What most impressed me on my initial visits was the landscape — the hilly terrain, the abundant vegetation, and the rivers. The contour of the land made it difficult at first to decipher the buildings; what stood out were the wonderful nineteenth-century residential and commercial buildings on the North and South Sides.

Wanting to learn about the architecture of the region and about the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation, I visited Landmarks' bookstore and bought Jamie Van Trump's Life and Architecture in Pittsburgh and Walter C. Kidney's Landmark Architecture: Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and A Past Still Alive: The Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation Celebrates Twenty-Five Years. I took them back to Chicago to read and digest while deciding whether to take the job in Pittsburgh. Jamie’s book told me a great deal about Pittsburgh buildings and Pittsburgh architecture and did so with such breadth and affection and involvement that Pittsburgh, through his writings, became a vital and appealing place. Walter's Landmark Architecture elucidated architectural shapes, textures, and patterns and revealed the subtleties and quirkiness of the designs and the designers working in the Pittsburgh area. A Past Still Alive demonstrated that while Pittsburgh, like many U.S. cities during the post-war period, had demolished scores of splendid structures and erected many mediocre ones in their place, the city still contained an extraordinary (if not widely-known) range of fine buildings preserved by an active and effective preservation movement. Of course, I took the job.

Introduction

If one reads the literature about historic preservation, it quickly becomes evident that the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation is, as Roberta Gratz wrote in The Living City, “one of the nation’s most successful historic-preservation organizations.” If one participates in Landmarks’ activities and programs, and reviews historical records and publications generated by the foundation, it becomes clear how consistent Landmarks’ vision, purpose, and approach have been through three decades, despite differing problems and changing conditions.

A chronology of the key events and activities of Landmarks’ first twenty-five years was compiled by Walter C. Kidney and published as the final section of A Past Still Alive. Walter has prepared a similar chronicle for the past five years which is soon to be printed in a separate booklet. My purpose in this essay is to explore the “character” of the organization and attempt a written “portrait” of the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation. Let me begin at the end, as it were, by presenting a summary of Landmarks’ quintessential characteristics. First, let me state what Landmarks is not and does not attempt to be:

What Landmarks is not:

• It is not an academic organization.
• It is not a museum.
• It is not a public or governmental enterprise.
• It does not serve an economically or racially homogeneous constituency.

Let me rephrase these statements positively:

What Landmarks is:

• Landmarks is an activist organization committed to practical preservation and to educational programs and publications that may be scholarly, informational, interpretive, or a combination thereof. Innovation and flexibility have characterized Landmarks’ approach and methodology.
• Although Landmarks has worked to save individually significant structures, including sites that publicly exhibit historical objects (and support the goals of such sites), its special focus is the preservation of city neighborhoods, and, in the case of Station Square, the restoration and revitalization of neglected, prime riverfront/downtown acreage through adaptive reuse.
• Landmarks is a private, not-for-profit foundation that seeks support from the private sector, uses available public funding for particular projects, and generates revenue to support its activities. Landmarks assists the development of the local economy through preservation programs that contribute to the local tax base rather than consume it.
• Landmarks was the first historic preservation organization in the United States to displace low- and middle-income neighborhood residents but helped them stay in their neighborhoods, restore their properties, and improve the quality of their lives. Its teacher-training programs and scheduled lectures and tours are offered throughout Allegheny County to persons in all economic and social circumstances. Today, its staff is among the most diverse in the city of Pittsburgh, employing a proportionately large number of minorities, and includes women and minorities in leadership positions.

What is Landmarks’ purpose?

Its raison d’être is twofold:
• Preservation (of significant architecture in Allegheny County)
• Education (articulating the aesthetic and practical importance of saving historic structures and areas)

Moving from principles to practical activities, let us examine Landmarks’ program and focus on its priorities during the past three decades, drawing upon statements from within the organization as well as on the assessments of historians of the preservation movement as they reflect upon Landmarks’ work in Pittsburgh.

Preface

About five years ago I participated in a series of conversations that ultimately led to my joining the Landmarks staff on January 1, 1990. Although I was born, raised, and attended college in the Commonwealth, I had been happily living in Chicago for over two decades and knew little about Western Pennsylvania. Allegheny County and A Past Still Alive: The Living City demonstrated that while Walter C. Kidney’s Landmark Architecture and Jamie Van Trump’s Life and Architecture in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and A Past Still Alive: The Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation Celebrates Twenty-Five Years. I took them back to Chicago to read and digest while deciding whether to take the job in Pittsburgh. Jamie’s book told me a great deal about Pittsburgh buildings and Pittsburgh architecture and did so with such breadth and affection and involvement that Pittsburgh, through his writings, became a vital and appealing place. Walter’s Landmark Architecture elucidated architectural shapes, textures, and patterns and revealed the subtleties and quirkiness of the designs and the designers working in the Pittsburgh area. A Past Still Alive demonstrated that while Pittsburgh, like many U.S. cities during the post-war period, had demolished scores of splendid structures and erected many mediocre ones in their place, the city still contained an extraordinary (if not widely-known) range of fine buildings preserved by an active and effective preservation movement. Of course, I took the job.

Introduction

If one reads the literature about historic preservation, it quickly becomes evident that the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation is, as Roberta Gratz wrote in The Living City, “one of the nation’s most successful historic-preservation organizations.” If one participates in Landmarks’ activities and programs, and reviews historical records and publications generated by the foundation, it becomes clear how consistent Landmarks’ vision, purpose, and approach have been through three decades, despite differing problems and changing conditions.

A chronology of the key events and activities of Landmarks’ first twenty-five years was compiled by Walter C. Kidney and published as the final section of A Past Still Alive. Walter has prepared a similar chronicle for the past five years which is soon to be printed in a separate booklet. My purpose in this essay is to explore the “character” of the organization and attempt a written “portrait” of the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation. Let me begin at the end, as it were, by presenting a summary of Landmarks’ quintessential characteristics. First, let me state what Landmarks is not and does not attempt to be:

What Landmarks is not:

• It is not an academic organization.
• It is not a museum.
• It is not a public or governmental enterprise.
• It does not serve an economically or racially homogeneous constituency.

Let me rephrase these statements positively:

What Landmarks is:

• Landmarks is an activist organization committed to practical preservation and to educational programs and publications that may be scholarly, informational, interpretive, or a combination thereof. Innovation and flexibility have characterized Landmarks’ approach and methodology.
• Although Landmarks has worked to save individually significant structures, including sites that publicly exhibit historical objects (and support the goals of such sites), its special focus is the preservation of city neighborhoods, and, in the case of Station Square, the restoration and revitalization of neglected, prime riverfront/downtown acreage through adaptive reuse.
• Landmarks is a private, not-for-profit foundation that seeks support from the private sector, uses available public funding for particular projects, and generates revenue to support its activities. Landmarks assists the development of the local economy through preservation programs that contribute to the local tax base rather than consume it.
• Landmarks was the first historic preservation organization in the United States that did not displace low- and middle-income neighborhood residents but helped them stay in their neighborhoods, restore their properties, and improve the quality of their lives. Its teacher-training programs and scheduled lectures and tours are offered throughout Allegheny County to persons in all economic and social circumstances. Today, its staff is among the most diverse in the city of Pittsburgh, employing a proportionately large number of minorities, and includes women and minorities in leadership positions.

What is Landmarks’ purpose?

Its raison d’être is twofold:
• Preservation (of significant architecture in Allegheny County)
• Education (articulating the aesthetic and practical importance of saving historic structures and areas)

Moving from principles to practical activities, let us examine Landmarks’ program and focus on its priorities during the past three decades, drawing upon statements from within the organization as well as on the assessments of historians of the preservation movement as they reflect upon Landmarks’ work in Pittsburgh.
The Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation was organized in September 1964 to preserve significant architecture in Allegheny County and to educate the public about the historic heritage of the area.


[Landmarks] began ... in 1964 on Liverpool Street. . . . James D. Van Trump and Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr., discouraged by the enormity of local architectural losses through urban redevelopment and general indifference, were walking along this sadly sagging late Victorian avenue. As rays from the falling sun picked out the detailing of the gingerbread porches, the two men talked with Barbara D. Hoffstot, Pittsburgh trustee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Charles Covert Arensberg, attorney and past president of a moribund chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, and Calvin J. Hamilton, head of the Department of City Planning. PHLF was born from their resolve, and from the outset had a deep commitment to finding means to revitalize neighborhoods without removing either historic buildings or the inhabitants.

Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr., Revolving Funds for Historic Preservation (1975), p. 78

**Historic Preservation After 1960:**

"From an Amenity to an Environmental Necessity"

The birth of the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation must be seen against the challenges the historic preservation movement had to meet in post-World War II America. Organizations hitherto devoted to preserving individual sites — at first, places associated with major historical figures or events and later buildings of unusual architectural quality — found themselves facing the wholesale destruction of the fabric of American cities. What had been a movement devoted to conserving the milestones of American cultural life now confronted the possibility of massive, irreversible urban destruction. Historic preservation changed, in the words of Ada Louise Huxtable, "from an amenity to an environmental necessity."

In the 1950s and 1960s in Pittsburgh, as in many other cities, urban "renewal" meant destroying much of the existing built environment. Here too, political and civic leaders and agencies, professors of urbanology and professional planners, architects and builders advocated leveling much of the city and "starting over." Pittsburgh’s "Renaissance" is seen in the popular mythology as a totally benign and positive revitalization of the city. Indeed, aspects of the program, such as controlling air and water pollution, were salutary. Other aspects of the agenda, however, involved wholesale property destruction, regardless of the impact of traditional and successful patterns of urban living, the displacement of thousands of residents, and the eradication of thousands of distinctive buildings and their replacement with drab and banal structures.

University of Pittsburgh historian Roy Lubove recently examined city planning, urban renewal, and historic preservation in Pittsburgh. He writes:

"The last chapter in the original 1964 edition of Lorant’s Pittsburgh: The Story of an American City, was entitled "Rührth" and was presumably by David Lawrence as told to John Robin and Stefan Lorant. The following passage does capture the essence of Renaissance I as it concerned the past and preservation values:"

"Pittsburgh’s great effort has been to remake itself, to change as fast as it can from the environment of the old nineteenth-century technology into the sleek new forms of the future. The city is racing time. It has no inclination to look back; it has no nostalgia for the past. The city welcomes tomorrow, because yesterday was hard and unlively. Pittsburgh likes buildings that glisten with stainless steel and aluminum, and it has little time for the niceties of architectural criticism when it compares what it gained with what it lost. The town has no worship of landmarks. Instead, it takes its pleasure in the swing of the headache ball and the crash of falling brick. It will tear down bridges without a second thought."

This anti-historical, anti-naturalistic bias ... would find expression in such projects as Gateway Center, East Liberty, Lower Hill and the Lower North Side (notably Allegheny Center), and ultimately the concrete spaghetti of I-279 slashing through the East Street Valley. Boulevards and parkways usurped the riverfronts in the Golden Triangle region and generally the rivers, as sources of recreational or cultural or residential development, were ignored. The problem continued up to the era of the Convention Center and Three Rivers Stadium which might as well be situated in the Mohave Desert as in a city defined by its rivers.

It was in this inhospitable environment that the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation was established in 1964.

Many historic buildings in the heart of Allegheny were demolished in the 1960s...
former residents. In many cases, ignoring the given, existing environment results in new ideas for renewal. One of these ideas is the concept of "Community Renewal - Through Restoration," 1964 - 1969.

The author of "The Stones of Pennsylvania," Professor Lubove, notes, was a major proponent of the concept of "Community Renewal - Through Restoration." In 1965, Landmarks began its tour program, and the next year started a newsletter, the forerunner of PHLF News. Jamie in the Charette days often questions the means and methods of "progress," and at times we are an intransigent opponent of it. We are willing to take the risk of unpopularity and the criticism that accompanies experimentation and dissent. Fast always we work not in order to preserve the artifacts of our past in misguided sterility; always we do it with an eye to the future, with an awareness that there can be no future without a past.

The young organization became adept at experiment and dissent. Often too, we are a Socratic gadfly, questioning the means and methods of "progress," and at times we are an intransigent opponent of it. We are willing to take the risk of unpopularity and the criticism that accompanies experimentation and dissent. By the time Landmarks celebrated its fifth birthday, key elements in the organization's program of preservation and education were in place:
- architectural site surveys, preservation studies, and preservation advocacy;
- preservation and restoration of historic neighborhoods and structures; and publications, landmark plaque designations, tours, and other educational endeavors.

Additional programs would be developed and new challenges faced, but the priorities and the modus operandi had been established. Landmarks also began to attract national attention, receiving an Award of Merit for outstanding contributions to local history from the American Association for State and Local History in 1967.

"Community Renewal - Through Restoration": 1964-1969

The authorities had chosen one means of renewal: that of ignoring the given, existing environment in areas marked for renewal; they moved out the people who lived there, demolished acres of buildings, and then built new ones — but generally not for the former residents. In many cases, relocating was slow in coming and valuable acreage in the city still lies unused and unatid at a time when land, housing, and money are very scarce. The Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation began working even before the incorporation date of September 30, 1964 — a preservation study of the 1300 block of Liverpool Street in Manchester, funded by Helen Clay Frick, had begun several months before. In 1966, the revolving Preservation Fund was established with a $100,000 grant from the Richard King Mellon Foundation, and Landmarks began to work aggressively to save and restore buildings in three historic neighborhoods: the Mexican War Streets, the Manchester neighborhood, where Landmarks helped residents organize what is now the Manchester Citizens Corporation and worked with the Garden Club of Allegheny County to encourage grand and support street beautification; and the South Side (Birmingham), assisting local community organizations restore commercial East Carson Street buildings and residences on nearby streets. An historic-architectural site survey of Allegheny County was begun in 1965 — the first county-wide survey compiled in the United States (funded primarily by a grant from the A.W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust). In 1967, Landmarks worked with the Department of City Planning to prepare an historic-preservation ordinance for the city of Pittsburgh (adopted in 1971).

Although Landmarks was not able to halt demolition of buildings such as the Allegheny Market House on the lower central North Side (that entire area, as Professor Lubove notes, was a major urban renewal casualty) or the Fourth Avenue Post Office downtown (although a number of architectural elements were preserved), Landmarks successfully campaigned to save the North Side Post Office (now the Pittsburgh Children's Museum), the Union Station rotunda (car stand), and the Neill Log House in Schenley Park, the latter with a grant from the Richard King Mellon Foundation.

Landmarks began a vigorous publications program. Jamie Van Trump's articles about Pittsburgh architecture had appeared, since the mid-1950s, in publications such as the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Carnegie Magazine, Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine, and Charette, the journal of the Pittsburgh Architectural Club which he had edited since 1961. As Landmarks' first architectural historian he began to write for the foundation and under its imprint. Landmarks' initial publications were a series of pamphlets issued under the title, "The Stones of Pittsburgh." The first to appear in 1965 were devoted to an architectural tour of Pittsburgh, Liverpool Street, the Union Arcade, and Evergreen Hamlet. In 1967, the results of the county-wide survey were published as Landmarks' first book, Landmark Architecture of Allegheny County Pennsylvania.

In 1965, Landmarks began its tour program, and the next year started a newsletter, the forerunner of PHLF News. Jamie's gift of 4,000 books to the foundation created the Landmarks library (handsonically augmented in recent years by generous book donations from Walter Kidney). In 1968, the four-year-old organization began its historic landmarks plaque program, funded by an Alcoa Foundation grant, identifying architecturally significant sites throughout the county; the first recipients were the Allegheny County Courthouse and Jail and the Union Arcade.

The following year, Landmarks began to offer restoration and preservation technical and consulting services to homeowners and community organizations. As part of its Mexican War Streets restoration effort, Landmarks began an experimental program, the first of its kind in the nation, in conjunction with the Pittsburgh Housing Authority:

A major breakthrough came for us when we reached agreements... to lease one of our housing units to the Authority, which will in turn lease it to a low income family. In this case the Authority guarantees us a rent that enables us to carry out restoration while at the same time providing housing for low income people. This agreement provides for reaching solutions to one of the dilemmas we face in preservation today: how to finance the restoration of the many fine houses that stand in blighted areas without dislocating the residents.

The young organization became adept at innovative financing, simultaneously exploring creative uses of governing programs in ways that accomplished preservation goals and developing the assets of the revolving Preservation Fund, generously supported by Pittsburgh's private philanthropic foundations. Landmarks' first published report to its membership in 1969 looked back over the first five years, articulating the foundation's approach to historic preservation as activist rather than antiquarian, typified by practical restoration projects within in-city neighborhoods in partnership with indigenous residents. The organization reaffirmed its determination to fight against the prevailing urban "renewal" ideology, and a willingness to find new ways to do so.

We have come to be recognized as an industrious and aggressive preservation-historical organization, one that is willing to venture into unexplored areas. We have also become known for our attempts to effect restoration without resorting to the method so tried and proven by other preservation organizations in the United States, that of moving the poor out and moving the rich in... Effective preservation... often entails working with people in complex social situations. Often our time goes more into community action than direct architectural preservation, but we know that the buildings are lost if the people who inhabit them are unaware of their importance, are indifferent to it, or are unable to pay for maintenance.

The Langenheim house on Liverpool Street in Manchester, as it was when Landmarks received it for preservation and eventual restoration.

"Community Renewal - Through Restoration": 1964-1969

The Langenheim house on Liverpool Street in Manchester, as it was when Landmarks received it for preservation and eventual restoration.

The Preservation Fund

Rehabilitation of a neighborhood depends absolutely on a general willingness to see it work and a belief that it can work. But it depends, no less absolutely, on money—money for materials, workmanship, and professional services. This is where the revolving fund comes in: properly applied, a revolving fund, even a small one, calls into play economic and psychological forces that effect changes far exceeding normal real estate investments.1

As stated before, Landmarks' revolving Preservation Fund began in 1966 with an initial grant of $100,000 from the Sarah Scaife Foundation. The revolving fund enabled Landmarks to buy the most dilapidated building in a historic neighborhood (thus preventing its demolition, and forestalling the accelerating deterioration of neighboring structures), restore it, and either sell or rent it to residents. The process was then repeated until a group of homes was restored. Low-interest loans were also made to individuals and community groups for worthy preservation projects, such as facade restoration or other neighborhood improvement projects. Sale and/or rental fees and repayment were returned to the "revolving" Preservation Fund; thus limited resources could be replenished and redirected, and more preservation/renovation projects undertaken.

The Preservation Fund also allowed Landmarks to forge agreements such as the one it entered into with the Pittsburgh Housing Authority in 1969—-an example of what Roberta Gratz has called Landmarks' ability to "creatively combine private funds with available government funding."2 By providing surety for projects considered "high risk" and hitherto disdained or avoided by government funding agencies and private financial institutions.

Landmarks' revolving Preservation Fund has grown into a major funding source providing loans and technical assistance to over thirty Pittsburgh neighborhood preservation organizations as well as consulting services to community organizations in twenty-two cities in the United States. Preservation Fund assets have grown from $100,000 to $2 million; the fund has leveraged almost $700 million including government grants and assistance from the private sector, plus over $800 million in bank loans. A list of Preservation Fund loans would fill a small book; projects range from $1,000 to a local historical society to support a campaign to save a threatened historic building to a $10 million joint venture program with a major Pittsburgh lending institution to assist community organizations undertaking long-range preservation planning projects. In addition to providing loans and grants for a particular need or project, the fund has also underwritten the initial phases of such longer-term programs as Home Ownership for Working People, which helps low-income working people purchase and maintain historic properties, or the Brighton Place project which has restored two blocks of Victorian houses, created two community-owned businesses, and will eventually oversee the restoration of some 200 houses on fifty acres in the Calliride section of the North Side. The Preservation Fund:

- supports programs that educate neighborhood residents about the architectural and cultural value of their historic buildings;
- acquires property, when necessary and if possible, to stabilize an historic area, halt further deterioration, and establish restoration models, and provides funds to enable community groups to purchase derelict buildings or notorious operations that impede neighborhood safety or growth;
- assists organizations to gain the skills needed to manage their own preservation and development programs;
- provides risk capital in the form of low-to-zero-percent interest rate loans, often as interim financing until long-term financing can be arranged, so that significant community development can take place; and
- provides grants to enable neighborhood groups to visit other communities with similar problems or hire consultants to advise and train residents in using historic preservation as a means of urban and human renewal.

Neighborhood Revitalization

In its sixth year of existence, Landmarks hosted its first major conference, the Conference on Practical Preservation in Urban Areas, co-sponsored with the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. (Since then Landmarks has sponsored a number of other conferences and seminars on various historic preservation issues.) The conference provided the impetus for a book, Historic Preservation in Inner City Areas: A Manual of Practice, published in 1973 and in a revised edition in 1974. What Landmarks had learned by trial and error in Pittsburgh, its successes and its failures, and its preservation principles and approach were made available, for the first time, in a widely disseminated written form. Historic Preservation in Inner City Areas repeated Landmarks' commitment to maintaining the indigenous social fabric of historic neighborhoods:
We make a commitment to try to retain the people who live in the areas where we acquire property and we try to develop residences for all income levels within the same neighborhood. It also stressed, rather uniquely for the national aesthetic concerns: [Preservation organizations] should show the community what architecturally valuable districts and structures it has; not only should such structures, such districts be clearly noted, but their aesthetic qualities and their usefulness must be fully described. The group must enthusiastically point out how these landmarks can continue to serve the community through specific new uses or revived uses.

The first reason for preserving historic districts is a practical one. Our cities simply cannot handle the logistics of dislocating the vast number of people that would be required were we to demolish all of our old and decaying neighborhoods and substitute new ones. Preservation, on the other hand, recycles the structures that are there. It does not require taking down the existing bricks, windows, basement, and floors, hauling them away, and bringing in new bricks, windows, lumber, and block and building them up again. Utilities do not have to be relocated; streets remain intact, and most important, patterns of life essentially continue as before. In fact, neighborhood morale is vitalized by restoration activity within the area, while massive demolition destroys that morale as well as the buildings. Landmarks has always preferred to work with and support neighborhood community organizations, offering services and administering funding for neighborhood projects through established community-based groups. Landmarks also actively worked with neighborhood residents to form such organizations where none existed; the Manchester Citizens Corporation and the Mexican War Streets Society are two such groups. The most notable achievement of this kind is undoubtedly the Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group (PCRG), originally an umbrella organization of community groups founded in 1988. Collectively, the member organizations are able to achieve political and economic goals that eluded them as individual entities. Beginning as a consortium of eighteen neighborhood organizations who joined together to encourage one lending institution to invest in inner-city areas in compliance with the Community Reinvestment Act, PCRG has grown to thirty-three organizations who now work with every major financial institution in Pittsburgh; these banks have committed some $2.4 billion to fund PCRG projects, and the neighborhood consortium is the leading CPA program in the country, and the only one led by a preservation group. In addition to providing various forms of financial assistance, Landmarks provided the manpower and funded the salary of PCRG’s executive director (Landmarks’ Preservation Fund director) Stanley Lowe, from 1988 through 1993, and has funded, and continues to fund, PCRG’s annual publication analyzing local lending institution investments in historic inner-city neighborhoods. PCRG’s annual banking awards luncheon recognizes those lending institutions which have worked most diligently to establish equal lending patterns and implement affordable home ownership in low- and middle-income neighborhoods; the event is perhaps the most diverse gathering of black and white, young and old, low-through-high income individuals, united for a common purpose, in the city of Pittsburgh.
The North Side Post Office, a grand Italian Renaissance building completed in 1897 and one of the few public buildings of the city of Allegheny to survive the demolition on the central North Side, was saved when Landmarks agreed to purchase and occupy the building. Landmarks’ Five Year Report of 1969 proposed that the “North Side Post Office be restored as the Museum of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County History” as well as “a vital ingredient in North Side itself. It would be available for local art shows and other community exhibits.” Although the building, renamed the Old Post Office Museum, served as Landmarks’ headquarters from 1971 to 1985, and housed, as did the adjacent garden, architectural artifacts salvaged from demolished buildings, it never became the hoped-for regional museum or community center. Landmarks subsequently proposed a new use for the structure as the home of the Pittsburgh Children’s Museum which occupied the building in 1985. Landmarks gave the building and garden to the Pittsburgh Children’s Museum in 1989.

One significant sites like St. Mary’s Priory, the Eberhardt & Ober Brewery, and the Flinton building in Sewickley are examples of privately owned historic sites housing successful commercial operations that were saved and restored with assistance from Landmarks. Between 1976 and 1994, Landmarks demonstrated that the willingness to experiment and “venture into unexplored areas,” proclaimed in its Five Year Report, was once again more than rhetorical when it restored and developed five historic buildings on fifty acres of downtown Pittsburgh, as a multi-use riverfront facility. The project was able to go forward due to a generous and farsighted gift of $5 million from the Allegheny Foundation. Station Square now contains some 130 businesses, employing 3,000 people, and pays $3 million a year in real estate and parking taxes; an average of three million people visit Station Square each year (86% of Pittsburgh’s visitors), making it the region’s premier attraction. An Industrial Riverwalk has been begun along the riverfront; artifacts from the region’s major industries will illustrate and document the industries that created the modern city, long dominating its economy and influencing its social character. A master plan for further development of the site was prepared over a two-year period with the assistance of urban planners Ehrenkrantz & Eckstut of New York, landscape architects Oehme & Van Sweden of Washington, D.C., and restoration architects Landmarks Design Associates Architects of Pittsburgh, and approved by Pittsburgh’s mayor and city council with unanimous public support in 1992.

Changing Attitudes

While Landmarks was evolving, urban renewal and planning agencies began to alter to some extent their “tear it down” policies. Pittsburgh’s Urban Redevelopment Authority commissioned Landmarks to do a preservation study of Manchester as early as 1970, and surveys and studies were subsequently performed for URA, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, and various city and county agencies. In 1976, Landmarks worked with the Allegheny County Parks Department to convert the parking lot in the Allegheny County Courthouse courtyard into a multi-use River and Jazz Festival, funded in large measure by the Sarah Scaife Foundation. In 1983, unable to prevent the demolition of three historic buildings, including the Loyal Order of Moose Building, to make way for new construction in the Cultural District, Landmarks worked to ensure that three adjacent city blocks of fine nineteenth-century commercial buildings would be preserved through establishment of the Penn-Liberty Historic District. Since 1987, Landmarks has chaired the Allegheny County Courthouse Restoration Committee.

Preservation Surveys, Studies, and Advocacy

Landmarks has continued to prepare historic-preservation surveys and studies, and to provide technical assistance. Landmarks’ most ambitious survey project was the second Allegheny County Historic Sites Survey, undertaken for the Commonwealth from 1979 to 1984, which greatly expanded the Landmarks-initiated 1965-66 survey, documenting virtually all significant historic-architectural districts within the county. Surveys have also been performed of downtown buildings, Oakland, the borough of Tarentum, and Sewickley Heights.

Landmarks surveyed the extant buildings of architect Frederick G. Schenkel, Jr., for the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in 1987. That same year, two important steel industry surveys were also undertaken: one, for the PIMC, documented the historical resources of the iron and steel industry in four counties; the other, for the Regional Industrial Development Corporation, surveyed the condition of the former U.S. Steel National and Duquesne Works.

Landmarks also prepared National Register nominations for individual structures and for possible districts — Schenley Park and a Homestead historic district are the largest. Between 1991 and 1995, Landmarks assisted Landmarks Design Associates Architects prepare the first African-American Historic Sites Survey of Allegheny County (to be published by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission who sponsored the survey). Landmarks also provides funding for surveys performed by other organizations, such as the East Carson Street Historic District nomination prepared in 1993 by the South Side Local Development Company.
Left: The Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Station in the 1920s. Above: Five historic railroad buildings now form the nucleus of Station Square, an adaptive-use project initiated by Landmarks in 1976.

Above left: The old Freight House under remodeling. Above-right: The Shops at Station Square, of which some are converted box cars. Far left: Making over the main waiting room of the P&LE Station as the Grand Concourse, 1977. Left: The Grand Concourse.
The best program is the one that develops out of the "givens" of the neighborhood rather than being imposed on it. Once the [historic] district is well on its way to completion you and your organization should move on to other projects. The area should belong to those who inhabit it. You must guide the program from a distance, offering advice when it might be taken, letting people find their own way when it won't.

Essentially, however, we have really freed — or at least started the process of freeing — this area to determine what it wants for itself. Within the next few years, the area should firm up well enough to determine its own course, to go on its own way — and we will then go ours.

Conserving Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial, revitalizing Allentown (for the Hilltop Avenue Improvement Association), exploring adaptive uses for the Braddock Carnegie Library, and assessing the impact of I-79 on Glencoe were a few of the studies performed in the 1970s. In the 1980s, Landmarks studied the preservation needs of Allegheny Cemetery for the Allegheny Cemetery Historical Association, analyzed the possible reuse of the Sewickley Borough Building, and reviewed a proposal to create a county marina, among others. In 1992, Landmarks and Landmarks Design Associates Architects examined J.H. Richardson's Emmanuel Episcopal Church and made recommendations for its restoration, and in 1994, Landmarks prepared a study funded by the Allegheny Foundation to explore means of preserving religious properties.

Frequently, however, Landmarks has prepared studies and made recommendations as a preservation advocate, in an effort to preserve a structure or recommend a new and appropriate use. Some, like a proposal to save the Byers-Lyon houses at the Community College of Allegheny County or the proposed adaptive use study of Fourth Avenue bank buildings, have borne fruit; others, like a proposal to convert Union Station into a hotel (in order to find an acceptable use for the building and avoid demolition necessary to build a new hotel) or to prevent the demolition of St. Peter's Church in Oakland, have not. Landmarks' staff has often testified before planning agencies and at public meetings.

The demolition of St. Peter's in Oakland, January, 1990
Education

Landmarks has continued to publish books and brochures. Until his retirement in 1981, Jamie Van Trump continued his "Stones of Pittsburgh" series and, in conjunction with The Carnegie, published An American Palace of Culture (1970). Life and Architecture in Pittsburgh, a selection from the some 500 articles and essays he has written, was published by Landmarks in 1983, and his long-awaited Majesty of the Law: The Court Houses of Allegheny County was published in 1988, on the centennial of the dedication of H.H. Richardson's Allegheny County Courthouse and Jail. Walter Kidney has written of Jamie's work, "he retained scholarly objectivity about facts but eschewed the sort of scholarly caution that has given the world so much worthy but dull prose," while Arthur Ziegler states:

Many cities have their historians. I know of none which has an interpreter of the experiences of the past that have affected people, accretion by accretion, who offers them up in such a sumptuous style, beautiful as an art in itself. Jamie reminds us that our buildings reflect lives; they express and symbolize those people who were involved in creating and in using them."  

In 1994, Professor Margaret Henderson Floyd defined the importance of Jamie's writings when she wrote, "Van Trump's numerous publications have provided the foundation for my research, as for all studies of Pittsburgh architecture."

As part of Landmarks’ education program, Pittsburgh Treasure Hunt, Landmarks’ first publication for children, written in conjunction with a walking tour, appeared in 1976. A slide show program for elementary and secondary school students, “An Eye for Architecture,” was prepared by Landmarks and the Allegheny Intermediate Unit (AIU) in 1982. Subsequently, the AIU has offered credit courses for teachers. “Exploring Your Neighborhood Through History and Architecture,” the “Hands-On History” summer institute for teachers; “Exploring Your City: Pittsburgh’s Past and Present”, “Exploring Architecture,” and “Pittsburgh Heritage”—all created and often taught by Landmarks’ staff in teaching the AIU intervises. This summer Sue Neff created and taught “Pittsburgh Heritage II.” This teacher intervis was offered as a sequel to Landmarks’ eight-day workshop that has been offered for the last eleven years. Eliza Smith Brown of Landmarks’ Design Associates participated in the non-credit adult extension courses sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh.

In 1984, Landmarks was able to establish a Revolving Fund for Education, the result of a $200,000 grant from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. The fund supports all aspects of Landmarks’ education program; it was augmented in 1989 and 1990 by major grants from the Richard King Mellon Foundation, The Mary Hillman Jenning’s Foundation, and an anonymous donor.

Two traveling exhibits, “Landmark Survivors” and “Architecture: The Building Art,” were created in 1985 with funding from the Henry C. Frick Educational Commission and PPG Industries Foundation; the exhibits travel to schools and community organizations. A “Landmark Survivors” video was created in 1991 for school use based on the exhibit, and an “Architects-in-the-School” program was established in 1991 to complement the “Architecture: The Building Art” exhibit. In 1986, Landmarks hosted the first of six “Hands-On History Festivals” for students and teachers. Two years later the “Portable Pittsburgh” program was begun for schools, offered by Landmarks’ docents. “Downtown Dragons,” an architectural walking tour for school children and adults, was created in 1994.

A library of slide-shows on a variety of historical and architectural topics was created in 1982; regularly updated and expanded, the slide library is available to teachers, organizations, and members.

Regularly scheduled tours continue to be given, and Landmarks offers specially arranged tours for visitors, such as the three-hour “NK City” bus tour that specially-trained docents lead. Groups of visitors from cultural and historical organizations from around the country and abroad, such as the School of Architecture of the State University of New York at Buffalo (who visit annually), the Society for Industrial Archaeology, the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio Foundation, Friends of the American Museum in Britain, Washington Art Associates, and the American Federation of Arts plus their visits to Pittsburgh with assistance from Landmarks, and members of the staff, and docents guide the visitors through the area.

Third-grade students pose by a creature at Station Square before departing on their “Downtown Dragons” walking tour.
A student views the "Landmark Survivors" exhibit.

For Chapel Area High School students create a video based on the "Landmark Survivors" exhibit.

Fifth graders at Wilkinsburg School show-off the old-fashioned costumes used in the "Portable Pittsburgh" presentation.


Students build a tower as part of the "Architecture: The Building Art" exhibit.
Landmarks continues to sponsor conferences, seminars, and forums. In 1979, Landmarks sponsored a conference on "Minorities in Historic Preservation"—the first such conference held in the nation—funded by a grant from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and, also that year, co-sponsored a conference on the re-use of downtown buildings with the Allegheny Conference and the Department of City Planning. In 1985, Landmarks held a public forum on the future of the Strip District. That same year, with the National Park Service, it sponsored a conference on the preservation of steel plant structures, which led to the establishment of the Steel Industry Heritage Task Force. In recent years, Landmarks has sponsored conferences on preservation of religious properties, environmental issues in preservation, and preservation law.

Landmarks' Distinguished Lecture Series has brought leaders in the preservation field to Pittsburgh since 1912, and the annual Award of Merit program, established in 1982, recognizes contributions to preservation and architectural history during the year.

For the past seventeen years Landmarks has sponsored an annual Antiques Show; in recent years funds raised by the Antiques Show have supported the continuing restoration of the Neville House.

Landmarks' educational programs encourage students and teachers to notice architectural details, to draw, and to create "books" about Pittsburgh's history and architecture.
Landmarks' National Reputation

National attention long focused on Landmarks' work. In 1972, the National Trust for Historic Preservation presented Landmarks with its Significant Achievement in Historic Preservation award; the citation lauded Landmarks' "philosophy of preservation" and praised: its persistent and far-sighted perseverance and restoration efforts in downtown Pittsburgh and in demonstrating that architecturally and historically significant structures are an urban resource of great importance to many people. By the practical recycling of old buildings in the Mexican War Streets district and by encouraging owners in the old Birmingham area to do the same the Foundation has proved that historic preservation can affect the lives of inner city residents in a tangible, meaningful and thoroughly beneficial way. While saving important buildings and neighborhoods, the Foundation's program has placed the emphasis on the improvement of the quality of life.

In 1977, Landmarks was awarded the American Institute of Architects Silver medal for: its successful efforts to preserve its significant architectural past, and to heighten public appreciation of that precious heritage. The history of the Foundation's success demonstrates a lively awareness of the economic and social realities as well as the architectural aspects of historic preservation.

In 1979, Professor Nathan Weinberg devoted half a chapter on innovative approaches to preservation to Landmarks in Preserving Architecture in American Towns and Cities. His analysis focused on key elements of Landmarks' program:

The preservation program developed by PHLF has been adaptive and progressive; it has made virtues of the necessities of the Pittsburgh situation, and it is evident that it has nothing to offer to preservationists in other large industrial cities. ... The program ... emphasized community involvement in the organization for preservation, the judicious use of revolving fund for demonstration buildings, the raising of public funds for low-interest loans and rent subsidies, and the stimulation of historic, architectural, and community awareness through publications, exhibitions, and tours.

Added to the major elements of the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation program — community self-help, revolving fund, demonstration projects, advisory services, and public financing proposals — have been a number of the usual activities of a preservation organization. These have included the preservation of theNeill Log House, the marking of historic landmarks and buildings, publications, exhibits, tours, a survey of the historic architecture of Allegheny County, and acting as a preservation planning service. ... However, the main thrust of the PHLF program has continued and continues to be the preservation of the inner-city neighborhood.

Landmarks' activities received increasing coverage in professional journals. In 1978, the AIA Journal carried an article titled, "Pittsburgh's Innovative Renovation Process," which called Landmarks' neighborhood program "one of the few success stories in rehabilitation without displacement." The Architectural Record's 1983 article, "Pittsburgh: Virtuous Preservationists," noted: "The combination of drive, concern and clout has earned PHLF the reputation of a group that delivers." Landmarks' preservation programs in the neighborhoods and its development of Station Square are evaluated and discussed in Roberta Guzzara's presentation of the preservation movement's gains and losses from the 1950s through the early 1980s. She termed the PHLF program innova
tive and the flexible aspects of Landmarks' neighborhood program as well as its participatory character. She wrote: More significant [than saving individual historic buildings] was the trailblazing effort to save historic residential neighborhoods with inherent character and graciousness that were otherwise doomed to more expensive and socially destructive demolition and replacement by high-rise anonymity. PHLF, under Ziegler's leadership, creatively combined private funds with available government funding, much of which had to be fashioned to meet preservation needs. ... The city was prepared to refashion the urban-renewal plan to include a renovation strategy for several architecturally rich neighborhoods. ... The effort turned into the country's first historic-preservation program for poor people and combined both home-owner assistance and low-income rental.

One hallmark of this effort was its establishment of a variety of strategies ... that could be applied in different combinations to any area in accordance with its physical and social differences. Another hallmark was its encouragement of and dependency upon a genuine community involving process. Neighborhood residents of all kinds gathered to identify problems, explore solutions and set priorities. Eventually, there emerged neighborhood associations that worked in partnership with the foundation and functioned separately to address the full assortment of local issues. Under PHLF's diverse techniques, new tenants or homeowners were drawn into preservation, parting with scarce resources. Buying and restoring the buildings in worst condition was priority. By upgrading and restoring living conditions for existing residents and not just incoming residents. Loans were made available for resident homeowners of modest means to encourage them to upgrade their property rather than sell and move. ... As for Station Square:

A parallel experience [to the revival of downtown Pittsburgh's commercial center ... A market study convinced the PHLF that Pittsburgh was the wrong city, that the station was in the wrong location, that PHLF was the wrong organization as developer of this wrong-headed project. ... Ziegler was proposing an urban-renewal program unlike any the lenders had encountered ever before, one that would preserve, not destroy, one that planned first to reuse the existing five buildings on the site, which required no demolition, no relocation of residents or businesses and no further land acquisition. Furthermore, it was one of the largest adaptive-reuse programs in the country undertaken by a nonprofit organization. ... It was as if Ziegler was speaking a foreign language when he tried to sell his idea of developing the site in manageable stages. "Like a city," Ziegler said, "we would let it grow by itself." His intention was to appeal to "homemakers first, with tourism extra." A significant thought considering the proliferation of so-called revitalization projects around the country designed first for the tourist and only second for the "hometown folks." In the end, the development got off the ground with a $5 million seed grant from the Allegheny Foundation, a trust of the Scale family, and a $2 million investment by Detroit restaurateur Charles A. Muëer ... Experts predicted financial doom for the preceding set-apart preservation of Boston's Fanueil Hall Marketplace and Pittsburgh's Station Square, two very different historic landmarks battered by age and neglect. Downtowns were dead, the experts declared, no place for bold and innovative restoration schemes that include a mix of commercial uses. Today, both landmarks are models of urban recycling and commercial successes, the envy of real-estate investors trying to turn them into image-making.
Staff
Landmarks is fortunate to have a loyal, hard-working staff. The following people are employees of the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation. Years of service for each staff member are noted:

Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr.
President (30 years)

Louise Sturgess
Executive Director (13 years)

Howard B. Slaughter, Jr.
Director of Preservation Services (1 year)

Walter C. Kidney
Architectural Historian (9 years)

Albert M. Tamber
Historical Collections Director (4 years)

Mary Lu Denny
Director of Membership Services (10 years)

Mary Ann Eubanks
Education Coordinator (2 years)

Philips Hoffstad
Director of Finance (5 years)

Ellis J. Cavalier
General Counsel (1 year)

Tom Coyne
Comptroller (3 years)

Linda Mire
Staff Accountant (1 year)

Sherry Kemmerlin
Secretary (14 years)

Jean Hardy
Secretary (8 years)

Sarah Slager
Secretary (5 years)

Judy Galloway
Secretary (1 year)

Station Square
Jennifer Uher
The Shops at Station Square Marketing Director (2 years)

Bill Lichauer
Station Square Marketing Director (4 years)

Thomas Keffer
Supervisor of Property Maintenance (12 years)

Larry Janicki
Maintenance Staff (8 years)

Richard Stahl
Maintenance Staff (4 years)

Mike Pajewski
Maintenance Staff (1 year)

Julie Butler
Assistant Audit Supervisor (5 years)

Frank Snyder
Parking Supervisor (10 years)

Joseph Friester
Custodial Manager (9 years)

Patrick Gilleon
Horticulturist (4 years)

Gregory C. Yochum
Horticulturist (10 years)

Ronald C. Yochum, Jr.
Facilities Management Assistant (11 years)

Melissa Lohrer
Manager/Buyer of The Landmarks Store (2 years)

Daryl Butler
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (5 years)

Allison Goodwin
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (1 year)

Janice Haymon
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (1 year)

Keith Herriot
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (1 year)

Jeff Richel
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (4 years)

Jeff Zatkiewicz
Part-time Grounds/Traffic (5 years)

Ted Morriss, who was a staff member from 1978 to 1983 and from 1990 to 1991, continues to serve Landmarks as an economic development consultant.

Stanley Lowe, Director of Landmarks' Preservation Fund from 1985 to 1993, is on a leave-of-absence from Landmarks, and now in serving as the Director of the Housing Authority, City of Pittsburgh.

“Preservation as it Should be Practiced”

Many of the successful historic preservation projects in Pittsburgh and in Allegheny County are admired and used, in some cases, without Landmarks’ role in their continuing existence a widely-known or recognized fact. To visit the Neville House, the area’s principal link with the formative years of America’s democracy and to experience 18th-century life and architecture; to admire the genius inherent in the Allegheny County Courthouse as seen from the courtyard park; to stand within the grand glass Victorian greenhouses at Phipps Conservatory; to walk down Liverpool Street, or Rosaca Place, or East Carson Street, or through the Penn-Liberty Historic District; to experience the vitality, enjoy the amenities, and view Pittsburgh’s spectacular skyline from Station Square — these are possible largely because of Landmarks’ practical preservation activities.

Charles C. Arensberg, chairman of Landmarks for 30 years, and Pat Pearson, a trustee of Landmarks since its founding in 1964

Landmarks’ achievements would not have been possible without the firm support of its Board of Trustees, who understand and share a philosophy of preservation and who have provided steadfast positive and practical reinforcement for Landmarks’ endeavors. Also critical has been the support and generosity of Pittsburgh’s foundations and their long-term financial assistance. In particular, Richard Scaife and his family, through their foundations, have not only been Landmarks’ most generous benefactors, but also have given the lead in funding those “high risk” innovative and path-breaking programs that have preserved so much of Pittsburgh and drawn national attention and acclaim.

In 1991, the theme of the annual convention of the National Trust for Historic Preservation was “Past Meets Future: Saving America’s Historic Environments.” I attended a workshop on Landmarks’ preservation program led by then Preservation Fund director Stanley Lowe, who mesmerized the audience as he showed slides of restored North Side buildings and described how they had been saved, restored, and are now lived in again. As a young man, raised in Manchester, Stanley was angry and concerned about the deterioration of his neighborhood. Better, he thought, to tear it all down. What value could these old buildings have? Had not people of means fled from such neighborhoods, filled with historic houses and neighborhood shopping streets, for the suburbs and the shopping malls? That was how he felt, until one day, Stanley said: “Arthur Ziegler came into my neighborhood and robbed me of my suburban dream!”

Left to right: Peter Brink and Richard Moe of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Arthur Ziegler; Anthony Wood of the J.M. Kaplan Fund; and Stazley Lowe on Liverpool Street in Manchester, 1993

Harriet Henson of the Northside Tenants Reorganization and Stanley Lowe, at a meeting in 1993 of the Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group
The Renaissance just beginning in 1930 (above), and the way the city looks now (below).
The 1300 block of Liverpool Street, as it looks today

Today if one visits Manchester, one notices a few signs of 1960s urban "renewal"—one of two fortresses-like low-income high-rise housing projects were erected and the block of commercial shops and stores on Pennsylvania Avenue was demolished (much to the regret of the current residents), and replaced by anonymous suburban tract housing. The glory of the neighborhood, however, is block-after-block of restored nineteenth-century homes — some of the finest in the city. The contrast between the historic survivors and the 1960s buildings is illuminating — and disquieting when one realizes that most of the North Side was slated to look like these parvenus. That the oldest structures were saved, that a neighborhod was revived and not extinguished, that the residents came to understand the importance of what they had and learned to proudly nurture it, and that this conservation of existing resources would be repeated in older neighborhods throughout the city of Pittsburgh, was the result of a tenacious process of preservation and education begun by the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation.
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