

**ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF May26, 2010
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:

Indovina, Astorino, Lockett, Rhor, Mike Gable in place of Rob Kaczorowski

PRESENT OF THE STAFF:

Morton Brown, Noor Ismail

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Brown noted that the Commission would approve the meeting minutes from March and April at this hearing. Meeting minutes from March and April were approved.

B. Correspondence

Mr. Brown noted an email from Mike Gable that stated the Mt. Washington flower baskets had approval from Verizon for use of their poles in the flower basket proposal that was being reviewed at the hearing. Mr. Brown also submitted an updated Communication Utility Pole application for the hearing.

B. Items for Review

- a. Schenley Plaza Restaurant (Conceptual)

Mr. Broadhurst of Eat n' Park Hospitality Group introduced himself and Andy Dunmire with WD partners. He went on to say that he appreciated the comments of the Commission from the April hearing and that he has worked with his partners to address those comments in the current proposal.

Mr. Broadhurst began by noting the site plan in the application and on the projection screen. He noted that there was a dotted yellow line showing the previously submitted footprint of the restaurant, and further demonstrated that the footprint had been reduced in response to the Commission's request that the restaurant reduce said footprint to reduce encroachment into the line of trees along the main promenade.

Mr. Broadhurst then stated that he would walk through each of the five items that were requested by the Commission upon the previous (April 2010) hearing, and respond to each in turn.

1. Perceived encroachment: Address perceived encroachment of restaurant structure by potentially adjusting scale and configuration of footprint of structure

Mr. Broadhurst again directed the Commission to the yellow dotted line on the site plan noting that the footprint of the restaurant had been reduced to allow greater space between the restaurant and the existing landscaping along the main promenade.

2. 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

Mr. Broadhurst stated that this was addressed by the removal of the parapet wall and the inclusion of cedar cladding (also on the covers for the HVAC system atop the restaurant), longer grasses on the roof garden, and the use of stainless steel and limestone surface materials throughout the exterior treatments. He also mentioned that the site-line of the roof height of the restaurant is now at the same, if not lower than the existing kiosks and restroom facility. Windows were also used to a greater degree in this revised design.

3. 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

Mr. Broadhurst stated that this was accomplished by the addition of windows, reduction of footprint, and the reduction of the height of the structure, and noted that he believes that the restaurant is now at the lowest total area that it can be. He also noted that there was a comment from the Commission previously that asked the applicant to look at the entryway to the restaurant. He stated that his group studied the entry to Phipps Conservatory for inspiration of the restaurant's entry. This led them to create an "open" atrium with a yet-to-be-determined hanging artwork/lighting feature.

He went on to say that the landscaping plan is not fully developed, but will work with the Parks Conservancy to fully realize plant types for the area. He noted a rain garden planned for the rear of the restaurant.

4. 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

Mr. Broadhurst stated that this was accomplished by "squaring off" the existing rubbish/maintenance area behind the restroom facility.

5. Investigate opportunities for more "green" technology and practice in structure, waste management and equipment (no HVAC, low carbon equipment, etc.)

Mr. Broadhurst stated that the group had always planned a "green" approach to the restaurant facilities, but did not go into much detail in the last hearing. He introduced Andy Dunmire to speak on this aspect. Mr. Dunmire began by stating that the group has gone through its LEED scorecard, and that they continue to develop the plan accordingly. To date, the applicant has proposed a green roof for the majority of the restaurant—minus the HVAC enclosures. He went on to note that along the park side of the restaurant there are some "living walls" proposed that will work in tandem with the rear rain garden that Mr. Broadhurst spoke of. He stated that even though they are not required to submit a stormwater management plan, they are thinking about ways to mitigate this issue through these mechanisms and highlight the "green awareness" of the park. He then noted the integrated rain barrel collection system that will be used to care for the greenery right on the premises. Mr. Dunmire also noted that there will be energy efficient equipment and low VOC materials used in the restaurant that will contribute to the LEED scorecard. Construction waste management will meet or exceed requirements at 75% or better credit. Composting will be accomplished onsite, and they plan to have a farm source program in place that utilizes local sources for food items.

Mr. Broadhurst then walked through the remaining slides in the presentation. He noted the side of the restaurant that the HVAC system would be closest to, and noted the cedar cladding present at that location. He then made note of the reduced parapet wall and green roof from different angles of the restaurant. He then stated that the five items requested by the Commission were addressed by his group and asked for questions.

Ms. Rhor thanked the applicant for listening and attempting to address the concerns of the Commission from the last hearing. She noted that it seemed like the applicant went point by point in addressing their requests and that she liked some of the revisions. She liked the lowered parapet walls and the addition of windows, particularly. She went on to say that she has spent a lot of time in the Plaza of late trying to understand how this restaurant will affect or fit into that environment. One thing that she was still concerned about however, was the overall footprint of the restaurant and the proportions of the structure in its context. She asked if there is anything that can still be done to reduce the overall "feeling" of imposition of the structure in its proposed context.

Mr. Broadhurst answered that they have exhausted all options to this end, and that at some point the facility just cannot be reduced further.

Mr. Astorino thanked the applicant for its efforts to date and stated that they have listened to the concerns of the Commission. He stated that one of the challenges that everyone has to get over is the fact that there is to be a restaurant at all in Schenley—that this is a difficult thing. He went on to say that he understands that

this is done—this has been approved in the past—so now he has to look at the project as is and merely critique its design. Mr. Astorino went on to ask about the green roof from the first slide. He asked what percentage of the roof is covered in green material, and which is HVAC or other equipment atop the restaurant. He was interested in how this will be screened.

Mr. Dunmire answered that the green roof is a low-slope roof, probably about a 3/12 pitch toward the park with the high end back toward the mechanical to help screen that and that the green roof would account for 45-50% of the building. The area that would not have a rooftop garden would be the mechanical/HVAC systems that would be clad in cedar planking.

Mr. Astorino stated that it would be three sides that are screened by garden.

Mr. Dunmire stated that this was correct.

Mr. Astorino stated that he had not seen this grass in winter, and asked what it would look like in winter.

Mr. Dunmire stated that there are different varieties and different systems that the group is exploring now, but are still in the early stages of this investigation. They are looking at a tray system that will allow them to grow the “first batch” of greenery in an offsite greenhouse so that the green roof will be immediate upon construction.

Mr. Astorino asked if it were his intention to screen the roof by greenery throughout the year as best they can.

Ms. Dunmire stated that even if the greenery is dormant during the winter, the HVAC will be screened by the cedar planking at all times.

Mr. Astorino thanked him and stated that this answered his roof question. He went on to ask to see the elevation and site plan that noted the amount of glass along the park edge of the restaurant.

Mr. Broadhurst noted in the site plan that almost the entire park side of the restaurant was made of glass with the exception of some small structure walls.

Mr. Dunmire also noted that the front of the restaurant was to receive the same treatment.

Mr. Astorino stated that it helps to minimize the impact on the park by having as much glass as you can there. He then asked to see the slide of the entryway. He asked what type of material is planned for the entryway.

Mr. Dunmire stated that the light colored material is to be limestone. No fiberboard.

Mr. Astorino stated that this was a rich material and that he liked the glass and limestone mixture.

Mr. Dunmire also noted that the name sign has been pulled off the façade and made into more of a monument sign that is placed low.

Ms. Luckett asked about the scale and elevation. She stated that the revised design still seems a little disjointed---she asked the applicant to state how they came up with the different forms and compositions in the design.

Mr. Dunmire stated that some of the more basic forms came from a need to house the mechanical aspects of the restaurant—particularly on the Pennant Place side of the restaurant. He went on to say that the entryway needed to be clearly designated, so they made its glass atrium a little higher and pronounced than the rest of the structure. As they moved toward the park side, the building is stepped down to lower its height and to integrate into the pedestrian level. He stated that he was not sure of the disjointed comment.

Ms. Lockett stated that this was just something that she was feeling about the design and that she was merely trying to put this into perspective---that she felt that the design could be better integrated into the environment.

Mr. Dunmire stated that he certainly will look into that as they refine the design.

Ms. Lockett stated that the entryway is very symmetric in the limestone columns and that for her, do not feel inviting.

Mr. Indovina stated that he appreciated the applicant taking the comments from the Commission into account. He then asked to go to the combination site plan/roof plan. He asked if the screening around the equipment on the roof would be all the way around—four sides.

Mr. Dunmire stated that this was correct.

Mr. Indovina asked if the rooftop HVAC would be set back from the park side and aligned on the Pennant Place side.

Mr. Dunmire stated that this was correct, although he pointed to a location on the plan and stated that it would not extend past a point—that it would be squared off at this point.

Mr. Indovina stated that he really liked the reduced footprint and the way that they pulled the structure back away from the main promenade. He asked the applicant to talk a little more about how the outdoor seating area functions. He asked if it were a public space or restaurant seating.

Mr. Broadhurst stated that there is park seating along this area currently, but the area will be primarily restaurant seating. He stated that access can be gained by entering the restaurant or from an area in the upper right of the site plan (from the park/promenade).

Mr. Indovina asked to see the floor plan. He then asked about the solid structure walls that currently interrupt the main glass wall. He asked why not make the entire wall glazed.

Mr. Dunmire stated that the design is an evolution and that once they had the living wall here, and they added a doorway there, but this question could be addressed as they refine the design. They will look into it.

Mr. Indovina asked to see the rendered elevation of the entry. He asked to clarify that the white forms around the entry are limestone.

Mr. Dunmire stated that this was correct.

Mr. Indovina asked to clarify that all of the solid masses were limestone.

Mr. Dunmire stated that all of the exterior materials are either stainless steel, cedar, or limestone—no synthetics.

Mr. Indovina stated that he liked the sort of lantern/artwork in the entry and imagined it to be nice at night.

Mr. Indovina then asked for comments in favor of the project from the audience. Mr. Indovina asked for comments opposed to the project from the audience.

Mr. Charles Rosenblum took the podium and introduced himself. He stated that he is a Pittsburgh resident in Brighton Heights and he teaches at the School of Architecture at Carnegie Mellon University. He went on to say that would not characterize his statements as being “for” or “against” the project. He stated that he is coming to this project in mid-stream, so he will not pose questions that may have already been addressed. He stated that he has had a long history with this site and only wants to see the highest quality attributes assigned to it. He stated that a restaurant has many complex issues with design and programming, and that a restaurant in this park setting would quickly pose issues of landscape, pedestrian circulation, and

urban design. He stated that he is concerned about the issue of circulation of people, how the restaurant is laid out against traffic paths, lines of sight, and how people are moving around this structure. He went on to say that he does not understand why the entrance is located where it is proposed, and asked if the entry is appropriately located relative to pedestrian flow. He also asked if the applicant had studied models of other park-based restaurants to determine the best landscaping and design modes that would accommodate this setting. He also stated that perhaps it would be a good idea for the applicant group to engage a landscape architect to help with some of these issues as the design is developed. He stated that he would suggest—hypothetically and out of respect for the designers—that he might look at this design problem as needing to be designed from the outside in, rather than from the inside out.

Mr. Indovina asked if there were any audience members that would like to make a comment opposed or in general.

Ms. Renee Piechocki stated that she would make a comment in general. She went on to say that she attended the first hearing of the proposed restaurant, and that this was a great improvement. She also stated that she agreed with all of the comments made. She stated that she loved the notion of a commissioned glass piece in the entryway, but encouraged the applicant group to consider other artist-designed building parts for the restaurant. She noted that the Office of Public Art just published a document called “Add Value Add Art” that resides on the URA website that might be helpful to the applicant should they choose to look into artist-designed building parts. She stated that many of the elements of the building such as the cedar screening of the HVAC could be designed by artists at the same cost. Other elements such as the garden, living wall, water collection system—any of these elements could be designed by artists such as Bob Bingham at CMU, who is “Mr. Green/Living Wall”....there could be several opportunities to engage local or national artists to this end. She stated that a free-standing artwork would be complicated in this area, but artist-designed building parts might make this restaurant one-of-a-kind, and stand out in a timeless, tasteful manner.

Reynolds Clark, Chair of the Oakland Task Force and Vice Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh introduced himself and stated that the OTF is very supportive of the restaurant. He went on to say that OTF has worked with the Parks Conservancy for 7 or 8 years now on the plans for a restaurant in this space, and that he is thrilled with the revised design presented here today. He stated that the restaurant will bring a 12 month presence into the Plaza which does not exist currently.

Mr. Indovina asked for any other comments from the audience. Mr. Indovina then asked for discussion of the Commission.

Ms. Rhor asked the applicant to respond to the comments made by Dr. Rosenblum and Ms. Piechocki. She asked the applicant if they had based elements or concepts of the design of the restaurant on any other models from other cities.

Mr. Broadhurst stated that he continuously travels and eats at restaurants all over the country to this end—it is his job to do so. He stated that he began investigating other models at a greater degree going back five years ago when his group first began speaking about a restaurant with the Parks Conservancy. Madison Square Park in NYC, Bryant Park—which was the inspiration for the vision of Schenley Plaza—were both inspirations for this restaurant. He went on to say that many other restaurants were looked at on the west coast and that admittedly, they were initially looking at this restaurant from the inside going out. However, they have been looking at this in the reverse through this process. He went on to say that he is planning to look into the commissioning of the art piece in the entry, but will investigate Ms. Piechocki’s suggestion of artist-designed building parts as well.

Ms. Rhor stated that Dr. Rosenblum also suggested that a landscape architect become engaged for the best integration of the restaurant into its context.

Susan Rademacher, Parks Curator of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy introduced herself and stated that then original design of the Plaza was approached as an urban design problem as well as a parks design problem. Sasaki Associates was the designer of record, and Alistair (blank) was the landscape architect and urban designer on the project. The grand promenade is a continuation of the visual line from the end of Bigelow Blvd. to the Panther Hollow Bridge. The restaurant was intended to be placed at this location to

work with the pedestrian flow from the Bigelow side and traveling down the grand promenade. She went on to say that the original restaurant concept presented by Atria's also had its entry located in a similar fashion.

Mr. Astorino thanked all for their comments and agreed that the location of the restaurant is the best location in the Plaza if you are going to put one there at all. He also noted that the entrance is placed where it should be—thinking that an entrance might be located anywhere else would be a disruption to pedestrian flow and access—to place the restaurant as close to Pennant Place and Forbes Avenue makes the most sense. He went on to say that Ms. Piechocki's comments were sound, and that hopefully the applicant can incorporate those comments. Mr. Astorino went back to the comment on the glazed window side of the restaurant to say that the more open and transparent that they can make that side, the better it will work during the day and the night. He concluded that the applicant has done a great job in answering questions and addressing comments of the Commission and the audience.

Mr. Indovina asked for any other comments from the Commission.

Mr. Indovina stated that the applicant was seeking Conceptual Approval at the hearing, and should that come to pass they would have to return for Final Approval with construction drawings and a landscape plan (that he would like to emphasize).

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

Ms. Rhor asked to have a little more discussion before moving forward with the approval. She went on to say that she is very interested in the comments made by Ms. Piechocki regarding the addition of artist-designed building parts, inclusion of local artists of living wall and rain garden design. She asked if the Commission could strongly encourage that in the motion. She liked the prospect of the art commissioned for the entryway, as well and thought that this is something that should be strongly encouraged by the Commission. She went on to say that she has heard a lot of feedback from constituents regarding the need to make this restaurant worthy of such a prominent and even historical aspect to this location. She stated that it behooves the Commission to listen to and voice concerns of constituents, especially in project such as these. She asked to see more details of the plantings because she cannot see in the current design what is actually proposed. She went on to say that she would be happy to grant Conceptual Approval with the condition that further landscaping details be provided at the Final review. Ms. Rhor also asked to see more details on the outdoor furniture and other items not currently shown in the design.

Mr. Indovina stated that he would prefer the applicant return prior to a submission for Final Approval with a developed landscape plan so that the applicant does not go too far down the road toward construction documents without direction from the Commission. He clarified to say that he would not need to make this a condition of approval, but would ask the applicant to consider returning for an informational update on this matter as an interim step that would only benefit the applicant in the long run.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval to the project as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant will investigate an artwork for the entryway atrium area, as well as artist-designed building parts on the exterior**
- 2) The applicant will provide further details on landscape design and materials and exterior furniture**
- 3) The applicant should consider returning for an informational update on a more developed landscaping plan as an interim step to Final review (for consideration-not a mandate)**

MOVED: Rhor

SECONDED: Astorino

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

b. Cliffside Park Renovation

Ms. Rademacher introduced the project by stating that she is joined today by Maria Reilly from Klavon Design Associates and Terri Baltimore, from Hill House Association to present the concept project plan for the Phase 1 entry to Cliffside Park in the Hill District.

She noted that the Cliffside Park location and its needs for restoration were identified through many community discussions over the past few years within the Find the Rivers project. She went on to state that this site was confirmed as a priority through the recent Greenprint planning process. She noted that this is a small park, it is do-able, and is currently within the City's management system of parks.

Ms. Rademacher noted that the project only has funds in place for the proposed first phase—entry to the park. As the PPC raises funds for additional phases of the park, they would come back with conceptual design and final construction documents for each of those phases as they were ready to roll out.

Ms. Rademacher noted the location of Cliffside Park as just off of Bedford Avenue at the end of Cassatt Street. She noted a slope at the entry of the park, which has presented design challenges. She then introduced Maria Reilly to describe the overall plan for the project.

Ms. Reilly began by showing images of the existing conditions of the park. She went on to say that the park was built in the 1970's of numerous planes of Belgian block. She noted the disrepair of the block, basketball courts, water fountain, retaining wall and other items in great need of repair. She also noted some neighborhood murals currently located on this wall which are intended to be kept within the restoration plan. She stated that extant trees in good condition are expected to be kept.

Ms. Reilly noted that there is only one entrance into the park and it is very dark—making it a security issue. She then displayed the overall park plan, but noted that they are only asking for Conceptual Approval today for the entry way portal piece. She noted that the community really wanted something akin to Schenley Park for the entryway—something elegant and traditional. The plan is also to create a second entrance for a later phase. The play court will be resurfaced, and the outline of old building foundations will be utilized as art/play areas. Rocks will be incorporated for kids to play on. The pathways through the park are meant to meander while remaining accessible. There will also be a water feature/jet spray/waterfall in the overall plan along with a performance space. For Phase 1, the entryway, will consist of seat walls with incorporated lit panels in the faces of the columns. She went on to say that this park is a couple of blocks away from August Wilson's birth home, and so the proposal is to pick up on this and utilize the theme of drama/theatre and art in this park.

Ms. Reilly noted that there are several placeholders for public art within the park. In consideration are murals, light, play houses, fence, and other items.

The 3form light panels on the entry façade seat wall are the first “art” pieces designed for the park. These panels are used in hockey arenas and are very tough. There will be text excerpts from August Wilson's plays that are backlit within the panels, and there will be 10 panels—one for each of the plays. The walls will be sandstone, with limestone caps. There will be limestone benches incorporated into the top. There are three proposed bollards for the entry portal—one of which is removable (center one) for trucks to enter when needed. She noted the plant palette and described type and placement of these items as being very simple. She then noted park signage near the entry.

Ms. Baltimore introduced herself and testified to the support from the community for this project. She stated that his project will greatly increase the quality of life of the residents in this area.

Ms. Rademacher stated that the PPC will provide a maintenance endowment for the needs of this park when completed that would supplement the City Public Works existing budget and manpower. She noted that there are a lot of community members who have demonstrated a vested interest in providing volunteer cleanup and continued vigilance on graffiti and other vandalism in this park.

Mr. Brown asked if the applicant would present the letters of support so that he could distribute them to the Commission.

Mr. Indovina asked for questions/comments from the Commission.

Ms. Rhor stated that she is very happy to see this project and that she appreciates the connection to art and the community—especially to August Wilson and his birth home. She asked if there was an intention by the applicant to include the community further in the construction or creation of the park.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they would absolutely plan to involve the community in volunteer efforts during the construction phases.

Ms. Rhor asked the applicant to consider employing artists—especially local artists—to create pieces for the park.

Ms. Baltimore stated that artists have been involved in discussion to date and are intended to be included in projects within this park and other projects within the community.

Ms. Rhor asked about the color of the lighted panel and whether it is intended to be of a yellow color.

Ms. Reilly stated that 3form can be any color, but the concept presented was just a mock up—the final color will most likely not be yellow. She went on to say that the final color will be subtle—perhaps a light green or blue, but something that would provide legibility of the text.

Mr. Astorino noted that the 3form pieces are quite nice and congratulated the team on a positive project, but noted that one negative is that they are not doing it all. Overall—a great project.

Ms. Luckett asked if there were any existing street lights along the adjacent Cliff Street.

Ms. Rademacher stated that there are street lights, but no streetscape. She went on to say that the community has stated that they would like some elements of the park to extend out into the street. This will be explored in the future, but there is no project or funding to this effect as yet.

Ms. Luckett asked how long it will take to complete the other phases of the project.

Ms. Rademacher stated it will take a while to complete, and is solely contingent upon funding. The next priority is the playground area after the entry is completed. The overlook area would follow after that. If they had all of the money today, it would take about 18 months to work through design and artist involvement---probably about 5 years for total completion.

Mr. Indovina stated that this is a very thoughtful plan. He went on to say that it does have a concern/caution on the electrical elements at grade in a park---about their longevity and vulnerability to vandalism, weather, etc. He went on to say that they should really look into ensuring very secure fixtures.

Mr. Indovina asked for comments from the audience, either opposed, on behalf, or in general to the project.

Mr. Harry Johnson, from the Office of Councilman Daniel Lavelle, introduced himself and noted full support of the Councilman for this project.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval to the project as submitted.

MOVED: Astorino

SECONDED: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

c. Beechview Spray Park

Mr. Bill Kolano of Kolano Design introduced himself and began to describe the signage component of the park.

Mr. Indovina noted that the spray park had already been completed and that the signage was the main point of consideration for this presentation.

Mr. Kolano stated that in 2006, his firm had worked with the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy and the City to create a master plan for the design of signage for the Pittsburgh regional parks. The design of the Beechview Spray Park closely resembles the regional park signage with slight variance. He noted that Director Radley of Citiparks had commissioned his firm to design these signs as a standard for this and future Spray Parks.

He went on to note the blue color of the sign as a standard to the plan, and described the color's relationship to the color of the sky. He noted the master design guidelines, making emphasis that the guidelines were always considered a kit of parts, and that signs for specific locations were to be derivative of, but not necessarily exacting to these guidelines. He went on to note the black painted metal uprights of the sign structure and shape of this interpretive panel.

Mr. Kolano then displayed the extant Schenley Plaza interpretive panel signs and noted that the signs were made of the same materials and blue color, but that the Plaza signs also incorporated photos and text that formed a two-tone palette of light and darker blue. He then displayed an aerial view of the Beechview Spray Park and described its placement, accessibility, and placement of the sign. He made note that the sign was strategically placed in order to hide an extant water cooling apparatus.

Mr. Kolano noted that the signage is highly legible, ADA compliant, and placed lower than normal so that kids can view it more effectively. He then displayed existing conditions of the park and emphasized the need to place the sign at this location in order to conceal the machinery. He noted that this sign would be placed in Beechview, then Troy Hill and other Spray Park sites as they are developed.

Mr. Indovina asked for questions/comments.

Hearing none, he then asked for any questions or comments from the audience.

Mike Gable asked to make a comment. He stated that the signs should have uniformity among the parks and signage therein. Mr. Gable stated that he would not deny this application, but he had hoped that this project would not present another standard or divergence (however slight) to existing standards as if this continues, there will be a multitude of different signs out there.

Ms. Rhor asked if the font used for this sign was the same as those fonts prescribed in the guidelines.

Mr. Kolano stated that the Schenley Plaza sign had its own logo, and the text in question on the Beechview sign is its logo---therefore it is different and distinctive.

Mr. Brown stated that he struggled with this application as it came in as it was just 99% of the guidelines---the same color, shape, and most of the font. He went on to say that he observed the Schenley Plaza example to understand how the two-tone background worked on that sign. In that example, the two-tone was created by a superimposed photograph. In this example, there is a definite and hard break between a lighter and darker blue background---neither of these examples was discussed in the guidelines. Nor was the use of a logo discussed in the guidelines. However, since the PPC did create the guidelines and the Plaza signage, it appears that Mr. Kolano is correct in his assertion that the guidelines were intended to create individualistic signage within these "loose" kit of parts. Mr. Brown stated that the Commission should consider the approval of this project as an approval of a new standard for Spray Park usage.

Mr. Gable stated that Public Works might be producing these signs one day, and for him, it matters a great deal on exacting standards due to the cost associated with purchasing one blue, two blues, etc. This should be considered.

Mr. Indovina stated that in a former Art Commission meeting, there was some concern about “billing” or hierarchy in text or logo between the Parks Conservancy and the City of Pittsburgh. It was decided that we should be cognizant that the signs should not read as the “City of Parks Conservancy” but rather the City of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Astorino stated that he is reluctant to move forward if Mike Gable was having reservations.

Mr. Gable stated that he is okay with it—he just wanted to bring these issues to the Commission.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Astorino

SECONDED: Rhor

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

d. Mt. Washington Flower Baskets Update: Site Revision

Mr. Chris Beichner, Director of the Mount Washington Community Development Corporation, introduced himself and stated that this proposal is an update or revision of the project to place hanging flower baskets along Grandview Avenue that the Commission approved last year.

He noted images of the baskets and stated that the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy will again provide installation and maintenance for the baskets. He went on to state that there are 80 baskets planned at this time upon City light poles located along Grandview Avenue between McArdle Roadway and Republic Street, Shiloh Street between Grandview and Virginia Avenue, along Virginia Avenue between Shiloh Street and Kearsarge Street, on Virginia Avenue at Chatham Village and along Bailey/Boggs Ave.

He stated that the total project budget is \$20,000 and is meant to drive visitors into the business districts of the area.

Mr. Indovina asked for questions/comments of the Commission.

Ms. Lockett asked if this were a permanent—year around installation.

Mr. Beichner stated that the basket would be up by early June and remain until mid October of this year. This would be seasonal, but just for this year, currently. However, they would like to see the pieces become a permanent installation at some point.

Ms. Lockett asked if he would like the Commission to approve as a permanent installation so that he would not have to come back each year.

Mr. Beichner stated yes, ideally.

Mr. Indovina asked for any comments from the audience.

Mr. Brown asked that if the Commission approves the project, that it consider approving as a permanent installation in these specific locations so that Mr. Beichner can proceed season in, season out without having to come back to the Commission each time.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the project as submitted with acknowledgement that the project can be considered permanent at the specific locations noted in the hearing, and therefore would not require subsequent review by the Commission each season.

MOVED: Rhor

SECONDED: Lockett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

e. Communication Utility Poles

Ms. Gwen Moorer of City Information Systems introduced herself and stated that she is here today to propose two communication security poles for City use in security purposes.

She went on to note the locations and the design of each of the poles. She made emphasis to the fact that each pole would be located nearby to existing poles so as not to disrupt viewsheds.

Mr. Indovina asked if the photo-rendering was accurate to the actual object/apparatus to be placed.

Ms. Moorer stated that this was accurate and the extent of what the piece would look like.

Mr. Astorino asked if these were the typical pole types found in the city.

Ms. Moorer stated that they would be 50 feet tall and made of wood and is typical of like poles in the city.

Mr. Brown noted locations of the poles on a map and street views from those locations.

Ms. Lockett asked if the poles disrupt the trails in any way.

Ms. Moorer stated that they do not offer any disruptions at all.

Mr. Astorino asked if there is any signage component to these poles as there are in other locations.

Ms. Moorer stated that there are no signs planned for this location.

Mr. Indovina asked for any comments from the audience.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Astorino

SECONDED: Lockett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

Meeting Adjourned