ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF April 28, 2010
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: **Klavon, Indovina, Cooper, Astorino, Luckett, Rhor, Mike Gable in place of Rob Kaczorowski**

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: **Morton Brown, Noor Ismail**

A. <u>Correspondence</u>

Mr. Brown noted that there was no correspondence.

B. <u>Items for Review</u>

a. Schenley Plaza Restaurant

Mr. Richard Reed introduced himself as a representative of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy and introduced the project. He stated that when the Plaza was created in 2005, its Master Plan included a restaurant on the premises which was originally proposed as a two-story restaurant by Atria, and now proposed as a one-story restaurant by Eat'n Park Hospitality Group.

Mr. Mark Broadhurst of Eat'n Park directed the Commission to the designs and noted that the name "Currant" is just a placeholder for a name they will develop later.

Mr. Andy Dunmire of Eat'n Park discussed the materials to be used for the restaurant, which are all pulled from the surrounding architecture and structures. He stated that the restaurant will work with the existing landscape and have a seasonal outdoor space.

Mr. Broadhurst stated that they are focusing on several green initiatives including rain barrels and a rooftop garden for herbs and vegetables, much like the one on Six Penn Kitchen downtown. He stated that the site plan will incorporate the existing trees, have transitional spaces like the outdoor seating, and leave open space for a potential children's theater next to it.

Mr. Broadhurst stated that a challenging aspect of designing a restaurant for this space is that it is open on all four sides, with no hidden "back" for loading and trash removal.

Mr. Astorino asked how the restaurant will handle the delivery trucks and the trash removal with that challenge.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that they hope to reserve several parking spots for delivery trucks on the Hillman Library side, but restrict these deliveries to an hour window during early morning hours. He stated that smaller trash cans will be held on the south side of the building and taken to a larger service area throughout the day. He added that their timeline includes breaking ground in October, after the busy summer and fall festival schedule, with a potential open date of April 2011.

Mr. Indovina asked what materials they will be using.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that all the materials were taken from the surrounding buildings and include limestone, fiberboard, cedar or trex, stone, metal, and stainless steel.

Mr. Cooper asked how they decided on the scale for the restaurant.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that they wanted to reduce the scale of the original design by Atria's to a one-story building to reduce the footprint in the park.

Mr. Cooper asked about the higher profile the nameplate on the front of the restaurant.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the intent of the design was to be as low as possible however, certain mechanical elements needed to be higher than the rest of the building, so in order to screen the equipment, the fiber board elements were included.

Ms. Luckett asked what the seating capacity of the restaurant will be.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that it will seat 150 inside and an additional 40 to 50 outside.

Ms. Luckett asked about how they address parking concerns with their design.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the restaurant will serve primarily walking-traffic, so dedicated parking is not necessary. He added that, especially at night, there will be parking in the area, just not right next door to the restaurant.

Ms. Luckett asked about the menu.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that their intent is to serve breakfast, lunch and dinner.

Mr. Indovina asked who the target audience will be.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that they would like to reach a broad audience with food that can be served quickly. He added that there will be full-service, but the food type will be wood-burning oven/rotisserie: food that has a long prep time but not take a long ordering time. He added that they are gearing the food towards park visitors that can come in to eat or order food and take it back out to the park to eat. He continued to say that the food would be priced in a mid-range of $10-20.

Ms. Klavon asked about how they would integrate the current landscaping into the design.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that there is currently some ground cover and a temporary walk in the area the restaurant would reside in.

Ms. Klavon asked when a landscape plan might be completed.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that once they finalize the design of the building, they will employ someone to develop the landscape plan, while working with Parks Conservancy to keep the design consistent with the plaza.

Ms. Klavon asked about the scale, indicating that from an aerial perspective, the footprint looks to be pressing on the park. She asked if they could consider making the footprint slightly smaller.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the drawings look misleading because the outdoor space is included in the footprint, even though it would be an open, but covered, area. He added that the original restaurant to be put in Schenley Plaza, Atria's, had a larger footprint and an additional story. He also added that the outdoor area is important to the project in order to transition into the plaza.

Ms. Klavon stated that the walkway in front of the restaurant is a very important part of the plaza, so the restaurant should interact with the walkway to look as if the restaurant was always there.

Mr. Reed stated that the tree line is something the group is being sensitive to, because the original design included the tree line to create a specific site line.

Ms. Klavon stated that her advice is to pay close attention to that tree line and the landscaping around the restaurant.

Mr. Dunmire stated that the group does want a strong connection with the park, so a landscaping plan is something they need to develop after this hearing.

Mr. Indovina asked how the outdoor spaces are separated and climate controlled. He also asked if people on the path can come and go in this space.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the open area is completely open and flowing, except for a few columns. He added that customers can enter from all areas and come and go from the path. He added that their might be a host to assist customers into the space, but it would be 'first come, first serve.'

Mr. Indovina asked about the hedge line.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the hedge and ground cover would extend the current tree line to somewhat control how people come into the space, but not to block off the walkway access.

Mr. Astorino asked if the outdoor area would have the ability to be closed off.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that it would be open at night. He added that there will be some ability to close it off hidden in the bulkhead, for larger events and during the wintertime.

Ms. Luckett asked about the outdoor lighting.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that the outdoor lighting plan is in the conceptual stage at this point. He added that they will work with the Parks Conservancy to coordinate and be consistent with their lighting plan.

Mr. Cooper asked what the intent or idea of the restaurant is in this public space.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that this restaurant will be an amenity for visitors of the park, since there is something missing from the plaza. He added that in the initial plan for the park included a restaurant, so this group would be fulfilling this aspect. He also added that the restaurant would be an amenity for Oakland.

Mr. Cooper asked why this restaurant would be different than another in the city.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that this restaurant is different because of the context and location. He added that other cities have successful outdoor restaurants.

Ms. Klavon suggested Tavern on the Green as a similar restaurant effort.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that this restaurant will not be as up-scale as Tavern on the Green, but this restaurant will be an amenity to the plaza.

Ms. Klavon asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on behalf, in opposition, or in general about the project.

Mr. Theodore Ley introduced himself as a resident of Oakland on Boundary Street. He asked if the restaurant on this space was a done deal.

Mr. Brown answered that a restaurant is contemplated in the Lease between the City and the Parks Conservancy and is allowed, but the design of the restaurant is not finalized at this point.

Mr. Reed added that the business model for the plaza included a full-service, year-round restaurant to help maintain the plaza. He added that, while the Parks Conservancy invests an additional $300,000 per year to supplant the resources the plaza receives from the City, in order to properly maintain the plaza for years to come, a steady revenue stream is needed.

Mr. Brown stated that this project is here today for Conceptual Approval and will still have go through Final Approval and Final Acceptance of the Art Commission, Historic Review Commission review and approval, and City Council would review and approve the lease—there would be many public hearings to complete the City Review Process.

Mr. Ley stated that his position is that it is a bad idea to put any restaurant in the plaza, because the green space is the entrance to Schenley Park, the kiosks will suffer due to the size and reach of the restaurant, employee parking will be affected by restaurant truck parking, the City will lose money on the parking rent, and the site lines will be affected. He added that his idea would be to put a children's garden there to maintain the vista and view of the Carousel.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that he understands the importance of the green space, but in observing the area, people do not frequent the potential restaurant space as much as the main lawn.

Mr. Ley stated that if there is to be a wood-burning oven in the restaurant, the smoke will blow towards Schenley Park. He added that air conditioning will not be noise free and could affect people's enjoyment of the park if they are sitting, reading, etc. He pointed out that once the restaurant is built, it's there whether it's good, bad, or indifferent.

Mr. Astorino stated that a one-story building is ideal, as opposed to the original two-story restaurant proposed, essentially, the lower the better.

Mr. Indovina agreed that the lower scale the better. He stated that the materials chosen integrate with the site. He added that the ability for the restaurant to flow into the park is important.

Mr. Astorino stated that even though there are trade-offs to having a restaurant in the plaza, it will be nice to have a place to eat to add to the overall feel of the plaza.

Ms. Rhor stated she likes the idea of opening the restaurant to the park, but the scale does not seem to be addressed, since it feels large in the space. She agreed that the greenery on the roof and the landscaping are positive aspects of the design.

Mr. Cooper expressed concern about the overall look of the restaurant. He reviewed the recent restoration of the site and its civic importance. He stated that this is an opportunity to do something great, beautiful, that stands out. He stated that some of the design looks like a suburban shopping mall building. He asked why it could not be built as a completely green restaurant with very low energy use. He stated that this could be something that draws people to the park.

Ms. Rhor agreed with Mr. Cooper in that this is an opportunity to build on the symbolic and historical nature of the park.

Mr. Astorino suggested that the group look at the design of the back side to inform the entire design. He stated that the synthetic materials, such as fiber board, are the areas that miss the opportunity to be something different and great.

Mr. Indovina stated that he would like to see a design that is more open to the park and addresses the urban context. He added that it would be nice to have a garden pavilion feel, rather than a building feel.

Mr. Gable stated that the restaurant should not mimic what is already in the plaza, but incorporate everything that is in Schenley Park. He asked the group to find a way to store their trash and recycling in the existing compound instead of expanding the area to the rear of the restroom facility to house rubbish.

Mr. Brown outlined the conditions for the motion he heard in the discussion: more green technology and practice, replace the synthetic materials with higher quality natural materials, more openness visually and physically, more integration with the plaza, and try to incorporate trash collection in the existing compound.

Mr. Broadhurst stated that he wants to work with group, but is concerned with the timeline.

Mr. Brown explained that if the Commission decides to table this and asks for modifications to the plan, the group can come back for Conceptual Approval of a new design as early as next month, and then come back the following month for Final Approval.

Mr. Indovina suggested that the group come back with more schematic drawings of a design that are more developed and architectural drawings to address the concerns of the Commission before the drawings are final and out to bid---this should save the applicant time and cost in the long run.

Ms. Klavon added that they need to include a schematic drawing of the landscape plan, as well.

Mr. Indovina asked if it would be possible to grant final approval without seeing construction documents.

Mr. Brown answered that Final Review is contingent upon construction documents, so could not be finally approved without them.

Mr. Indovina stated that he feels uncomfortable conceptually approving this design, because he sees room for improvement.

MOTION: To Table the application for the Schenley Park Restaurant with the condition that revisions are made to the design of the restaurant that strives for more integration of the restaurant into the plaza.

Requested revisions are as follows:

- Investigate opportunities for more "green" technology and practice in structure, waste management and equipment (no HVAC, low carbon equipment, etc.)
- Remove the use of fiberboard and reduce other synthetic materials as feasible on the upper exterior facades and potential other areas, replacing with higher quality natural materials such as cedar planking, currently considered in other portions of the design
- Create more visual, physical, and perceived "openness" of the restaurant from the interior and the exterior perspectives of the restaurant by further developing a landscape plan and the outdoor patio spaces and their relationship and connection to the Plaza pathways and lawn in terms of openness and/or barriers
- Incorporate the rubbish collection area (currently designated # 3 on site plan) into the restaurant instead of increasing the size of the existing adjacent restroom facility (#7 on site plan) fencing to accommodate
- Address perceived encroachment of restaurant structure by potentially adjusting scale and configuration of footprint of structure

MOVED: Cooper **SECONDED: Rhor**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

b. Mt. Washington Viewing Machines on Grandview Avenue

Mr. Christopher Beichner introduced himself as the Executive Director of the Mt. Washington CDC, the private partner representative Bruce Brushack of Tower Optical, and the project. He stated that viewing machines along Grandview Avenue will improve the visitor experience, give visitors something to do, and give a closer/better look at the historically and culturally significant buildings and landmarks throughout the city. He stated that the project intends to install up to nine viewing machines for this project, just not all at once. Mr. Beichner stated that the project has coordinated with the ADA Compliance Coordinator of City Planning, Richard Meritzer to include ADA compliant viewers. He distributed additional information to the Commission that includes pictures of the handicap accessible viewers. He stated that one of the handicap viewers will be placed next to a handicap parking spot and will be evaluating a second location for feasibility of a handicap viewer.

Mr. Astorino asked if the viewers will be on the hillside or along the sidewalk.

Mr. Beichner answered that the viewers will be along the sidewalk side of the railing. He added that Tower Optical will provide insurance, indemnify the City and the CDC, and provide ongoing long-term maintenance on the viewers. He stated that the viewers will be secured to the sidewalk and their placement has been supported by Public Works.

Mr. Astorino asked if the viewers have an ease of use and improved optics.

Mr. Brushack answered that the viewers are now 10-power binoculars instead of the older 7 to 9-power.

Ms. Klavon asked how they would handle visitors from rotating them in order to look into residential windows and if they would place a pin in the viewer to prevent 360-degree rotation.

Mr. Brushack answered that pins in the viewer are not effective.

Mr. Brown stated that from the vantage point, a visitor may not be able to see through the viewer if it were turned 360-degrees.

Ms. Klavon asked for clarification as to whether the viewers were placed on the Mt. Washington overlooks or not.

Mr. Beichner answered that placement of the viewers on the overlooks is not optimal, due to the amount of people that frequent those areas. He added that the City would likely not approve such placement either.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification as to where the ADA compliant viewers would be located.

Mr. Beichner answered that the first ADA compliant viewer would be placed on the sidewalk at the corner of Shiloh and Grandview near a handicap parking spot, conveniently only fifty feet from the incline. He stated that the ADA Coordinator was comfortable with the sidewalk clearance. He added that a second location is being evaluated for usage and accessibility near the "Point of View" sculpture site further down Grandview.

Ms. Klavon asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on behalf, in opposition, or in general about the project.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval for the Mt. Washington Viewing Machines along Grandview Avenue.

MOVED: Luckett **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

c. Bloomfield Memorial for Fallen Heroes Streetscape

Ms. Karla Owens introduced herself as the Executive Director of the Bloomfield Development Corporation, the sculptor James Simon, and Lisa Ceoffe of the Treevitalize Program. She distributed additional information to the Commission and introduced the project. Ms. Owens explained that the location of the project is at 4712 Liberty Avenue, in front of St. Joseph's Church, which is an historic landmark. She stated that the project was developed to honor three policemen that were killed last year, one of whom was a resident of Bloomfield and a patron of St. Joseph's Church. She stated that the site and permanent memorial was chosen after conversation between the victims' families and the community. Ms. Owens stated that the site will include a sculpture on private property, but four tree beds with landscaping, lighting, and benches in the Public Right of Way need to be approved by the Art Commission.

Ms. Owens stated that the tree beds were recently installed by the Treevitalize Program, which are 5x20 feet in size. She added that each bed represents a memorial for a fallen officer, with an extra one to symbolize all other public safety officials. She stated that an 8-foot bench is proposed to be placed in front of each tree bed. Ms. Owens stated that the lighting proposed for this project will be flush with the ground to accommodate the heavy foot traffic and possible parking in the area.

Mr. Simon explained what the site might look like once all the elements were installed, adding that there will be plenty of sidewalk space once the benches are installed. He stated that there will be medium to low grasses and flowers planted in the beds, but specifics have not been determined yet. Mr. Simon stated that the backless benches are from Forms and Surfaces in Millvale.

Mr. Astorino asked for clarification on the number of benches to be installed, since the submitted drawings conflict with what was presented.

Ms. Owens answered that there will be one in front of each of the four tree beds, so four benches total.

Ms. Luckett asked the group to point out the bench locations on the drawing.

Mr. Astorino asked who installed the tree beds.

Ms. Ceoffe answered that the Treevitalize program installed the beds after obtaining encroachment permits for the over-sized beds from the City.

Mr. Indovina asked whether the group intended to include a tree guard or not.

Ms. Ceoffe answered that there will not be tree guards at this time, but if they decided to include them, they would come before the Commission again.

Mr. Gable asked what, besides the trees, the City will be required to maintain.

Ms. Ceoffe answered that nothing else will have to be maintained by the City, as part of the encroachment permit.

Mr. Gable added that there will likely have to be an agreement with the City for the benches and the lights, because they are in the right of way.

Ms. Ceoffe stated that they would have to obtain encroachment permits for those, as well.

Mr. Cooper suggested that they approve this project conceptually, and ask them to come back with a landscape plan at final review.

Mr. Brown asked whether the images of the example landscape materials were still intended to be used. He also asked if the lighting will be normal white lighting.

Ms. Owens answered that they will come back with a detailed landscape plan and that the lighting, except for the blue lights near the sculpture, will be white.

Ms. Klavon asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on behalf, in opposition, or in general about the project.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval only for the Fallen Heroes Streetscape, with the expectation that a developed landscape and site plan will be presented at Final Review.

MOVED: Cooper **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

d. Market Square Street Furniture

Ms. Klavon recused herself from the discussion of the Market Square Street Furniture project and exited the hearing room.

Rob Indovina took the Chair position.

Mr. Geof Comings of the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership (PDP) introduced the Market Square Project.

Mr. Comings described the Market Square renovation project and noted that the square is set to re-open in early June, 2010. The PDP's intent is that when the square re-opens, it looks great. Mr. Comings went on to say that the PDP has met with the merchants within the square and described this project in which the street furniture around the perimeter of the square could have a cohesive and high quality aesthetic and design. He went on to say that the merchants were amenable to this, and asked that the PDP coordinate this, and advise the group of merchants on an appropriate design of the street furniture. Mr Comings then directed the Commission to the images displayed of a comparison between loosely organized and haphazard placement of street furniture and the more formal and coordinated version that is intended for Market Square.

Mr. Comings displayed more images of white plastic chain barriers and chairs and noted that this is an example of what the PDP would strive to avoid in this endeavor. He noted that high quality street furniture made of enduring (metal) materials speaks to a passerby of the quality and permanence of the establishment inside each storefront. Mr. Comings presented examples of "good" street cafes from around the world and mentioned that Pittsburgh can look the same way, if done correctly. Mr. Comings then pointed out a rendering of the Oyster House, currently located in Market Square to demonstrate that each property owner around the square will purchase one set of barriers that will keep each street café contained to each restaurant/merchant. Each barrier will be the same design, material and color. Mr. Comings went on to say that the PDP has outlined a catalogue of sorts that gives each merchant the ability to choose among several slightly different designs of tables and chairs, but all are metal and powder coated black material. In this way, each restaurant could distinguish its own taste to a degree, but all street cafes would be coordinated in color and material—thus, providing a cohesive aesthetic throughout the square.

Mr. Comings then stated that the reason this is being brought to the Art Commission is because unlike current street cafes in other portions of the City, the PDP is seeking permission to allow these street furniture items to stay in place overnight---24/7. The current street café ordinance states that each piece of street furniture and barrier must be taken in each night. Mr. Comings stated that one reason for this request is that while there is a lot of room on the exterior 15' wide sidewalks for street cafes, there is not much room in the small, historic restaurants in which to store the outdoor pieces overnight.

Mr. Comings went on to say that another ordinance conflict is within the fact that the PDP seeks to take up more than ½ of the existing sidewalk with street cafes. He stated that it was always contemplated within the Market Square Plan—and that this plan was vetted through City Planning, Art Commission, and other City agencies long ago—but currently this would be in violation of the existing street café ordinance. Mr. Comings stated that the PDP has met with Councilman Kraus and Councilman Lavelle on this issue and that both were supportive. He went on to say that the PDP is currently proposing a permanent change to the City's sidewalk café ordinance that would allow the Market Square District the ability to leave the street furniture out overnight, to take up more than ½ of the width of the sidewalk, and to not utilize a side barrier (parallel to street, containing street café within). The latter is seen as an aesthetic and ease of access issue for patrons. The ordinance currently states that the street cafes must be fully enclosed by barriers. The proposal is to keep the barriers between merchants (perpendicular to street), but forego the barriers that would contain the long side of the cafes (parallel to street). Mr. Comings went on to say that Market Square was re-designed to do away with curbs and place everything at grade so that the entire space would feel "open" and "inviting". The PDP feels that the closing off of the street cafes on the street side would conflict with this aesthetic and ideology. Mr. Comings stated that Council will be reviewing this proposed amendment sometime in May, 2010, and that the PDP will also be going to the Zoning Board for approval of this as well.

Mr. Comings stated that the permanence of the pieces is what triggered Art Commission review. All other aforementioned issues will culminate in proposed amendments to City Code. Mr. Comings then displayed a site plan showing the dimensions of the sidewalks (23 feet wide), 3' x 10' standard tree pits, 5 feet of standard pedestrian right of way, along with the 15 feet wide street café. He then noted a site plan of Primanti Bros restaurant that presented a street café that was 61 feet long and15 feet wide that exemplified the problem of relocating all of the tables and chairs inside the restaurant each night. Mr. Comings then displayed examples of the tables and chairs that were given as a catalogue to the merchants. He went on to say that while there were three different styles, the materials and finish were the same: steel, with black powder coated finish. Mr. Comings stated that a lot of the street furniture has already been ordered by the PDP, who coordinated the orders from the individual merchants. Mr. Comings went on to say that the PDP has recommended that the amendment to the existing street café ordinance would include language to say that only when the sidewalk exceeds 15 feet in width and only in the historic district of Market Square would street cafes be allowed to stay out overnight so that this endeavor would not unduly encumber all other locations within the City. Mr. Comings stated that the other reason for this legislative change is to ensure that, in ten years when other merchants and potentially the PDP is no longer a caretaker of this area, there will be some assurance that these guidelines for the street cafes will be adhered to by new merchants and the City for this area. Mr. Comings noted again the reason for the request to remove the street-side barriers to the cafes. He stated that since the square is intended to look, feel, and physically be "open" and inviting the barriers would detract from this visually, and not allow patrons to so easily stop in for a drink or food. Mr. Comings noted the proposed property line barriers—stating that they would be produced by a local company, Red Star Ironworks, and would be black powder coated with feet that would allow them to safely stand upright at each property line between businesses without being bolted into the sidewalks (which was a concern from members of the URA, the designer of the space and the PDP).

Mr. Indovina asked for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Astorino asked to clarify that the PDP is creating guidelines to ensure that each merchant in Market Square—current and future—would remain in keeping with the overall look and physicality of the "same" kind of street furniture. Mr. Astorino asked if each merchant was going to purchase the street furniture themselves.

Mr. Comings confirmed that each merchant would purchase his or her own set of street furniture and barriers. He went on to say that the merchants could tap into the Paris to Pittsburgh initiative sponsored by Colcom Foundation that could pay for up to ½ of the street furniture at each location, but essentially each merchant would have to supply the balance of the ½ of each item.

Mr. Astorino asked what would happen when and if a white plastic piece of street furniture appeared in front of a restaurant in the square after all of this---who would be the "police" in this scenario?

Mr. Comings stated that he would be very surprised if this occurred, as he has an order form from just about every merchant from around the square, but the guidelines that are going into amendment to code that stipulates that the HRC (Historic Review Commission) would have powers of review and rejection of any new street furniture that does not meet these guidelines.

Mr. Astorino asked if HRC would have power to remove.

Mr. Comings said yes, but the PDP would speak to anyone who did such a thing first and try to work with that person to remedy the situation. He also stated that since the Paris to Pittsburgh program will cover ½ of the cost of these items, there is a financial incentive to comply.

Mr. Astorino asked if the pieces would be chained down or chained together each night?

Mr. Comings stated that in the past, they have tried this as an experiment and there were some pieces stolen from the center of the square, but not one piece was removed around the perimeter. He went on to say that the PDP does not think there would be a problem with theft—although each merchant would be advised to potentially chain each chair to the tables in a way that would make it difficult for any theft. He went on to say that the tables and chairs would be left out seasonally—from April to October each year, as the winter

months would garner no patrons and the cleaning of snow from the sidewalks would be better mitigated without street cafes.

Ms. Luckett asked if patrons would be able to relocate chairs and tables outside of the barriers when there are events such as concerts in the square.

Mr. Comings stated that this would not be allowed, but the PDP believes that there should be enough chairs planned for the center of the square to accommodate any events.

Mr. Indovina asked for any further comments from the Commission. Mr. Indovina asked if there were any comments from the audience. Mr. Indovina asked the Commission for a motion, stating that the project is submitted for Conceptual and Final Approval.

Mr. Cooper asked to clarify that the Commission would approve the process for procurement of the street furniture that the PDP has identified.

Mr. Indovina stated that part of the approval would be for the divergence of this project to the existing ordinance—to leave the pieces out overnight.

Mr. Brown clarified to say that this was true, but the Commission would also approve the design specs for the pieces in addition to allowing them to do away with the street-side barriers and to keep pieces outdoors overnight in a permanent, if not seasonal, fashion.

Mr. Astorino moved to grant Conceptual and Final Approval to the project as submitted.

Mr. Cooper seconded.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the Market Square Street Furniture.

MOVED: Astorino **SECONDED: Cooper**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

e. Lawrenceville Streetscape Planters

Ms. Klavon returned to the hearing room and assumed the Chair position.

Maya Henry introduced herself as the Business District Manager of Lawrenceville Corporation (LC). Ms. Henry began by stating that the LC has been involved with the businesses in Lawrenceville for a long time in planning for streetscape beautification. Community planning meetings along this front have gleaned some insight as to what is needed and what is desired from residents and business owners.

The Office of Public Art was engaged by the LC to give a presentation after many requests were made by business and building owners regarding a need for information about types of public art that would be appropriate for the area. The LC was then able to utilize the information from this presentation to formulate a plan for artist-designed planters in the streetscape of Lawrenceville.

Ms. Henry stated that the goal is to create artist designed planters that would contribute to the “funky”, arts-friendly neighborhood of Lawrenceville--to distinguish the business district of Lawrenceville as its own unique entity while remaining conducive to the built environment. Ms. Henry went on to say that the LC is lucky, as it has Lea Donatelli of the Office of Public Art on its public art sub-committee. Ms. Henry stated that Ms. Donatelli had been a great help in reviewing the request for qualifications that has been drafted but not distributed at the time of this hearing. Ms. Henry stated that the project is seeking Conceptual Approval of the Art Commission to send out the request for qualifications--hopefully with the knowledge that the Commission approves of the project before going further in design development. She went on to say that qualifications will be reviewed by the LC sub-committee, select business owners, staff of LC and

Lawrenceville United and potentially others that might be recommended by the Commission and/or the Office of Public Art.

Ms. Klavon asked for questions of the Commission.

Ms. Luckett commended Ms. Henry on utilizing all of the amazing artists in the Pittsburgh area.

Ms. Henry noted that one of the examples of artist-designed planters in the presentation came from Cleveland, Ohio, and that this example is one of the most outstanding of any she had found.

Ms. Klavon stated that she herself is not usually a fan of planters in general, but pointed out that some of the existing planters in the presentation work really well with existing architecture and some do not. Ms. Klavon went on to say that since Lawrenceville already has a lot going on in its streetscape (with banners, gateway signage, trash receptacle covers, etc,) how will the artists who are vying for the project be instructed on a direction to pursue in the proposal phase---meaning, will they be instructed to fit with existing architecture, be completely autonomous of context, or a mixture of both? She went on to say that it might prove difficult for an artist to fit with existing architecture in front of one building, when just next door the architecture might be completely different. She said that planters usually are connected contextually to a single structure and when they are meant to run along a street, they are usually more generic. Ms. Klavon asked where the planters would be located---strategically placed, random, or according to a rhythmic placement along the street.

Ms. Henry stated that the planters will not take up the entire streetscape, but that the sites will be up to each business owner and Public Works to evaluate. Ms. Henry stated that the planters' placement will have a lot to do with the pedestrian experience. She went on to say that LC has worked with the Mayor's Office to receive and utilize the City-standard three rivers bike rack that has been placed at strategic locations throughout the district, creating a consistency through the use of the same design even though the placement might seem sporadic. Ms. Henry stated that they have looked at the success of these bike racks as an example of how they might place the planters. Light poles, tree pits, and other street items would have to be considered when planters are placed—as well as choices made by the individual property owners in the district.

Ms. Klavon asked why create planters—why not use public art in some other fashion and locale?

Ms. Henry stated that they are trying to meet the demand of business owners—that this was a specific request of that group and, this project was attainable by the LC—something functional that they felt they could bring public art into.

Ms. Klavon stated that planters are the first thing that people will not maintain.

Ms. Luckett asked what the precedent has been for owners in Lawrenceville to maintain their property.

Ms. Henry stated that the majority of their property owners sweep their sidewalks on a regular basis, and many already put planters outside their businesses that they do maintain. Ms. Henry stated that she would agree with Ms. Klavon that the LC will have to keep an eye on the planters in order to ensure that they are being maintained, but the LC will have a letter of commitment from each property owner stating roles and responsibilities of maintenance, breakage, vandalism, etc.

Mr. Astorino commended the group on its project and stated that the community group does a wonderful job. He went on to say that he likes the different planters along the street currently—that, perhaps having different artist-designed planters might be a good idea. Mr. Astorino then stated that perhaps if the property owners were asked to contribute money towards the planters, they might be more apt to maintain them.

Ms. Henry stated that perhaps they could look into asking for a 1 to 1 match for this purpose—that the LC has done this on other projects with success.

Mr. Astorino asked if the planters would happen along the building façade.

Ms. Henry stated that this was the initial idea, but perhaps once they see an actual artist's proposal they might place a different way and make that determination before they return for Final Approval.

Mr. Astorino stated that (and that this was his opinion only and not a mandate)since all of the building facades are so different along Butler Street in Lawrenceville, that perhaps placing the (consistent-looking) planters on the curbside of the sidewalk made more sense. He went on to say that there is something very "Lawrenceville" about the current practice of each property having its own planters, with their own character that reflects the owner of the building and the different building facades. Perhaps if the LC is going to create a consistent-looking planter, the new planters should just be placed somewhere else—away from the building facades, especially those that carry their own self-procured planters.

Mr. Cooper stated that he agrees with the statements made by Mr. Astorino. He went on to say that this line of thinking might call for an adjustment of the overall number of planters contemplated in the project. He asked Ms. Henry to consider placing a fewer number of planters, grouped at specific and strategic locations signifying, perhaps, notable locations along the length of the district (parklets, bus stops, gathering spots, etc.). He went on to underscore the statements already made of the wonderful "eclectic" nature of the existing planters along the district---the fact that they are so different from one another makes them special.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Cleveland planters are beautiful and that she is sure that an artist could come up with something truly amazing, but the idea should be to strategically place the planters to accommodate all of the aforementioned comments—especially the idea that the planters should signify specific areas of the district in their grouping.

Ms. Henry asked to clarify that the Commission would like to see that the planters are placed strategically, perhaps to signify certain locations.

Mr. Cooper stated yes, but also the LC should contemplate creating fewer planters with more of a strategic impact.

Ms. Klavon stated that there should be a "reason" for the planters to be where they are. She went on to say that in the Cleveland example, those planters are already living in that space on the sidewalk in a very orderly, but appropriate fashion.

Ms. Luckett asked what is the length, or overall distance of the footprint of the project.

Ms. Henry stated that the project currently is planned for the Butler Street business district which is 34th to 55th street on Butler.

Ms. Luckett stated that given this large footprint, 35 planters are easily do-able along that corridor.

Ms. Klavon stated that the call for artists should include language about the reason for the planters---why are they here, what they signify, etc..

Mr. Cooper agreed, and stated that the more artists are engaged in the debate in why these should exist and where they should go, the better the project will be. He went on to say that this project is great, and should happen more within the city. He stated that he would not want to see the pieces trivialized by making so many of them of a standard design that they almost become like garbage cans—so familiar and regular, that they are easily dismissed.

Ms. Luckett asked about scale.

Ms. Henry stated that this will be discussed in the proposal phase and considered with the artists, and when the project is submitted for Final Approval to the Commission.

Ms. Luckett stated that Ms. Henry should be wary of the potential for person to back up on or hit the planters with cars if the planters are placed too close to the curbs in any given area.

Mr. Brown stated that Ms. Henry can talk to him, and Ben Carlise of Public Works even before the project comes back to the Commission to advise on specific placement so that these issues mentioned can be avoided.

Ms. Rhor asked about the language in the RFQ that states that persons currently enrolled in a degree program are not eligible to apply.

Ms. Henry stated that one reason for that is that they want the highest level of excellence in design and execution of the project, and that they are also asking that an artist participate in a very thorough timely community and fabrication process that will require a certain level of expertise and experience.

Mr. Cooper stated that he would suggest that they strike this language, as the great Maya Lin was only a student when she won the competition for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in DC.

Ms. Henry stated that the group has not discussed this extensively, but would look into leaving this out of the RFQ.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any in the audience to speak to the project.

Lea Donatelli introduced herself as a resident of Lawrenceville and Chair of the Public Art Committee of the LC. She stated support of the project, and is interested in the process of engaging artists within the built—sometimes functional—environment. She went on to say that she appreciated the Commission's feedback and that all of it was very helpful.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any in the audience to speak against or in general about the project.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval of the Lawrenceville Streetscape Planters.

MOVED: Indovina **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

f. Lawrenceville Community Garden

Ms. Henry submitted a letter of support from Public Works and larger copies of the landscape plan to the Commission.

Ms. Henry began by stating that her role as Business District Manager of Lawrenceville Corporation (LC) also includes green space development within the business corridor. The project submitted for consideration is a green space meant for residents, visitors, and patrons of the business district---to give them a place of pause and enjoyment that might make them stay for a while. Ms. Henry stated that with her at the hearing was Jordyn Melino, a landscape architecture graduate student at Chatham University and resident at Phipps Conservatory who designed this community garden project. Ms. Henry stated that the lot was brought to the attention of the LC through a plan called the "LOLA" Plan which stands for Lower Lawrenceville which spans 34th to 40th street along Butler. This plan called for more green spaces in the area and attention given to areas such as Doughboy Square.

The LOLA Plan looked at this area and explored ways that this area could be utilized as a public green space. The LC held community meetings discussing amenities to the area that the community wished to see. It was at this time that the LC contacted Chatham and received help in the planning process. This is what brought Ms. Melino into the project as she was able to utilize part of her community field work requirement from her studies for this project.

Ms. Henry stated that Green Up Pittsburgh was also engaged at this time to help with the planning and later, implementation of the project. KMA Associates, a local street furniture firm, donated some of the street furniture items to the project. Ms. Henry noted current photographs of the lot and stated that the lot is really just an overgrown and neglected area with many invasives such as Japanese Knotweed. She went on to say that the plan will deal with beautification of the lot. Ms. Henry stated that Green Up Pittsburgh has a long, demonstrated history of taking on City vacant lots and turning them into beautiful green spaces, so their expertise in this project has been most essential. Ms. Henry went on to say that she had been working with the Office of the Mayor and the URA for about 10 months to investigate all insurance and legal issues related to this project, as well as completing the design. One way that the group decided to make the lot easy for liability issues was that the URA gave the lot to the City through a motion of its board, thus making the lot public property (City owned). Ms. Henry noted that there were surveys sent around the area asking residents and property owners if they would consider watching and help maintain the green space, in addition to the LC soliciting for a community garden steward that would be the leader who would coordinate the effort to maintain the area with volunteer help. Ms. Henry noted the garden plan. She then asked Jordan Melino to speak about the design of the garden.

Ms. Melino introduced herself as a current homeowner in Lawrenceville, as well as a first year Masters in Landscape Architecture student at Chatham and began to describe the garden design. Ms. Melino stated that the overarching idea for the green space was that it would create a pause area for the community in the midst of its bustling business district. She went on to say that through a community charrette, it became apparent that there would need to be two entry points into the space, as well as a third entry from the back of the area that sort of makes a three rivers triangle design, as seen from above. Ms. Melino noted that many of the plants chosen for this project are the same as those from the Phipps Conservatory Discovery Garden, as she is currently the Exhibition Coordinator there, and the path design of this park reminded her of the paths in this area of Phipps.

Ms. Henry noted that the Commission received cut sheets and images of the street furniture (benches, three rivers bike racks), lighting and planters proposed for the garden—seen in the back of the packets. She noted an image of the bench with a grass pattern etched into the back of it. Two of the benches will be donated by KMA, and these benches are meant for outdoor use with the utmost resistance to weather and vandalism.

Ms. Henry asked for any questions of the Commission.

Mr. Indovina asked if the installation (entire green space project) has a limited lifespan.

Ms. Henry stated that the short answer is yes, but only if any development by the City were to come to the site. Currently there are no plans for development, but the LC is aware that if the City decides to develop the space at any point in the future, the green space will be gone. The LC will review the space annually with the City, but there is no indication that the space will be developed within the next five years.

Mr. Cooper asked about the maintenance arrangement.

Ms. Henry stated that the LC is signing a license and maintenance agreement with the City to specify terms of the arrangement that the LC has a maintenance budget that it will supply for the first year and that it will provide a portion of that for the second year. The LC has a tree-tender group that will water its street trees and help maintain this area.

Mr. Indovina asked about the material of the path.

Ms. Henry stated that it would be crushed limestone.

Mr. Astorino asked how many lighting poles were planned, and where they would be placed.

Ms. Henry stated that they have budgeted for four light poles, and noted locations for poles in the rear.

Mr. Astorino asked how high the retaining wall was to be.

Ms. Henry stated that the wall varies, ranging from 5-6 feet to 2 feet with an integrated bench on the lower end.

Mr. Astorino asked if the path were relatively level, or does it go up toward the 5 foot retaining wall.

Ms. Henry stated that the slope is completely negligible---nearly level throughout. The designed area ends at the retaining wall because the slope of the earth behind the wall is so severe, that no one could traverse it—therefore the designed portion of the garden begins at the wall.

Ms. Klavon asked if the retaining wall and landscaping costs were not included in the budget because they were considered donated.

Ms. Henry said yes, that these items are donated through the Green Up program.

Ms. Klavon asked about the need for the wooden planters in the front of the garden.

Ms. Melino stated that they act as a face to the site, and also have integrated benches.

Ms. Klavon asked if these were in-kind donations as well.

Ms. Henry stated that they were.

Mr. Gable asked if there was a plan to account for damages that will inevitably be inflicted by skateboarders or vandals to some of these street furniture items. He stated that the low wall, planters, and benches seen very appealing to these groups.

Ms. Henry stated that the benches and wall could not be easily reached by skateboard as there is grass and crushed limestone to cross before you get to these items---skateboarders could not easily reach them. Additionally, the types of street furniture were chosen for their durability in this environment—including vandalism resistance.

Mr. Astorino asked if there are plans to present more detailed drawings in the future for Final Approval. He went on to say that typically, the Commission sees more detailed drawings with more information before granting Final Approval—for instance, placement of the lighting, etc. He asked if the group planned on doing this, or is the group reliant upon volunteer efforts and thus cannot “afford” subsequent design work.

Ms. Henry stated that they can produce revised designs and more detailed plans. She went on to say that the retaining wall is merely being rebuilt, so there might not be much of a drawing to produce for it.

Mr. Astorino asked to clarify that the wall currently exists at this location.

Ms. Henry stated that the wall does currently exist tat this location, and that it just needs some repair work.

Ms. Luckett asked what material the wall was made of.

Ms. Henry stated that it was cement, but painted many different colors. The group would like all of it to be stone-like cement.

Mr. Cooper asked what remains on this lot of formally existing houses in their foundations.

Ms. Henry stated that the site is completely free of such things as this is the former site of an auto dealer.

Ms. Klavon stated that the plant list does not correlate with the landscape plan.

Ms. Melino stated that the plan is broken down by area in a way that the area entitled “Woodland Slope” matches the plant list of the same. She noted the “Sensory Gardens” are labeled in green and the planters as well.

Ms. Klavon asked which color are the perennials.

Ms. Melino noted that the areas are color coded and the names are in bold. She then noted each on the site plan.

Ms. Klavon asked why Ms. Melino did not want to use indigenous plant material.

Ms. Melino stated that most of the plants are native.

Ms. Klavon asked if the cherry tree was native.

Ms. Melino stated that the Weeping Cherry is not native, but has been integrated into our landscape and is now doing quite well. She stated that they have many at Phipps Conservatory.

Ms. Klavon stated that she thought this was an odd choice of plant for an urban garden.

Ms. Melino stated that the Weeping Cherry was chosen as a specimen tree, and that since the garden was supposed to be more reflective in nature, the Weeping Cherry exemplified this motif well.

Ms. Klavon asked for question from the Commission. Ms. Klavon then asked if there were any persons in the audience to speak on behalf of the project.

Kim Graziani introduced herself as the Director of Neighborhood Initiatives of which the Green Up program is a part. She thanked the Commission for its time and comments at the hearing on this, a project that she considers to be the signature Green Up project for the City. She went on to say that the primary goal of the Green Up program is to turn vacant City-owned lots into green space through private-public partnerships and community engagement and that she believes that this project exceeds these goals like no other Green Up project has. She thanked the Commission once again.

Mr. Gable asked if the City were going to maintain the garden.

Ms. Graziani stated that it would be a joint City/community maintenance effort, and that a license and maintenance agreement was being drafted.

Mr. Gable asked to clarify that the property was deemed “City” property, but not “park”.

Ms. Graziani stated that this was correct.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the whole idea is that this is a neighborhood volunteer project, and that the community would do the planting as well.

Ms. Graziani stated that the only way you can get the community buy-in is if they do the planting as well. She also stated that the agreement would spell out certain duties for the community as well as responsibilities for Public Works as far as installation and upkeep of the parcel. Public Works would essentially do all of the “heavy lifting” and the community would keep an eye and several hands on the garden as it needs routine upkeep.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any persons opposed to the project or those who would like to speak in general. Ms. Klavon then asked for discussion of the Commission.

Mr. Astorino stated that he would like to see more detailed drawings, but overall this project seeks to take an eyesore and turn it into a thing of beauty and that for him this is a very, very positive thing to occur. He went on to say that he would have a hard time not approving this project for this reason.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Commission should consider the five year lifespan for the project.

Mr. Astorino stated that the lifespan could be a year, though, if someone came in to develop the property.

Mr. Brown stated that it is also important to note that—as discussed—this parcel is not to be designated as a park. He went on to say that this fact, coupled with the volunteer aspect of the project and so many items such as the retaining wall that pre-exist to this location, made him feel okay with the somewhat lacking construction drawings.

Ms. Rhor stated that this project has demonstrated a lot of community involvement and is perfectly located within the community. She went on to state that the project looks good.

Mr. Indovina stated that he was a little concerned about the wooden planters. He stated that if they were meant to last five years, then they will do fine, but if it turns out to be longer they might fall into disrepair.

Ms. Klavon stated that the planters are not even needed.

Mr. Cooper stated that he did not think the planters added anything to the garden. However, he added that he agreed with Mr. Astorino that if you look at the current state of the parcel against the proposed renovation, one cannot deny the positive difference this will make in the community.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify the intent of the applicant.

Mr. Brown stated that the applicant is seeking Conceptual and Final Approval.

Ms. Klavon asked if the Commission should see one more generation of the design.

Ms. Luckett stated that she is fine with the project, but would like to see more detailed drawings of a site plan.

Mr. Cooper stated that this project had much more information than the project submitted earlier in the hearing that was asked to come back with more detailed plans—if the Commission wanted to look at each project in a comparison for equity. He stated that there are differences between the two projects that could warrant a Final Approval for this project.

Mr. Indovina stated that he would be fine with granting approval subject to staff review of the proposal to ensure that the group has complied with the comments made at the hearing.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the Lawrenceville Community Garden with the condition that the applicant provide staff with further details of design based upon comments made at hearing.

MOVED: Cooper **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: Indovina, Cooper, Astorino, Luckett, Rhor

OPPOSED: Klavon **CARRIED**

g. Downtown Planters

Judy Wagner, Senior Director for Community Gardens and Green Space, of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (WPC), introduced herself and began to speak about the planter project for Downtown. Ms. Wagner stated that the project began with a temporary placement of some 400 planters in the Downtown area for the 250th birthday celebration for Pittsburgh in 2008. In 2009, the WPC came before the Commission seeking approval to keep the project going for that same year. The Commission granted approval for the 2009 season. In early 2010, the WPC received confirmation that Colcom Foundation would fund the project again for the current season prompting the WPC to seek approval of the Commission to continue this project for the 2010 season.

Ms. Wagner then walked through a presentation of the spring mix of flowers proposed for the planters. She noted five different color combinations that were planned in concert with the Downtown Partnership and the Cultural Trust that would be displayed in different areas of Downtown. Some are planned to signify a particular destination or signify a pedestrian path. Ms. Wagner displayed images of employees from Direct Energy in Downtown volunteering their time to plant hundreds of plants within the planters last season. Ms. Wagner then displayed summer planting schemes that incorporate some sun-friendly plants and some shade-friendly plants to accommodate different environments in Downtown. Ms. Wagner then displayed some mum and ivy arrangements with evergreen centers planned for fall. In the winter, all planters will have evergreen plantings that will withstand the harsh climate of Pittsburgh. She went on to say that the grant will cover a full time staff to plant and maintain the planters for the duration of the 2010 season. She went on to say that there is a reserve of plants to replace those vandalized or harmed, but also noted that it is remarkable that there is so little damage or theft of the plantings. She then asked for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Astorino asked if the planters have water reservoirs.

Ms. Wagner stated that they do not. The planters are watered every second day by a contractor with very specific instructions.

Mr. Indovina stated that Ms. Wagner had said that the funding was a bit of a surprise to the WPC and they did not know if it were actually going to happen this year—and asked what would have happened if the funding did not come through.

Ms. Wagner stated that they would have dismantled and removed them.

Mr. Indovina stated that in the past, there seems to have been funding year to year.

Ms. Wagner stated that she would love to be able to say that this project would be perpetuated into the future, but the funding has been a challenge to procure for the long term. Colcom has been gracious in its funding, but it is not clear to the WPC that this project would be funded in perpetuity.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the Commission had stated that this project would be approved for 2009, but that this was to be the last year of it—no more after the 2009 season would be approved.

Mr. Brown stated that the motion that was approved in 2009 stated that the project was approved for the "2009 season only", but did not say that the applicant could not ever come back again for approval of a new season. He went on to say that the meeting minutes from that time indicated that Ms. Klavon had asked that the WPC explore other underutilized and under-maintained areas of the City such as the median strips on Grant Street instead of continuing with the planters.

Ms. Klavon asked if Ms. Wagner had looked into other areas of the City such as the median strips to beautify with plantings instead of the planters.

Ms. Wagner stated that she did not know if Colcom would support that type of project, but she could certainly speak to them about that. She went on to say that it is possible they would fund it, it is just that Colcom came to the WPC stating that they would like to fund the planter project specifically. It was Colcom's vision to do the planters, so the WPC did not explore other alternative ideas.

Ms. Klavon reiterated that it was a condition of prior Commission discussion that the WPC explore some of these other areas that greatly needed help and that the planters themselves were almost too many. She went on to say that plants are a good thing and that no one should say no to such an endeavor, but the issue perhaps is how its done—that this is the call of the Art Commission to discuss ways of improving the visual landscape of the City.

Ms. Klavon stated that se believes that there are too many planters of this type, they have nothing to do with the architecture that is around them and that many times the planters encroach on a pedestrian's ability to traverse the sidewalk. Some planters seem to be maintained very well and others are often waning---the

planter project seems to cost such a large amount of money, it would seem that the money could be better spent in other places.

Ms. Wagner asked if Ms. Klavon would reiterate some of the other locations that would be suggested.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Grant Street medians were discussed last time, and remain an important spot in the City that needs some help. Ft. Duquesne Blvd. strip is also in need of help—littered with bulbs would be spectacular. The entrance to the City on Liberty triangle—all of these would be really using the money for the "money shots".

Ms. Wagner stated that she would welcome input on future projects and placement options. She went on to say that if the Art Commission does approve and the letter comes, she would like to sit down with Colcom on the front end—well in advance of the planting season---to discuss some of these ideas suggested at the hearing. Part of the problem in the past has been that the funding cycle does not easily align with the planting cycle.

Mr. Astorino stated that Wood Street is going through some major renovations in the coming months and asked if she was aware and had she planned for the planter locations to accommodate.

Ms. Wagner stated that the WPC will move the planters accordingly---and have done this in the past.

Mr. Astorino asked if WPC would work with staff on relocations and new project ideas.

Mr. Brown interjected to say that his office and Public Works would help in any way they could.

Ms. Wagner said that she appreciated that and would take him up on that. She stated that Public Works has always been a good help.

Mr. Indovina stated that a transition to a more permanent installation would be nice to see—perhaps some of the median work would be a nice alternative.

Ms. Wagner stated that the medians are a City contract, and therefore could not be done by WPC.

Mr. Indovina stated that he appreciates the planters and thinks that they look wonderful.

Mr. Brown stated that his interest lies in a more permanent solution, and that he would welcome conversations between Public Works, WPC and Colcom to this effect.

Ms. Wagner stated that perhaps she would contact Mr. Brown after the planting season to begin discussions on this.

Ms. Klavon asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on behalf, in opposition, or in general about the project.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the Downtown Planters with the condition that the applicant work with staff on future location options.

MOVED: Cooper **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

Mr. Cooper asked to speak about the Schenley Plaza Restaurant again before the meeting adjourns. He went on to say that he believes there to be an opportunity in this project that he fears will be missed between this hearing and next time the Commission sees the project unless something is done. He asserted that due to the location of this restaurant—in a park—but also in close proximity to Phipps Conservatory's Center for Sustainable Landscape, with its ultra-environmentally friendly facilities and the colleges close by which will guarantee a clientele to this restaurant with an environmentally-conscious bent, why not request of the applicant to make this restaurant a demonstration facility of a no energy use--green practice in sustainable building materials and equipment. He went on to say that the restaurant design is currently sub-par, but conceptually there is a potential here that will be missed if the Commission does not work proactively to remedy.

Ms. Luckett stated that she agreed, but wondered what the stakeholders'approval/support of this project consisted of.

Mr. Brown asked if she was referring to the letters of support that were submitted.

Ms. Klavon stated that she believed that stakeholders most likely are in favor of a restaurant, but probably did not question further—or, did not want to critique the design.

Mr. Astorino stated that he empathized with the argument, but the Commission should understand the economic reality here----that, if the Commission were to mandate green technology that would increase the cost there may be no restaurant.

Ms. Luckett agreed that the Commission and the applicant should strive for something better.

Mr. Cooper stated that this is a very important park and a very prominent location that deserves the best restaurant possible.

Mr. Brown asked if the Commission would like for staff to draft a letter to the applicant stipulating the motion made at the hearing, pertinent discussion, conditions of approval and the request to investigate more green technology.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Brown stated that he would draft the letter in the coming day, and send to the Commission for edits and approval before sending out to the applicant.

Meeting Adjourned