to comply with anything. I will landscape it myself. I have all intentions of cleaning it up around there.

Pete Ciccaglione: Well, it will be a 100 percent improvement just by you taking it down.

Fred Petrella: Yes, I know and the one next to it is in worst condition then this one.

Barbara Jones: Maybe it will be the start of something.

Fred Petrella: Let's hope.

Steve Gifford: Any comments or questions? Can I have an approval for this project?

Pete Ciccaglione: I make that motion.

Nancy Stewart: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**ITEM #2 206 NORTH MAIN ST.-OWNER-DAVE CASALE-APPLICANT:-  
EILEEN BILLEY-PROJECT-SIGN**

Bill Miller: I am with Sign Stat. I am here for Attorney Billey. At the existing location of 206 N. Main St. there is a wood pole structure there made out of a six (6) by six (6) posts which I did include a photograph of the existing post system that is there. We would like to use that post, the same post and just hang the sign and I submitted pieces of material so you know what it is. Its corrugated plastic sandwiched by two pieces of aluminum and that is the design we are proposing. The arm that extends from the vertical pole is forty-eight (48) inches and we are proposing a forty (40) inch wide sign.

Steve Gifford: Does anybody have any comments or questions?

Lee Calisti: Are you providing or did you do the other sign for Strassburger?

Bill Miller: Did not. I am only here on behalf of Attorney Billey.

Lee Calisti: Is that sign currently in place?

Nancy Stewart: No.

Bill Miller: Yes.

Nancy Stewart: This one is proposed with the other attorney's name on it but it doesn't have that particular post.

Bill Miller: It does now.

Nancy Stewart: It does?

Bill Miller: Yes it does.

Lee Calisti: So this is in place right now? (he is pointing to screen).

Steve Gifford: They forgot or did not know that they had to apply for a sign permit and get reviewed by the HARB. That is why they are on the agenda for tonight. So this is an adjacent sign that's next to it?

Barbara Jones: You are here to the next one?

Bill Miller: Yes.

Nancy Stewart: So only the one wooden post is still standing?

Bill Miller: If you look at the one on the left, on the other side of the steps that pole structure is still there. There is no sign hanging from it, just the pole structure. The pole structure that has the white sign on it has been replaced by the other sign. That is what is on site now.

Pete Ciccaglione: It would look better if you used the same pole and structure to hang their sign?

Bill Miller: The attorney stated that she was only going to be in that location for about two (2) years and she would prefer to use the existing pole structure because of the fact of the additional fee that would be involved to purchase and install it and besides she would have to take that one down and dispose of it. Rather than to do any damage to the yard she was hoping to use the existing structure.

Lee Calisti: I would favor twin poles. The design of the sign is fine.

Bill Miller: They were twin poles until that one was put up without approval.

Nancy Stewart: Do we know the price of that pole is?

Bill Miller: I am sure that attorney will address that. He's on for tonight. I am not here on his behalf. I am only here for attorney Billey. If you require a new pole structure we will put a new pole structure in.

Pete Ciccaglione: Make them match, you can do either one. The one that you don't have permission on looks better.

Bill Miller: They removed that one.

Steve Gifford: I believe the cost of that pole was around \$500.00.

Bill Miller: The sign that we are talking about is for Attorney Billey doesn't even come close to that. She would pay more for the pole then she would for the sign.

Steve Gifford: I guess since the pole would remain after she's gone she could deduct that from her rent and the property owner would take ownership of it.

Lee Calisti: Two years is a long time to be staring at an old pressure treated post.

Nancy Stewart: It's being painted black?

Bill Miller: Yes.

Steve Gifford: Well, the consensus of the board is that the metal pole is a better option then the wooden one and its unfortunate that it was put up first before Eileen was able to submit hers.

Bill Miller: That's a wood pole, 4X4 verses a 6X6, it just has a decorative bracket on, that's all.

Lee Calisti: That's a wood pole?

Bill Miller: Correct.

Pete Ciccaglione: Can you duplicate the other one and paint it black? They sell those at Lowes, those finials.

Bill Miller: If that is what the board requires then that is what we will do.

Steve Gifford: It should be uniform.

Barbara Jones: It goes better with the house with the wrought iron. It seems to me that the owner is taking ownership of the pole because it's only the tenant who is putting the sign up and there might be something that can be worked out there.

Lee Calisti: I wouldn't want to be the attorney with the poor looking pole with the other half being the good looking pole; I would just feel an imbalance.

Pete Ciccaglione: Plus it's right on a busy street.

Lee Calisti: I think it's in her favor being an attorney that they have the same pole.

Bill Miller: We can convey that to the attorney.

Nancy Stewart: It would seem to me that probably the least requires her to pay for this since she is the one paying for it. I would think as the property owner would like to see it uniformed. Maybe she should talk to the owner.

Bill Miller: She has.

Steve Gifford: Can we have a motion, I'll make the motion. The motion is that we approve the sign as presented, the wooden post will be painted black with the arm being removed and a decorative arm similar in style installed with a finial cap.

Lee Calisti: I second the motion.

Bill Miller: To try and match that exact finish that might be a little bit of an issue. Do we have to match that one or can we just put maybe a ball up there?

Pete Ciccaglione: They have them with points, I've seen them at Home Depot and Lowes it might not be the exact.

Bill Miller: That's correct, but whether I can match that exact post cap. As it is I am going to have to take off the top of their post because it's peaked.

Steve Gifford: Use your judgment and get it as close as you can.

Bill Miller: Okay, thank you.

**ITEM #3-660 EAST PITTSBURGH ST.-OWNER: BOB DAVIS-APPLICANT-  
JEFF WICKER, JOHNNY B'S-PROJECT-SIGN**

Marty Skuta: Skuta Signs, representing Johnny B's.

Maryann Piper: I am the manager of Johnny B's.

Marty Skuta: If you look at the screen you can see the sign that is there right now. We gave you some pictures of the proposed sign. The blue letters up there would be channel letters like the rest of them in the area with neon inside of it. The bottom part is called the bullet with sports bar and nightclub. That would be the sign, on the windows we wanted to put some neon inside. The windows are tinted I believe, is that correct?

Maryann Piper: Yes, they are. That neon will match the blue of Johnny B's.

Nancy Stewart: And it says Johnny B's?

Maryann Piper: It's just around the three windows. It will be the same color as Johnny B's. It's blue.

Pete Ciccaglione: Is the neon going to be on the outside of the glass?

Marty Skuta: No, it will be in the inside.

Lee Calisti: The neon is it going to be on or off, is it going to flash?

Marty Skuta: Just on.

Steve Gifford: Are there any comments or questions from the board?

Barbara Jones: How is the sign illuminated, the bottom sign, and the red and white one?

Marty Skuta: Internally. I believe Mr. Davis wanted everyone to have the same type of letters like Phar-Mor had, down the line.

Nancy Stewart: Do you have a picture there of the whole plaza?

Steve Gifford: I don't have one. I do believe that Szechuan Gardens is individual letters.

Marty Skuta: I believe they all are.

Steve Gifford: They are all consistent even though they are not the same font style or color.

Barbara Jones: The internally lit sign is that in opposition to our guidelines?

Steve Gifford: On the Gateway it's acceptable. In our downtown environment other options are probably better.

Lee Calisti: It's generally discouraged, it's only seven (7) inches high and the others are individual.

Marty Skuta: It's conservative for the amount of coverage. If you would put something up different I think it would junk it up.

Steve Gifford: Can I have a motion to approve the project.

Nancy Stewart: I make that motion.

Pete Ciccaglione: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**ITEM #4-206 N. MAIN ST.-OWNER-DAVE CASALE-APPLICANT-  
STRASSBURGER, MCKEENA, GUTNICK AND GEFSKY-PROJECT-SIGN**

Steve Gifford: As their sign is already up and they were notified of their failure to follow the process that is why their application was received after it was already installed. At this point are there any comments or questions? I would like to make the comment that I have discussed these two signs prior to them being installed with the property owner; he does have one additional suite which could possibly be divided into two. Two additional suites that can be leased out and I told him that in the future any proposed signs will not be approved for mounting in the yard and that would be his responsibility to communicate that to future tenants, that their signage would have to be attached to the building in some way that would be in keeping with the available space and also the placement of it. I encouraged him to do a freestanding sign given the cost his tenants are putting out to purchase and install their own signs that he could easily share that cost with them and he chose not to pursue this path, so just for the record I want it noted that we did have that conversation and if a future tenant does come before the board he understands that they are not going to get, it would be very difficult for them to get approval for a freestanding sign.

Lee Calisti: Is his approval then conditional on those terms so he doesn't get a third or fourth sign in his yard?

Steve Gifford: We can make that. I believe that is acceptable. I shared with him these photos and local sign companies that can install that for him and give him a quote. So getting back to the proposal, is there any other comments or questions? Can I have a motion to approve the sign as presented?

Lee Calisti: I make a motion based on the conditions stated.

Barbara Jones: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**ITEM #5-655 E. PITTSBURGH ST-OWNER-FRANCIS MURRMAN-  
APPLICANT-MICHAEL SER-EAST PITTSBURGH STREET BEVERAGE-  
PROJECT-SIGN**

Alan Checca: I am with Sign-a- Rama in Greensburg. We have two projects proposed for tonight. This one is for the East Pittsburgh Street Beverage. In the packet there is a sign currently hanging above their canopy awning and it's in need of being replaced. Mother Nature has taken its toll on the sign. There is light shining through the letters and the decals are in poor condition. It does need freshened up. (What we would like to do is we presented a virtual proof of the sign proposed.) This is basically what it would look like, it would also be back lit, we are replacing the face it's already an existing sign. In the packet there is also a small decal which is color swatches and the material that will be used so it's basically a face with vinyl decals on it and we would like to get approval to replace that sign for them.

Nancy Stewart: Are you saying the base against the building is staying put?

Alan Checca: Yes. The cabinet is staying put, maybe a couple of light bulbs will be replaced and we will then slip a brand new face right in.

Nancy Stewart: Is that an edging around it or just a frame?

Alan Checca: It's like a kick band, it slides in a track. It's the exact same thing that is there currently.

Nancy Stewart: The other one looks like it's a little more rounded.

Alan Checca: It's hard to go on a virtual proof. It will look exactly like what is up there with the current graphics on it.

Steve Gifford: This is an interesting project in that conversations we've had with the property owner concerning last years HARB review for a proposed sign for Dino's and several concessions were made and I think communication was made by the Planning Director, Barbara Ciampini and she is not here tonight, about the desire for future signs going up on the building, part of a comprehensive sign package. I see Mr. Murrman has signed off on the application and maybe he has forgotten that conversation that he had with the Planning Director?

Alan Checca: He did not mention it to me at the time when we met with him. Like I said we are just looking to replace what is already there. It would be an improvement. We're not changing anything or altering anything.

Steve Gifford: I would agree as well, this sign has more style and decorative. The concern that I have is now we are starting to get into a format where we are approving signs that are inconsistent with adjacent properties or tenant. Dino's now has a flat sign and on the other end, the left end you have Classic Floors which is a little more script,

more decorative and still a flat panel. I have concerns; I would like to hear what the other HARB board members have to say.

Lee Calisti: I think the graphics are nice; it's a nice looking sign from a graphic standpoint. I too, share Steve's comments about this one sign at a time without any idea of when the other signs are going to come or when and our ordinance clearly looks for a master plan for signage for a building and I think that was conveyed back last year. I don't have any reservations on the sign that you are presenting, I think the graphics are very nice. When is the next one going to come and what is it going to look like. How is there going to be any consistence with this building?

Steve Gifford: Who is paying for the sign? Is it the property owner?

Alan Checca: Each property owner is. Like you said we have Dino's to address yet but each one is paying for their own sign.

Pete Ciccaglione: It would look a lot better if all three signs looked the same.

Alan Checca: I agree, but try to get \$2,000.00 out of someone that doesn't want to spend that on their signage. I don't disagree with you, uniform is nice but I have to stay within their budget.

Lee Calisti: It's always a dilemma for us as well; this is certainly an improvement over what is there.

Alan Checca: Mother Nature has taken its toll on the sign.

Lee Calisti: That's not the question that is being debated here, it's our concern of the overall plans for the properties in our districts that were, what's the big picture that we're trying to oversee.

Nancy Stewart: Would there be a cost difference if you were to take down whatever that frame is and put something up that was in a consistent size with same the one on the left but had the same graphics inside of it that you already had proposed?

Alan Checca: It would be quite a bit less of a sign because now you're taking the lighting away from it. You're comparing an apple to an orange, can it be done, and sure, I am not sure the business owner wants that. She was very adamant about having it lit.

Nancy Stewart: Is the one on the left not lit?

Alan Checca: No. The left and right are just flat signs. The one in the center is lit. All I can do is speak on her behalf and I'd be willing to bet she would rather leave it alone and leave it lit then to down size for a lesser sign.

Nancy Stewart: I didn't realize the one on the left wasn't lit. I don't have any objections to the sign, I think it's an improvement and every business is different, it's not perfect but maybe if the two on either end would conform to one another maybe that would be a direction they could head in.

Steve Gifford: It's kind of an interesting discussion that we're having here tonight because we are having tenants that are actually paying for improvements to buildings that they don't own even though the tenant could leave at the end of their lease but certain improvements stay such as the two signs we saw in the front yard. Most likely the sign will be taken down when they leave but the posts will stay there and the property owner is benefiting from their investment. As with this building here it is very possible to look at a question that you proposed, is it possible that the property owner is responsible for providing the lighting above each of those signs. And the East Pittsburgh Beverage sign is taken from the back lit face sign to a flat panel, say for example if she would leave at the end of her lease whenever that might be a new business comes up and it has the above lighting, then they just pay for the sign and it's a lower cost for them and the property owner takes care for the improvements of their building. Not saying that's not what we should propose here tonight I'm just saying that's a conversation that would be interesting to have with the property owner. I would hate to put it on Dino's shoulders. I think last year's minutes, the property owner argued that the reason he needed the sign was because his business was failing and I am glad to see that the sign that we approved saved his business but I hate to put that burden on his shoulders to put a far better sign to match East Pittsburgh Beverage but then also to restrict East Pittsburgh Beverage by reducing their sign less than what they want. Just thoughts.

Barbara Jones: I think because of the conversation we've had last year with the property owner about the sign on the road and for the fact that no discussion was ever had with the tenants about that, that concession that we really made then with that sign that it's hard for us to say yes to this sign knowing that it's going to be changing again every time another tenant comes in and another sign will be faced with the same situation. I like the idea of trying to have the property owner put in lights and make it a little more consistent that would add appeal to the entire complex.

Chuck Sartoris: I am also with Sign a Rama. In talking with these customers they are scared to death to do anything with their signs. We all know that. Dino said you will never get it approved for a new face on that one but if you do I my go with something illuminated. This may be the start of putting three illuminated cabinets there thus producing some continuity there for that façade of that building. You have to start somewhere and I don't know if your against internally lit cabinets or if that's not acceptable for the area or what we need to do there.

Lee Calisti: Well, on the heels of the last applicant, the board has been very consistent in terms of discouraging internally lit signs. I think there are enough cases that we disapproved of or pointed people in other directions and just because we had a small section that was internally lit on the last applicant I don't feel that it is inconsistent to disallow this one internally lit and looking for a complete building sign package that

would have none internally lit signs with lighting the way Steve described it. It's much more practical I think it puts the burden on the property owner and less burden on the tenants and the tenant's investment is lower and you get the end result as we've achieved. I think our position is fairly consistent if not totally consistent that we've discouraged internally lit signs in any of our districts that we have jurisdiction over. I would favor seeing the same graphics that Mr. Ser has presented here in a non-internally lit sign and have the property owner put up some type of lighting up that will illuminate that. I think the graphics would be great and I think they are very handsome seeing something fresh like that would be a tremendous improvement. I am really concerned about approving this one because Mr. Dino and Mr. Twaddle are going to want the same thing and that is not the end result that we would like to see for signs in the City.

Chuck Sartoris: Well, to the best of my knowledge the landlord is not going for anything and the beer distributor the owner said if I can't get this I will just leave this one up. What do we do here? I guess it's our call on if we put a new face in there and hopefully get something going. We already suggested to try to keep some continuity with the flat signs against the wall and get a light and put it on the building. The landlord won't go for it and the tenants aren't going for it.

Steve Gifford: It's a shame that the property owners and the landlord aren't here tonight. You have to be their voice and for us not to be able to participate in a conversation with them. We really don't need to make a decision this evening. We can table this until next month, they already have a sign that is already up and its promoting their business and that gives us time to have a conversation with the property owner to see what his thoughts are.

Lee Calisti: What I don't find in the boards best interest to allow certain applications to be approved because the property owner holds it over our head, well its better then nothing kind of thing.

Chuck Sartoris: I don't think that was his point. He's not putting any money out for it. He's leaving it up to the tenants to do what they can with the signs.

Lee Calisti: We already have what we have now so we can't change that unless we do something. But to say you're going to have it my way, if the property owner says well if you want to have anything done with the City you are going to do it my way or nothing. I don't think as a board we can really except that as being a method of approval because that seems to go against what our task has been to enforce the Ordinance that the City adopted. It seems like we're being forced into making a decision because we want improvements so much and we want the City to benefit from it, so it's our way or nothing type of thing is what I am getting that the property owners are saying to us and I don't find that to be acceptable.

Chuck Sartoris: She wants to improve her sign.

Lee Calisti: Right, but if she wants to improve her sign then you need to be consistent with the design ordinance that the City approved rather than anyway. Anyway she wants.

Chuck Sartoris: So what do we need to do to get a sign approved for her? Do we have to have an externally lit sign like the other two on the sides?

Lee Calisti: I think what our board is looking for is a plan for the entire complex. What is the lighting and signage going to be for the entire building and maybe all three tenants don't occur simultaneously but when they do decide to invest in that we know where it's going to go. Now that is my opinion.

Pete Ciccaglione: I agree.

Nancy Stewart: Well being new to the board and not being involved in prior discussion I don't have the same perspective. I find this sign attractive and don't have a problem with it. I would like to see consistency. I differ with you guys in that respect.

Steve Gifford: Then I think the best thing to do is to table it for next month and that way we have a chance to talk with the property owners and also the business tenants. Perhaps in August we are having this conversation and propose the East Pittsburgh Street Beverage sign and hopefully we can have a conversation where a master plan put together for the property and the property owner makes a decision to share some of the investment in his building and I think that would be a good solution then making a decision tonight up or down on this. Does anyone else agree with that?

Barbara Jones: I agree with that. I think the graphics are very good on the sign and you would hate to waste them. I think we can come to a solution if we can just get a little more corporation.

Steve Gifford: I make a motion to table this application until August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 with the understanding that we have conversation with the property owner and also the tenant. And of course if you guys are going to be doing the sign then you will be involved as well.

Lee Calisti: I second the motion.

Nancy Stewart: Abstained

Lou DeRose: Steve, the board members can not abstain unless there is a reason or a conflict.

Nancy Stewart: The reason I would abstain is because I am lacking information from the historic nature of this. So I vote against.

**ITEM #6 655 EAST PITTSBURGH ST-OWNER-FRANIS MURRMAN-  
APPLICANT- DINO DENICOLA-PROJECT-SIGN**

Steve Gifford: Any comments or questions from the board.

Lee Calisti: Again, it's not the matter of the graphics. I guess my question is why is the applicant putting a sign in the window rather than a sign up above?

Alan Checca: I can't answer that.

Lee Calisti: I think it's a back door approach.

Alan Checca: It's an approach to do window lettering. It's like buying a blue car instead of a red one.

Lee Calisti: Maybe the expense, the logistics of getting this in place may have appeared easier on this method to the applicant than asking us as a board to approve a sign over the building. I don't want to put words in the applicant's mouth but it just seems strange. The other thing is according to our ordinance a window sign should cover no more than 30% of the window area.

Alan Checca: That's 30%.

Lee Calisti: That's 30% of the window?

Alan Checca: I'm not sure that that is, I am saying we will make sure it's not more than 30%.

Lee Calisti: It looks like 50%.

Steve Gifford: I think based on our previous suggestions, I think we should table this proposal as well and that way Dino isn't encoring this expense if he can put that into a sign above the store front.

Alan Checca: Do windows need approval?

Steve Gifford: Yes.

Alan Checca: It was somewhat contradicting reading, the regulations. Well if we are tabled we're tabled.

Steve Gifford: I make a motion to table this until next month.

Barbara Jones: I second the motion.  
All were in favor.

**ITEM #7 226 S. MAIN STREET-OWNER-REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY-APPLICANT-GREENLIGHT ENGAGE/GABRIEL FELICE-PROJECT-FACADE/MURALS.**

Gabe Felice: I am starting a non profit organization for art, mostly visual art and one of our main focuses is to get art upon vacant buildings and store fronts in and around Greensburg. This particular project is for Troutman's the above is what it looks like now (he's pointing to the screen) and I believe it's just right now plywood, this is an artist rendition of what he would paint upon the actual building, the artist name is Joel Zupancic and we had been talking about doing something, we had a couple of designs that Joel had come up with and this one is just a nature scene that we wanted to go upon the building either by paint directly on the wood itself and it will be acrylic paint or by having the artist paint upon canvas material and have it mounted directly onto the wood so it can be easily removed.

Nancy Stewart: Would it be protected in anyway?

Gabe Felice: It would be protected as far as a glaze perhaps or polyurethane. Our budget isn't very big right now because we are just starting out. I have some lacquer that was purchased recently. Its UV protected.

Pete Ciccaglione: I think as long as you use an exterior paint.

Gabe Felice: The only thing we thought of is that the artist might want to keep the canvas on the wood.

Nancy Stewart: That's what I was thinking to; it's a way to protect it from people marking it. Its art work and you would hate to see it damaged.

Gabe Felice: This is for the doorway (he's pointing to screen) for Troutman's there and the artist name is Garret Shannon. (He did a light house where the above, were the light would be it actually turns into a candle.) I was talking to him today and he said he would be going off to his second year of college and we talked about the canvas being a good idea as far as time constraints. I am not sure what is going on with the building right now but we kind of all decided as a group if anything were done to it that would be a good thing regardless if it was there for just a weekend or not. We're just really interested in working with HARB to get local artist with mural ideas to be approved in town to kind of beautify the City.

Pete Ciccaglione: Did you say you are a non profit?

Gabe Felice: Its' not official yet but we are working in that direction.

Pete Ciccaglione: See me after the meeting and I'll give you my card. I have 11 paint stores in Western Pa. and I'll give you all our mistake paints and you can inter mix them.

Gabe Felice: That would be great. Thank You.

Barbara Jones: My question is, is there any thought to the building owner replacing the glass in the windows and then putting these murals inside while the building is still available?

Steve Gifford: The information is that the Redevelopment Authority will not be replacing those windows at anytime in the near future. The Church adjacent to it has an agreement with the Redevelopment Authority to buy this property and they are putting together a proposal to possibly demolish this property and that's the reason we encouraged the applicant to have the panels and to be able to be removed and installed somewhere else. This could happen within the next 12 months give or take.

Barbara Jones: I like the idea.

Lee Calisti: I think it's a remarkable solution and I'd like to see 10 more.

Barbara Jones: I was thinking that for the inside of these windows, if you can make use of the inside because they are vacant too.

Gabe Felice: That's another question I had. Since we started this whole idea we've had a lot of artist come to us about doing something like that, mural panels in the vacant store fronts and I really wanted to find out if the images need to be seen by HARB. I was just wondering if these specific locations would have to be picked along with, right at the same time.

Steve Gifford: Probably the best process is for us as a board, not today but look at a process for approving public art whether it's just a basic blanket criteria in a certain geographical area in which it can be placed and then leave that up to the discretion of the Planning Department the finale approval so that why there isn't a delay of coming in front of us every month with different ideas and new locations as you have a property owner give you permission to place them in a window. The County Commissioner Kim Ward and also the Chief of Staff Tom Bayla both approved this project and they think it is a good idea and the Y approved it. So it always has to start with the property owner and if you can get their approval and then we can develop a process it can happen quickly. Any other comments or questions? Can I have a motion to approve the two images and the location as presented?

Barbara Jones: I make that motion.

Lee Calisti: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**ITEM #8 419 WEST PITTSBURGH ST-OWNER-WESTMORELAND  
DERMATOLOGY-APPLICANT-WESTMORELAND DERMATOLOGY-  
PROJECT-THIRD FLOOR ADDITION**

John Hegnes: I am with Stillson and Associates we are the Architects for this project. The intent here is, above this portion of the building to extend this up one (he's pointing at screen). It's that portion right there, this portion here is in place and adding this additional section on top. That is the front elevation. The only difference on this portion is we do have a hip shingle roof to match the existing building on this where as this point right here on the existing building it's a flat rubber roof. This new portion will have a hip roof.

Steve Gifford: This is a view from the alley, (he is pointing to screen).

John Hegnes: The windows are the same and all the details would be the same. Do you have a floor plan?

Steve Gifford: I did not scan a floor plan just because our board is just interested in the exterior appearance.

John Hegnes: Okay, as you can see on your plans this back corner of the building is recessed, it is detailed this way and just happens to set back I think about 11 feet. We will be filling this back corner in and it will look exactly like the rest of the building. There is a porch of the basement elevation which is covered for an entrance to that lower level, that will remain open and we will just fill in this portion above to match.

Steve Gifford: Are there any questions or comments from the board?

Barbara Jones: My concern about this is the height of the new addition.

John Hegnes: We did the addition to this previous and the issue was to deal with the top of this cupola in the front and that has sit that hip right there. We would not exceed that. Nothing would exceed that point. Ultimately what happens there, this hip comes across the front and travels down the side and across the back. Everything that you would see from the street would be shingles.

Steve Gifford: Any other comments or questions from the board?

Lee Calisti: The question I have is, has the Doctors discussed anything beyond this? There have been multiple additions to this building in the past 20 years and here's another one.

John Hegnes: I don't think there is any place to go.

Lee Calisti: That's what I figured.

John Hegnes: I think this is about the end of the line for this if they want to do something else there it would need to be some place else. The height issue with the last addition and this just simply fills out the footprint. If you would start to exceed the footprint you're going to enter into the parking and that would be a problem. I don't think there is going to be anything beyond this location.

Steve Gifford: Any other comments or questions? I understand the concern of the height of this addition but it won't be as noticeable as whenever you're coming down Pittsburgh St. given the drop of the hill and the speed of the cars. The adjacent property owners, do you know if the Progress Fund or Pantalone Funeral Home, have they been introduced to this addition and if they have any concerns?

John Hegnes: I have not discussed that with them and I don't know if the Doctors have discussed it with them.

Steve Gifford: I did have a conversation with the Director of the Progress Fund about two months ago and I guess it was introduced to them and he's okay with the addition on the other side of the building. Can I have a motion to approve this project? I make that motion.

Barbara Jones: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

**ITEM #9 404 E. PITTSBURGH STREET-OWNER-UNION REAL ESTATE-  
APPLICANT-SAVE A LOT-PROJECT-SIGN/FACADE**

Gary Baacke: I am with Union Real Estate Co. We manage the Greensburg Shopping Center. I am also here with Bill Snyder from Design 3 Architects. Just a brief history of this particular space this is the old Tile City space for those of you who have been around for a while and know the Greensburg Shopping Center. It's around 14, 500 square feet, Tile City moved out in 1999 and the space sat vacant for roughly 4 years. We wanted to find the right fit for that space and that took a little bit of time. We partnered up with the *Save a Lot* people and they felt this was a good area for them to conduct business. It's a very nice store there and they opened up in 2004. They've done okay there; not great. It's a beautiful store, well stocked but as far a curb appeal goes it seems to be a very small look to it from East Pittsburgh Street when driving by. As you can see you see *Save a Lot* great food great pricing that represents about a third of the over all store front and a very small part of the overall store itself. The store is kind of L shaped and the back of the store measures about 140 feet long and the front is only 90 feet long. On the right hand of that store you have two other businesses, tobacco store and a Chinese restaurant. They don't have a lot of visible front, so we basically talked to them and asked what can we do for you to make your store do better and one of the things that came up was to put a new façade on the store incorporating the store front they do have and making it look like a larger presence and make it noticeable for potential customers. They made one revision after we submitted all the drawings to you and I will pass these new revisions out. The item that they basically changed was just the wording itself of the sign they had left hand side meat and produce and the right hand side frozen and they eliminated those signs and just gone to the word food store under the save a lot sign. They kind of reduced their sign, this is a new design of their store and they try to keep them all consistent. I think it's a great improvement for the building.

Steve Gifford: This façade that is being proposed, this is standard for their corporation? All *Save A Lot's* have this?

Gary Baacke: No, what is being proposed as far as keeping it uniformed is the sign itself. This is design 3's design, as far as the curved top, that type of thing, we wanted something that would be a little more unusual than your basic warehouse look so we tried to do something that is going to be nice for the area and the Shopping Center and it will give *Save A Lot* the identification it is looking for.

Steve Gifford: Does the owner of the plaza have any plans to renovate all the other facades?

Gary Baacke: At this time we do not. We repainted the façade about 3 or 4 years ago. Again the focus is we have a good tenant and want to keep them as a good tenant. They do employ quite a few people here, it's a good tax base there and there are other reasons to keep this tenant going. One of the reasons this is going ahead as it tries to incorporate their store front as a uniformed store as opposed to just a little sign they have now and the façade they have now.

Steve Gifford: Any other questions or comments? This is the graphic image as proposed.

Barbara Jones: My comments are that is what I am use to seeing is a store like that, there is one in Wilksburg. That's why I thought that was the corporate look now with the curve and. That is not an attractive plaza.

Gary Baacke: Thank you.

Barbara Jones: I'm sorry, but to change that one store front which is dramatically different then the others, I think it makes the others less important and they are all struggling.

Gary Baacke: That is a fine comment if I may comment on your comment. Sitting in the audience and seeing how you view other tenants I agree 100% that you need to start somewhere and it is great to have uniformity, I think it makes a lot of sense and we have to start somewhere. Right now we have a good tenant and would hate to see them leave. It took us four years (4) to find a replacement and I don't know how long it would take to find a replacement if they leave. Unfortunately there is only so much money to go around we do recognize that and believe me if I had funding I would be happy to do the whole center, but for now we start with this, they are the anchor tenant and then we are able to build on that.

Barbara Jones: I was just thinking about adapting that somehow so it didn't take away from the presence of all the other tenants in the plaza since they would then look smaller and sort of less important when this is in place.

Pete Ciccaglione: I know it's an anchor tenant I actually think it looks nice. You really do have a very old plaza and you just freshened it up a few years ago and made it look 100% better. I don't think their goal here is to go backwards. That is a big improvement for Save A Lot. If they continue to bring that around I am alright with that.

Nancy Stewart: I agree with you I think it's a step in the right direction. Maybe in time it will be something that moves its way around. It makes *Save A Lot* a lot more noticeable to anyone driving by and you might get in there and discover there is a Chinese Restaurant there that you didn't know about. Perhaps there is a benefit to the other tenant by improving part of it.

Gary Baacke: We were not approached by *Save A Lot* we actually approached Save A Lot to do this. We said we understand you guys are doing the business that you would like to do and that other comparable markets are doing much better, so as a team and partnering up we said what can we do to help you out? We don't advertise like other stores, so what can we do to help you out? We don't run food stores and don't advertise but we do run Shopping Centers so maybe improving your front is the way to go.

Lee Calisti: I guess out of all the comments I am the one who doesn't like it at all. It isolates *Save A Lot* too much from the rest of the plaza. Just to call it an improvement, some improvement is better or good, no one can deny that it is an improvement but just because it's an improvement to me doesn't mean it's acceptable. In a City plaza in the City of Greensburg, although it's not downtown it is a City plaza and I feel this has a suburban plaza look and I think the reason that it is most acceptable to people is because it's so familiar for most people. We've all seen suburban plazas where we are forced to accept them, Wal-Mart being the leader out there but I don't find it acceptable for a start of renewing a City plaza. Even though it's an improvement it's not enough. Just like I was trying to articulate to the last applicant for their sign that I don't feel forced to approve any improvement just because it's an improvement, it's like well okay you can get an improvement or you can leave it the way it is now. To me those aren't the only two choices but I just don't favor it because of its, the way it isolates the store from the rest of the tenants as Barbara was trying to talk about and the suburban look of it.

Steve Gifford: So just as a follow up question, then you're not opposed to changing the store front of the plaza, you just don't like the design?

Lee Calisti: Right, I don't feel this design is the best way to do it because I think that if it doesn't talk about the whole plaza in general, it doesn't leave room for the entire plaza, or direction for the entire plaza to go. Auto Supermarket might want to put up a bigger impediment and where do the next guys come in and I think if this is the beginning of improvements then in five (5) or ten (10) years were going to have a plaza in the middle of the City of Greensburg that looks like a Wal-Mart plaza like Hempfield Township.

Gary Baacke: Two comments if I may, this particular store is 14,500 square feet not 150 square feet, secondly right across from the street is a residential street so I appreciate what you're saying and I understand that it is being incorporated in the City limits when you have houses across the street it does give the suburban feel.

Steve Gifford: As an idea since it's book ended between sections of the plaza. How does the board feel about extending the improvements from *Save A Lot* to the end of the plaza so this corner is incorporated and it's not just popped in the center? Would a design that would include that change be more favorable?

Gary Baacke: We can do masonry columns on each end there.

Steve Gifford: As a different option to extend the improvements from *Save A Lot* to the Fortune Cookie and the Tobacco store at the end of the plaza as that being the first step.

Bill Snyder: One of the challenges is that *Save A Lot* is lodged within three (3) bays and each bay steps down. Just by stepping down the mass starts to get larger.

Lee Calisti: This is a tough building site to design. I don't have a better solution. It's a tough building to solve. I am not advocating a Historical Traditional look as well I think any type of contemporary expression would certainly be appropriate. My personal

opinion is I am trying to steer away from the stucco suburban look. It's prevalent in the east and west sides of the City of Greensburg and there's no control out there. I can't say I have a better solution. That's my reaction to what is being presented.

Barbara Jones: It does seem to me that you can adapt it somehow so its smaller, that it doesn't have such a presence, overwhelmed the other business in the plaza. They are going to get street visibility and with the new logo you would think they would get better street visibility then with the sign that's up there now. It's so broken up the continuity that you've given it with a broad space, it's just so big and it just seems to me that you can adapt it to sit better within the plaza instead of going above it and towering over everyone else.

Gary Baacke: One of the obstacles that we have if that was built like a normal rectangle store that would be 140 feet across the front and it's only 90 feet. I understand what you're saying about the other tenants. The two tenants on the right hand side, the Chinese restaurant and the tobacco store are 1500 square feet each and their store front is probably 18 feet wide we have a tough enough time that we have sign criteria's as well fitting store signs between the walls and trying to give them more space. You have dry cleaners that's 2400 square feet and beside them is the Lora V's restaurant that is 4800 square feet. It's hard to make every body equal when you have such a distance apart on the size of their stores.

Steve Gifford: It doesn't necessarily have to be equal; can't it just be extending the line of the façade?

Barbara Jones: What it seems like they are trying to do is connect all three bays of this plaza into one store or to make it uniformed and because of its height and its overwhelming everyone else if there was someway to connect that along so it looks like its one property instead of three. It wouldn't take away from the other businesses.

Gary Baacke: What about as an option if instead we had the domed top and we made it just straight across? Would that reduce the impact of it?

Bill Snyder: One of the reasons that it is as high as it is we are hiding the roof that is beyond. Otherwise that roof starts to peek above that is why the outer ledge lines with the roof in the back.

Lee Calisti: I don't think that's the part I found objectionable I guess; maybe the material is a big hinder for me. The shape and the lines of the plaza have presented kind of fit the material they've selected. So to change material, you couldn't just swap another material it would want a different formal expression. A different flavor, I would actually like to see it, my reaction is that it is a plaza style that has been done in the 1980's and it doesn't talk about 2008. I'd rather see it radically different, if that was the mood to set the tone for the rest of the plaza that would be more urban I think then this.

Pete Ciccaglione: What about a design with metal panels or something like that?

Lee Calisti: I am open to a lot of different things. I love materials and I think there are a lot of materials that can go. This is the look we fought Rite-Aid for four months not to put in a Gateway. We got more of a traditional response from them at that end. I think this is the stucco look that they've done and do frequently in the past and again that is in a different location. I don't have a solution and don't know what it would be and I would be open to a verity of things much more edgy then this. Again I understand that budgets are really tight and the tenant moves out tomorrow what do you do? You want to please the tenant and keep the tenant. I do believe that there is room for that.

Gary Baacke: I guess the center was built in the late 50's early 60's and here we are 2008 and we are trying to blend in and get more current but to try to do something cutting edge and now all of a sudden you got this store that really jumps out and to me shows how tired or how old the remaining portion of the center is. We're trying to do a complimentary to everything then just have one store stand out.

Lee Calisti: This isn't the only one. I spoke out against the Wal-Mart plaza when they were building it and thought it looked 20 years old the day they built it. I wrote my letter and said my peace and it went silent. You stand up for what you believe in.

Garry Baacke: That's why you have this forum.

Lee Calisti: I am encouraged that there is interest in doing something, I find that very positive.

Steve Gifford: Is it to much to ask to have one or two alternative proposals developed for us to consider next month?

Gary Baacke: I am open to that. I need a little more direction into what you're looking for. Dollars is a big driving force and this was something that was not planned on our end. Trying to recognize the issues with the store and trying to get it off and running like it should be this is how we got here today. I don't think we are opposed to doing that but we need a little more direction on what you think you might like.

Bill Snyder: To do something a little more edgy that will defiantly stand out from the rest of the center.

Lee Calisti: And I may be the only one that votes for it.

Bill Snyder: Do you want us to match the character and stay in the vocabulary or start a whole new vocabulary?

Gary Baacke: What if we were to go ahead and extend over the right two existing stores, I'd like to go a little further then that I think that would look a little off balance, we can then do the two stores on the left hand side.

Bill Snyder: We may have a picture of that whole plaza.

Gary Baacke: From the right hand side up to where the bridge is, at the meadows sign. And down to the Tobacco shop.

Lee Calisti: Again, there is not a lot of good presence out there it's a very difficult building type, it's almost this orphan, it doesn't have any basis historically to go by so I guess it's a building type that came up in the 1900's and the original ones were bad and it probably took 30 years to get on the right track.

Steve Gifford: Does everyone else feel that having them submit one or two other proposals is good? I think it would be a good path for us to follow on this. As opposed to Lee I am not necessarily comfortable with this façade here. It does stand alone from the rest of the plaza. As much as I would like to think that within the next five (5) years maybe a little bit more would improve and the next five (5) a little more would be improved. I think this is an opportunity for us to look at that whole section as we we're talking about and make one consistent change and if something would happen like the Auto Supermarket and would want to expand their area or you get a new tenant to move in or whatever it might be. We can look at the next step sometime in the future. We can revisit this in August.

Gary Baacke: This is sort of new to us we're not here on behalf of the sign company but I sort of am, can I get some feedback on the signage? Again, it's going to be the *Save A Lot* as you see it and have the food store underneath. The *Save A Lot* is individual lit channel letters. The food store is a plastic non lit letter and I believe the *Save A Lot* is a 6 foot letter. I believe they are asking for it to be 30 inches and I also believe it exceeds your sign requirements and I would assume you have to apply for a Variance.

Lee Calisti: That is a different issue that our board does not do.

Steve Gifford: If it's larger than our ordinance requires that has to go through the Zoning Hearing Board.

Gary Baacke: So do I need your blessing on that before I go?

Steve Gifford: Yes.

Gary Baacke: Without the signage there is no point in me doing this.

Barbara Jones: Is that the standard size of the sign? Is that the corporate size?

Gary Baacke: What they have is a 4 foot letter package, 5 foot letter package and 6 foot package, and all of them would exceed the code and again its because that store front is so much smaller than the back of the store to balance the store.

Lee Calisti: Are you measuring one bay or all three bays?

Gary Baacke: Three bays is 90 foot which would be 90 square foot of signage and this one that we are proposing is like 260 square feet.

Bill Snyder: *Save A Lot* raps around those other two stores so it's much bigger back there.

Lee Calisti: Is that the company's logo font?

Gary Baacke: Yes. They're showing 6 foot and the options are 4, 5 or 6 and they could probably reduce it. Again the whole concept was for visibility and if I can't get them that then we are kind of going backwards here. If I took this package to the Zoning Hearing Board would they be able to rule on it without having the construction work done?

Lou DeRose: No, they could not. They won't rule on the sign if they don't know what it's on.

Steve Gifford: They could consider the request for a larger sign then what's permitted with the understanding that I guess the design of the plaza is approved?

Lou DeRose: I don't think so because they wouldn't have a design. They wouldn't have a design to look at.

Steve Gifford: I guess I am trying to help Gary, what Gary is saying is if the larger sign isn't approved then there is no need to doing the whole store front.

Gary Baacke: There is no consideration on given your 90 square foot sign based on 90 square feet then my hands are tied.

Lou DeRose: It's not absolute that they are going to say no. They will want to know how much it's going to exceed.

Steve Gifford: That is sort of the direction I was looking at is that my opinion is that I would approve the style of the sign and lettering as presented I would offer that recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board and hopefully with their understanding that they would also see it the way I see it as long as it is incorporated into the total façade.

Barbara Jones: The A is smaller then the S?

Gary Baacke: Yes. The S is larger.

Bill Snyder: Our roof will stick up over the sign it's like a catch 22. There are some things we can do.

Lee Calisti: I don't want my take on this to change the direction that you may have gone otherwise. I just felt that I needed to state my point of view. You're welcome to have your point of view, there is not a lot, our guidelines are really good for restoration and when we get into new construction there are principles involved but it's more of a challenge to direct people to be compliant with our Ordinance when its more difficult to govern construction and we purposely didn't want to have prescriptive designs for construction, we felt that would make the City really bland. All the board members have different opinions and I think that is healthy but I just wanted to state mine.

Steve Gifford: I think we made good progress in having the whole wing looked at with some different design options. Does everyone else agree that this sign looks acceptable?

Lee Calisti: In terms of the letters?

Steve Gifford: Correct, the whole layout design of it?

Lee Calisti: Yes.

Steve Gifford: When we look at it next month the total package we can support and make an argument for encouraging a Variance. I need a motion to table this project for next month.

Lee Calisti: I make that motion

Barbara Jones: I second the motion.

All were in favor.

Nancy Stewart: I make a motion to adjourn.

Pete Ciccaglione: I second the motion.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:30 PM



