

down the path where the trees open up and there is a 20' city light pole about 38' behind the sculpture that would offer a great source of light for it as well.

He said one thing the Art Commission might have noticed from the construction documents is that they are proposing a pea gravel mix in the concrete base, which was recommended by Mr. Syl Damianos' group who also submitted construction documents for this project. Mr. Brown said the base will be smooth and not a raised terrazzo. He said this was meant to add a more natural look and aid in connecting the sculptures to the natural context of the park.

Mr. Brown said that generally all of the bases will look similar in profile. He said they tried to get a 4 inch profile for all of the sculptures, but this depends on the slope of the earth. He said the Gruber piece in its new location will still have a rise about 1' 11" high. This was another reason why he wanted this piece to be as level as possible.

Mr. Brown said they have designed a 6' surround of concrete around the integral base of the Gruber piece, which he said is similar to the other pieces as well. He said all of the sculptures are proposed to have the pea gravel mix, which the artists have weighed in on, and agreed that the mix is appropriate to the pieces.

Mr. Brown said that the Morandi piece, which was touched upon in the last hearing, has a little plinth that rises. He said that in its original location in the Squirrel Hill Library, the piece did rest on a tablet of stone and had a water feature underneath it. Mr. Brown said that in his original opinion the base for the piece should almost be invisible, but there was not a good way to do this especially in regards to maintenance. Mr. Damianos contacted the artist about these concerns, and the artist said he wanted the concrete base.

Mr. Brown said the fastening mechanisms were also of great concern. He said they have had problems in the past with older sculptures which had steel next to aluminum, etc., as this would cause corrosion problems over time. He said the conservator advised them to use dialectic tape to separate the fastening mechanisms from the sculptures that should cut down on, if not remove, corrosion problems over time.

Mr. Brown said that the Morandi, Calaboyias, and Gruber pieces also have sleeves that will be bolted to the concrete by stainless steel rods and then when the pieces are laid over top of them there is a set screw that is also stainless steel that will come in from the side that will be largely invisible. He said this way they will be completely secure over time and with the dialectic coding they feel it will be corrosion proof as well.

Ms. Slavick asked if Mr. Morandi specified the color for concrete base under his piece.

Mr. Brown said that the pea gravel mix was presented to the artist and he liked it a lot.

Ms. Slavick said she was just wondering if it were possible to darken the base to give it the sculpture the effect of coming out of the grass.

Mr. Brown said he also presented this idea, but the artist did not like it. He said they went through much iteration with the piece, but nothing appealed to the artist. Mr. Brown said he does like the continuity between the pieces since they are all from the same time period, he thinks having similar bases works fine. He said from a maintenance perspective, the current Morandi base is the best.

Ms. Rhor asked if there was any more word on the Master Plan for Bakery Square and Mellon Park.

Mr. Brown said he did not know, but Mr. Richard Reed and Ms. Susan Rademacher were both present to answer this question.

Ms. Susan Rademacher of Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy introduced herself, and said there has been no change. She said funding has to be raised to do the Master Plan.

Ms. Rhor asked if they could move forward and just have this project woven into the plan.

Mr. Brown said that this was the agreement all along that they would move ahead with these sculptures and they would be considered existing conditions to any Master Plan that might occur. Mr. Brown said that in their site visit, he did agree that it was a good idea to move the Gruber piece because it also allows room for interpretive signage or some sort of entry feature. He said this would come later.

Mr. Brown said he is still working on the signage and lighting for these pieces. He said the Gruber piece will be fairly easy to light by placing a spotlight on the 20' pole. He said the other two pieces will have to have ground base lighting, since there is no way they can reach them by pole.

Ms. Klavon asked why they have to be lit.

Mr. Brown said they want more light on them for safety, to prevent vandalism, and to offer more light into the park. He said they have been suffering a lot of vandalism on the Columbus sculpture at Phipps, and it already is in a well-lit and well-trafficked location. He said he does not want to take any chances. Mr. Brown also added that in their community meetings one thing that many members voiced was their want of more light in the park at night, generally speaking. He said he told the community members they would add lighting to the sculptures thereby adding more light to the park.

Ms. Luckett said she does not have any questions.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions from the Commission.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of the project.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss the project.

Ms. Briggs said that at the site visit, both she and Mr. Astorino had concerns about the placement of the Gruber piece so prominently on Fifth Avenue. She said this was really the issue, the prominence of the placement. She said they were not comfortable with the discussion of the sculpture park in the first place as a new sculpture park with old works of art. She said it was requested to put the Gruber piece in the nestling of trees. She said she has not measured the topography of the ground, but she does not think it would be impossible to place the sculpture in this location and sink the base into the ground. She said the whole reason for this was so that none of the pieces would be on any of the major street fronts, so that they would not be prominently displayed and lit. Instead, they would be something you would discover glimpses of as you walked through the park.

Ms. Briggs said she was frankly shocked when she read that the Gruber piece had been moved to the edge of Penn Avenue to improve the visibility and grade of the land, when visibility was the reason why they wanted the piece to be in the grove of trees. She said that she and Mr. Astorino still feel strongly about this, and since the site visit was not on record, she thought she would at least speak for herself about the location they discussed. She said they left quite a large area for the site to be chosen from, and she thought any of the three sides around the triangle would be appropriate. She said the sculpture being 17' high is a very dominant piece.

Ms. Klavon said that if you place the 17' sculpture on a grade, the grade makes the sculpture that much more dominating and larger.

Ms. Briggs disagreed. She said if you cut into the grade, it allows a person to have different approaches and different relations with the sculpture. She said as you are coming down the hill you are seeing it in one way, and on the other side you see it in another way. Ms. Briggs said that frankly she thinks any sculpture is more interesting in that kind of setting. She said the base does not need to stick out, instead it can cut in.

Mr. Brown said Ms. Briggs is right that you can cut into the grade, but even on this slight grade, the difference between one side and the other on the base to level-ize it, is 4" to 1'11". Mr. Brown said that in his opinion if you increase the slope to have a level-ized base, visually your perception of it is that it is not level when one end is much higher out of the ground than the other. He said his big concern with putting it in this location was the slope, but he was also concerned that it was getting close to the Calaboyias piece.

Ms. Klavon asked about the radius inside the triangle as a possible location.

Ms. Briggs said this area is much steeper.

Ms. Klavon said if you go right of the triangle, you are still placing the piece on Penn Avenue.

Ms. Briggs said no, you are not placing it in the same manner on Penn Avenue as it is positioned now.

Ms. Rhor said that the closer you get to Penn Avenue, it risks the same problems it had when it was proposed to be placed on Fifth Avenue. She said it becomes a gateway piece as opposed to someone just happening upon it as a person walked through the park.

Ms. Klavon pointed out the entrance to the park is near the new proposed location, so it would still be on gateway.

Ms. Briggs said the two locations they had discussed were to the right of the triangle and on the inside of the radius. She said she thinks the site change to Penn Avenue is significant. She said the idea was to prevent one sculpture seeming more important than the others, and just to create glimpses of the pieces to draw people into the park rather than be pieces that people simply drove past and were by “visually attacked.” She said moving the piece to where it has been moved is exactly counter to that. Ms. Briggs said she would ask that they revisit this, but if no one else agrees they can vote.

Mr. Brown said he certainly did not mean to add something “shocking” to their packet this month, but at the same time he cannot call them up and lobby in the meantime. He said this is his only way to communicate with the Art Commission legally.

Ms. Klavon asked if he could put the sculpture back to where they originally discussed.

Mr. Brown said there may have been a communication breakdown. He said he thought the preference was to keep it on the outside radius of the circle, rather than on the inside. He said his issue with placing it in the aforementioned location was that you would only see 10’ of the bottom half from the street, and it would appear that you were looking at the backside of something. He said that if the Art Commission wished to revisit the site, it can be done. However, he said aesthetically to him, this seemed like a better location.

Ms. Renee Piechocki introduced herself as the Director of the Office of Public Art. She said that she, Leah Donatelli, and Mr. Brown spent hours out at the site after the Art Commission’s site visit. She the originally location to the upper right hand corner of the triangle has a different tree species from the ones in Mr. Brown’s Photoshop rendering which are London Plains. She said the tallest branches are much higher. Ms. Piechocki said when she went out to the site, they say that the lowest branches were very low, thereby cutting the visual perception of the sculpture in half. She said they thought it would be better in a location where the trees would be more of a canopy around the sculpture and did not cut it in half. She said it also would not affect the piece if branches were falling down, etc.

Mr. Brown said that he thought they were on the same page about the Gruber piece being so vertical and imposing that they wanted to get the piece away from the entrances. He said for him, this was another entrance, and another reason to slide it down to where he was now proposing. However, he said it could still work in the other location, even though aesthetically there is still a problem.

Ms. Briggs said if there is going to be forward movement with the Master Plan, the funds invested in the time to light these projects might be minimal in the hopes that through the full Master Plan they will have a more robust lighting system.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to make a motion for the project.

Ms. Rhor made the motion to approve the project as presented.

MOTION: To grant final approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Rhor

SECONDED: Slavick

IN FAVOR: Klavon, Lockett

OPPOSED: Briggs

CARRIED

a. Three Rivers Heritage Trail Signage: Conceptual and Final Approval

- o Tom Baxter, Friends of the Riverfront

Mr. Tom Baxter introduced himself as the Director of Friends of the Riverfront (FOR). He stated Mr. Charles "Chuck" Alcorn, the Executive Director from Riverlife was also there to present that day. He said in 2004, Riverlife did present this project for Conceptual Approval, but he was not sure if Mr. Brown was able to find this information in the Art Commission archives. He said what they were really there for was an update and Final Approval.

Ms. Klavon said no, they were there for both Conceptual and Final Approval.

Mr. Baxter said ok. He said the property is actually a mixture of City, URA, private, easement, Friends of the Riverfront, and other property. He said they were only there for the city property portion.

Ms. Klavon asked how many times they fall on city property.

Mr. Baxter stated the matrix is fairly large. He said there are 103 parcels that make up the Three Rivers Heritage Trail, and only 27 are on city property.

Ms. Klavon asked how many medallions they would be installing.

Mr. Baxter stated there will be a total of 102, of which only 61 would be installed currently.

Mr. Alcorn submitted maps with the proposed trail mile marker locations to the Art Commission members.

Mr. Baxter stated that FOR, the City of Pittsburgh Department of Public Works, the Pittsburgh Police and Emergency Services, the Sports and Exhibition Authority, and Riverlife partnered to develop a system of trail identification and location signage along the Three Rivers Heritage Trail. However, for many years, he said the original markers have become fragile, unsightly, and prone to damage, removal and vandalism. Additionally new miles of trail have been added since then. Today, very little of this former signage system is in place and functional, creating a hazard and limiting the enjoyment of our parks and trails.

Mr. Baxter said that they again are partnering with the URA, Riverlife, City of Pittsburgh Department of Public Works, Pittsburgh Police and Emergency Services, and the Sports and Exhibition Authority to come up with a new mile marker system that will be more mature with the Three Rivers Heritage Trail, and will last longer. He said they are also trying to get a license and maintenance agreement with the City of Pittsburgh.

Ms. Klavon asked for information about the mile markers themselves.

Mr. Baxter explained there are two markers within the City of Pittsburgh – one in Downtown from the West End Bridge to the Ohio River to the Hot Metal Bridge to the Monongahela River to the 31st Street Bridge to Allegheny River where Three Rivers Park is located. He said beyond this is the Three Rivers Heritage Trail, so you have an overlay of two different systems. However, he said they would like to install both markers at the same time, and care for them both with the same license and maintenance agreement.

Ms. Briggs asked who the graphic designer of the mile markers was.

Mr. Baxter answered Landesberg Designs. He said Landis did work with Pashek on the concept, but they did review numerous types of material such as stainless steel, nickel, copper. He said they finally selected bronze for its longevity and contrast, which was a concern from the Department of City Planning.

Ms. Klavon asked when we will see the Three Rivers Park markers.

Mr. Baxter stated that every half mile there will be marker. On the other side of the trail there will be a Heritage Trail marker. He said these locations were selected prior by Pashek Associates.

Ms. Rhor asked how do these mile markers help engage people and get them out of their cars as indicated in the application.

Mr. Baxter said the mile markers will be in a number of publications including the Heritage Trail map, and they will have an online interactive version of the map for hand held devices.

Ms. Lockett asked what the anticipated annual maintenance costs were.

Mr. Baxter said they markers are built robust (400 lbs) to insulate themselves against theft. Additionally, Riverlife already has a license and maintenance agreement with the City of Pittsburgh that allows them to have trail stewards to monitor and maintain them once a week. He said FOR has a fund for maintenance that is expected to last for 10 years.

Ms. Klavon asked about the symbol on the marker.

Mr. Alcorn explained where the elements of the symbol originated from, which included a reference to Fort Pitt and symbols for water and nature.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions from the Commission.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of the project.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss the project.

Ms. Briggs said she thinks the concept of the mile markers is great, and her only concern was the markers being stolen which she believed they adequately addressed by using bronze as their material.

Mr. Brown said seeing the sample mile markers in person makes him believe these markers do comply with the Department of City Planning's ADA Coordinator's (Mr. Richard Meritzer) request for light colored text on a dark colored background. Mr. Meritzer said this is the preference from the ADA. Mr. Brown said that over time since the pieces are not coated, the dark and light areas will contrast even more.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion.

Ms. Briggs moved for Conceptual and Final Approval.

MOTION: To grant conceptual and final approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Briggs

SECONDED: Rhor

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- c. Schenley Plaza Restaurant: Final Approval
 - o Mark Broadhurst, Eat n' Park Hospitality Group
 - o Richard Reed, Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy

Mr. Richard Reed introduced himself with the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy (PPC). He submitted a letter for support from the University of Pittsburgh Vice Chancellor, Renee Clark. He also introduced Andy Dunmire of Eat n' Park Hospitality Group and Natalie Byrd from LaQuatra Bonci Associates.

Mr. Reed explained Schenley Plaza was constructed with the intention of having a full service restaurant in its plan in 2005. This is the third time this project will be presented to the Art Commission by this group. A similar project was submitted to the Art Commission by a different operator (Atria's) and was previously approved in 2006 by City Planning. At the April, 2010 hearing of the Art Commission, the Commission chose to table the decision of Conceptual Approval with several conditions.

Mr. Dunmire introduced himself as a representative of Eat n' Park. He stated that they have addressed many of the conditions and concerns put forth by the last Art Commission, which were illustrated in the plans given to the Art Commission.

Ms. Lockett stated that she thinks the landscaping looks great. She asked if the highest part of the intended landscaping wall was indeed 4'.

Ms. Byrd introduced herself as from LaQuatra Bonci. She said it is 4' high at the point because they have to take in the existing grades. However, they did meet on Monday to discuss the fact that this is very high,

and it is not their intent to block any views of the lawn, so they decided to only have a 2 ½' maximum height. Ms. Byrd said they could submit their new grading plan per request.

Ms. Lockett asked for more information about the proposed monument sign.

Mr. Dunmire explained they did not want to have this signage placed high on the building, so in keeping with many of the other monument designations within the park, they placed a lower sign at the front of the building. He said the name is still not determined. He said the intent is to have a low wall with a channel letter sign, which they would have to apply for Zoning Approval as well.

Ms. Lockett asked if the signage would be to the right of the entranceway.

Mr. Dunmire said yes, they know where they want to locate the sign and they know what kind of font and sizing they will use even though they do not yet know the name. He said they want the Art Commission to approve the size of it.

Ms. Lockett then asked for more explanation about the indoor/outdoor gas fire place, and asked if it will be on the East side of the building.

Mr. Dunmire said it will be on the North side. He also said there will be designated seating around the fire place on the inside and outside of the restaurant.

Ms. Lockett asked what the plans for the light-scaping were.

Mr. Dunmire pointed these out in the plans around the landscaping and over top the living walls. He said there are also lights around the low patio walls

Ms. Lockett asked about the lighting for the entrance.

Mr. Dunmire said there will be a glass sculpture in the entryway, and they are planning on lighting the front atrium.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions from the Commission.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of the project.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss the project.

Ms. Rhor asked what the Commission thought about the landscaping.

Ms. Klavon stated she felt they met the requirements put forth by the Art Commission last time.

Ms. Rhor asked if the children's garden was something new to this plan.

Ms. Klavon and Mr. Brown both stated that it is new.

Ms. Byrd said PPC did not want a children's garden per se, but the area in front of the carousel is used by parents who normally put up tents to have lunch, etc. She said they really just wanted to provide a flexible space for them. Therefore, their design includes low walls, trees, and different paving. She said really it is just a seating area with plantings for the overflow of the carousel area.

Mr. Reed said the original plan had an outdoor stage/theater at the backend of the restaurant, but they did not have any funding for that so this was a way to accommodate a play area for possible performances.

Ms. Rhor asked if there was seating in the children's garden.

Ms. Byrd said there are low walls with seating. She pointed out there really could be a performance in the middle of the garden, since there would already be seating around it.

Ms. Ismail stated this was an example of a project that meets the criteria for going before the Planning, Art, and Historic Review Commissions. She said they are working on coordinating these reviews by the Commissions better.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion.

Ms. Luckett motioned to approve.

MOTION: To grant final approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Luckett

SECONDED: Briggs

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- d. South Pittsburgh Off Leash Exercise Area and Southside Sculpture Project: Conceptual and Final Approval
- o Mike Radley, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation
 - o J.T. Sauer, Architect, J. T. Sauer and Associates
 - o Tim Kaulen, Artist

Mr. Tim Kaulen introduced himself as a representative of the Industrial Arts Coop, which is a group of artists who create public sculptures together. He explained the sculpture was commissioned by the Department of City Planning in the late 90s. He said it is comprised of two 18' steel workers made of recycled I-beams and a ladle/relic of the steel industry.

Mr. Kaulen stated the Southside Riverfront Park site has been designated by the city. He said they have acquired many contributors and supporters along the way.

Ms. Piechocki from the Office of Public Art explained that this project started in 1997. She said the monies were from a community development block grant program that the city passed in 1997. Between 1997 and 2001, a grant of \$24,900 was paid to the artist from the city, and all monies the city has invested have already been encumbered by the artist and paid out. She said as Tim described, the artwork features two large sculptures of steel workers made from reclaimed steel including some I-beams that were from the construction of the Hot Metal Bridge. The period after 2001 was a dark period.

Ms. Piechocki explained the original site at Southside Works was lost when the development was completed. The original site for the sculpture was no longer there, and another appropriate site in the development could not be located. She said there was also no city property large enough to hold the sculpture. A new site along the Southside trail was then identified through a two year process led by OPA and City Planning staff. The goals were to find a piece of city land that would accommodate the 24 by 30' footprint of the artwork and keep it on the Monongahela River as close to the Hot Metal Bridge as possible.

She said today the artist and the Industrial Arts Coop have raised the budget for this sculpture. She said she thought it was interesting to note they have received considerably funding from the Heinz Endowments, the Fine Family Foundation, Highmark, and Pittsburgh 250 Community Connections Group, totaling at least \$150,000.

Ms. Piechocki stated in 2008, the Art Commission did grant Conceptual Approval for the sculpture at this site. Since that time, the artist and Industrial Arts Coop entered into an agreement with the City of Pittsburgh for Design Services which included creating the construction documents and doing the core sample.

Ms. Piechocki said OPA and other community members have been silent supporters of this project over the last 13 years.

Mr. Kaulen stated in the last few years his group was approached by Councilman Kraus to create an off leash dog park in the South Side. That is when they decided to incorporate their sculpture and the dog park into a bigger scope. He said he is in full agreement that these two elements be integrated in the same site.

He said to date they hired a Civil Environmental Consultants (CEC) group to conduct a geo tech study to evaluate the qualities of the soil. He said they have also engineered the piece, both its construction from a mechanical and structural analysis, and engineered the base it will sit on.

Mr. Kaulen stated they still have excavation to be done. He said some preliminary work has already been begun at the site to accommodate the dog park. The concrete pad for the sculptures will be 2 miles away. He said they have a lighting plan to allow the sculptures to have a presence at night, and for security purposes. He said this equipment as well as the plan were donated. He said Duquesne Light has offered to support the installation of that equipment and the connections for power to a nearby utility pole pending city approval and identifying a contractor to do the work.

He said the steel sculptures will be clear coated with an anti graffiti treatment. A maintenance plan would include a bi annual treatment of linseed oil, which is the working man's treatment for rusty sculpture. He said this would also prevent corrosion while allowing the sculpture to maintain its rusty nature.

Ms. Klavon asked if the funding was for both the sculpture and the dog park.

Mr. Kaulen said it is fairly isolate, so the final landscaping will be the integral connection.

Ms. Sauntee Turner introduced herself from the Office of the Mayor, and stated today she was representing Parks and Recreations. She explained this dog park was part of the city's plan to expand off leash dog areas, which is explained thoroughly in the application. She said the chosen Riverfront Park has been approved by Zoning. She said they had to do something with this site as there was an incident of violence and a lot of homeless people dwelling due to the overgrowth of vegetation. They have worked with several Social Services organizations to help transport these individuals.

Mr. Ben Simpson introduced himself with J.T. Sauer and Associates. He said they were contacted in 2008 by the city to work with City Parks and Councilman Krauss' office to do a series of community meetings with people who were interested in an off leash exercise dog park area in Riverside Park. He said there are guidelines, such as the number of acres, for constructing a dog park. He said this site fit the bill. Adequate parking was already available, so the site would just need a few minor updates.

He said they were then approached with a design for an entry plaza different from the one they themselves had designed to accommodate Mr. Kaulen's sculpture. This is how the two ideas became married together.

Mr. Simpson explained that the dog park will be surrounded by 6' fence, so that people can allow their dogs to run free. He said there is a double gate feature to allow owners to enter and exit into the park to prevent their dog from feeling overwhelmed. He said entrance landscaping is kept low. He said in researching other County dog parks, they realized people use the dog parks to also socialize so this was taken into consideration. He said the design is open so visually police officers will be able to see into the park.

Mr. Simpson said they created two areas, one with an aggregate walking path and landscape with nontoxic materials for animals, and a separate area for dogs that might not get along with the rest of the group. He said different vegetation will help buffer the train tracks.

Mr. Simpson said for the entrance, they were presented with Mr. Kaulen's sculpture at a community meeting where discussing his vision for the park and their general interpretation of the sculpture itself, they realized it was a former industrial site. He said they wanted to counter the sculpture which is very geometric with a more organic feel for the rest of the dog park. He said the theme was "industry reclaimed by nature" to show the past, present, and future of the steel industry.

Mr. Simpson said they have chosen ornamental and native plant species that are found in Brownfield reclamation sites where they have a lot of earth tones and will provide a lot of movement to counter the rigid nature of the structure itself.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions from the Commission.

Ms. Slavick asked what the anticipated maximum height of the maple trees was.

Mr. Simpson answered 30 to 50', but they will try to place them to still keep the sightline opened to the city itself. However, what they did not want to happen was have the trees themselves take away from the scale of the sculpture, since the height speaks a lot about what it is trying to represent – the size of a steel mill. He said these trees will be used primarily for shade, which was a major concern from users of other dog parks.

Ms. Rhor pointed out that many of the drawings in the application are still vague. She asked if there was any information he could add in this regard.

Mr. Simpson said they have not done many drawings of inside the dog park since this is part of the Master Plan. However, they are trying to stay true to the Brownfield site while giving it a more organic plant palate. He said these will be very low maintenance plants that are nontoxic and durable.

Ms. Rhor asked if there would be benches and other elements.

Mr. Simpson pointed out the benches are shown on the construction documents. He said there are semicircle concrete pads that will be provided to mount these backless benches, which will be black powder coated. He said this will blend in with the black chain link fence. He said they are still looking at different manufacturing type benches. He said the shade structures they will be using will be standard as in other city parks.

Ms. Klavon asked where they get the shades from.

Mr. Simpson explained that after the double gated entrance they will have a compacted limestone staging area where owners can clean off their dogs if there is mud. He said in this area they have created two standard shade shelters which are used in other city parks that are black powder coated pole with supports that has a fabric cover that goes over it. Mr. Simpson said Public Works will take these down at the end of the year. He said these shade shelters come in a variety of colors, but they wanted to choose an earth tone color.

Ms. Briggs stated that even in having a background in architecture, she was finding these particular construction documents very hard to read in regards to the dog park and not the sculpture. She said these documents were telling her absolutely nothing. She asked what Alternate 1 in the budget referred to.

Mr. Simpson said this was for the second dog park area – or section B. He said originally there was concern there would not be enough funding for both areas, so they provided this as an alternate based on the available funding at the time they wanted to start construction. He said it was possible they would have to do the second area as a second phase.

Ms. Klavon asked if Mr. Simpson was a licensed landscape architect.

Mr. Simpson said he is an associate landscape architect, and Jim Sauer is the primary architect who was not able to be there today. He stated Mr. Sauer is a registered landscape architect.

Ms. Klavon said she does not think they achieve what they say. She said they say they want to be organic, but she does not find the park organic. She also pointed out that she has never seen a dog park with a 6' fence. She then stated that she did not find the design up to par.

Mr. Simpson said what he meant by organic was the plant material near the entrance of the dog park, and not so much the dog park itself.

Ms. Klavon said that she is very familiar with this area since she walks this path everyday. She said they have taken a very wooded area, albeit it was very wild, and now it is a very square, linear “fru fru-y” thing. She said they have lost sight of the very interesting pieces to the site, and now she said she does not think it has any of it. She said she does not find it be very interesting. She then stated that she does not think the sculpture should be messed with.

Mr. Simpson said that this area is currently overgrown and basically a slag dump. He said there is a lot of waste and garbage, very little soil, and as Asante had alluded to, there was a serious security issue. He said for this to be any kind of usable space, this had to be opened up. He said this was an absolute requirement. He said there are really no design standards in regards to this.

Ms. Klavon said that what happens in that area happens in a whole bunch of different places along the trail, referring to homeless people. She said she knows this from personal experience.

Mr. Simpson said he cannot speak in regards to city policy on the usage of these areas.

Ms. Klavon asked then why must they have a 6' high fence.

Mr. Simpson said this is what he was going to address next. He said there is really no standard from a design professional's standpoint as to a dog park, other than normal design standards for people, but there are recommendations from the American Kennel Club and other societies that say you should have a minimum of a 6' high fence to avoid pets being able to get out. He said if you look at a lot of kennels they have a 6' high fence for this very reason. Mr. Simpson said this is the standard they went off of. He said they decided to use a vinyl coated chain link fence to prevent it from rusting so that it would last and also blend into the background. He said the existing fence is over 8' tall.

Ms. Lockett asked what the budget for overall maintenance and upkeep looked like.

Mr. Simpson said he cannot speak towards city budgets. However, he said Public Works would just have to mow certain areas once a year, and the spaces are large enough to allow maintenance vehicles to pass through. He said they would also have to empty garbage cans however often the city deemed necessary.

Ms. Piechocki said that this sculpture is not a private commission to be placed on public land, and therefore does not come with a maintenance endowment. She said this was a city commission, so the money for maintenance for this piece will come out of City Planning's budget or DPW's budget.

Ms. Turner said as far as maintaining the park, it would be put into the same rotation as the other park systems and be maintained that way.

Mr. Gable asked about the backless benches.

Mr. Simpson said these benches would be similar to the ones seen in the spray parks.

Mr. Gable said he is glad they are using the black vinyl because this is one of the standards they have. He said he also understands why they are doing the fencing, even though he would love to see no fencing since this does ruin the visual.

Ms. Turner said this is the standard in the dog park at Riverview Park, and it works for the people who need the fencing. She said three of the other parks do not have fencing, and she does not prefer these. She said she prefers to go to Riverview because it has the fencing. She said they are just trying to have some variation in their parks.

Mr. Simpson said this was also a concern in the community meetings. He said with the train tracks there they have to provide a physical barrier. He said the community members also stated they would feel more comfortable allowing their dogs to have free reign in a fenced off area while they socialized with other community members.

Ms. Klavon asked what the community members said about this site being chosen for the dog park.

Mr. Simpson said during the last community meeting there was much excitement, and in fact, there was concern that this park was not being built fast enough. He said some local community members had even started a petition to try to get the park moving along faster.

Ms. Ismail said she could also speak to this. She said this dog park is something the community really wants. She said there has been a lot of community engagement and her neighborhood planners have been extensively involved in this.

Mr. Brown also agreed, and said he has been present at these community meetings.

Ms. Briggs said that when she lived in the Southside in 2003, even she wanted a dog park in the Southside back then.

Ms. Turner said while this park will be in the Southside, the park is really for the entire city. She said they encourage people to come from wherever. She said their goal was to create a destination for people in the South region of Pittsburgh, because currently there is a lack of such a space for dog owners there.

Mr. Gable pointed out that since the interior of the park will be grass, it is not going to last. He also said he thinks the park is a little overdesigned seeing that it is a dog park. He asked if or when things get lost or destroyed by a dog, if they expect these things to get replaced. He said they are going to lose plant material and the grass. He said they will have to figure out how to shut down one part to restore another section,

and there will be constant flip flop. Mr. Gable said, for example, you can see that Riverview Park has lost all of its grass. He did point out that they have not lost grass in West Park which does not have a fence, but he said he was not trying to say there was a causation effect between fences and loss of grass. However, he said the larger the area the better.

Mr. Gable asked if they are going to be expected to replace the plant material all of the time.

Mr. Simpson said the plant materials were chosen for their durability, but he does understand that dog waste can kill grass. He said Public Works can shut down one of the areas of the park to allow rejuvenation.

Ms. Slavick asked if we know of any plant species that can resist dog waste.

Ms. Klavon questioned the choice of plant material. She said it has lost form.

Mr. Simpson said they were trying to reduce some of the impact of the fence. They were also trying to create a visual buffer for the train area.

Ms. Klavon added that having shrubbery along the fence just reinforced the linear nature of the fence.

Mr. Simpson said that part of the problem of creating landscape islands that protrude that they originally had in the park increases costs significantly and does not provide the benefit of getting the dog park built. He said the cost of landscaping meant the loss of a section of the dog park based on their estimates.

Ms. Klavon said sorry, but she thinks good design is affordable, absolutely.

Mr. Simpson said that is why they have looked at alternatives such as seeding.

Ms. Klavon asked if they have any water for the park.

Mr. Simpson said there is no utility access there. He said in most parks people bring their own water and dog bowls. He said to get water here they would have to drill under the CSX track. He said this was not in the budget at the time, but it does not mean this is not possible in the future.

Ms. Klavon said this was interesting since they were right across from the river.

Mr. Simpson said they did consider having a drinking pool from the river, but there were many environmental permits that would have to be put in place. Additionally, the community members explicitly said they did not want their dogs to drink this kind of water, because there are sewer/Alcosan access right across from the dog park.

Ms. Briggs directed her question to Ms. Piechocki. She said she is extremely confused why this sculpture is tied to the dog park. She said that she is delighted that they are building a high quality \$230,000 dog park in the South Side, and said this would be the fanciest dog park her dog of 13 years would ever have gone to. However, she found it insulting that they have taken so much time to discuss the dog park and have asked the artist and the sculpture to hang on the side, waiting for the Commission to decide whether or not the dog park was designed properly. She said she did not understand why they were attached. She asked if it was just because this piece designated location was moved to this site.

Ms. Piechocki said choosing this site was a 2 ½ year process, and this site in particular turned out to be the best one. She said the decision to place the sculpture in this location came before the dog park. She said part of the artist's concern was that originally nothing was happening here. She asked why the city who invested all of this money into the work would want to put it on this junky piece of land. She said that she and Ms. Donatelli reassured Mr. Kaulen that this site would become something else. She said they thought by putting the sculpture there it would spur more dialogue about what could happen with the land, and that is in a sense what happened. She said during this time Councilman Kraus and Parks and Recreation were trying to find a place to put a new dog park. Therefore, they decided to place the sculpture here first, and then the dog park came around it.

Ms. Briggs asked if the installation of the sculpture had to wait until the dog park was in root.

Ms. Piechocki said no, but the funding to install the sculpture at this site is tied to the dog park. She said preparation of the landscape is tied to the dog park.

Mr. Kaulen said it is his understanding that his project can continue as an isolated approach not pending the development of the dog park. He said the finishing of the dog park would allow for the complete landscaping. He said all of their work is on the back end of this and would need to occur prior to the completion of the dog park. He said they want to be in there first.

Ms. Klavon asked how he felt about his sculpture being next to the dog park.

Mr. Kaulen said the main attractions at Southside Park, boating, biking, running allow the piece to be complimented well without additional concerns of safety and vandalism. He said for a public park, this is a good site. He said he thinks the dog park creates an amenity that is parallel to those others and does not bring risks to the big concern about public safety. He said he is most excited for the sculpture to be completed, and that is his priority. He said he thinks the dog park is a fine compliment to it.

Mr. Kaulen then apologized and said he had to go.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of the project.

Ms. Piechocki said she wanted to talk about sculptures in dog parks. She said if it seems strange that this sculpture is in a dog park, she reminds the Commission that the North Side dog park which she lives across the street from is complemented by a Civil War memorial which is perhaps very strange. She said she thinks this work is much better than that one.

Mr. Mike Radley introduced himself as the Director of City Parks and said he would like to speak on behalf of the project. He stated this concept began before he became Director of City Parks and has evolved into a very elaborate plan that will meet the needs for off leash exercise areas for the residents of not only Southside, but the South Hills. He said he is excited about the opportunity to blend this park with a unique sculpture. He said if there are concerns with design such as fence height, these things can be worked out. Mr. Radley said this is inherently a great project for not only the Southside but the entire City of Pittsburgh.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss the project.

Ms. Klavon said they can separate their decisions for the sculpture and the park.

Ms. Briggs said she thinks they should definitely separate these two different issues for voting.

Ms. Rhor also agreed they should be separated and said they are looking at two different levels of completion.

Ms. Klavon pointed out that landscaping for the sculpture is part of the dog park plan.

Ms. Briggs said the landscaping of the dog park could be part of the second plan along with the installation of the sculpture.

Ms. Rhor said she is okay with that.

Ms. Briggs, Ms. Rhor, and Ms. Klavon agreed that they should discuss each separately, and decided to discuss the sculpture first.

Ms. Rhor stated that she felt the site was a good location for the sculpture. She said she has fewer problems with the design of the sculpture and the siting, so as far as problems or issues, she did not have any in particular.

Ms. Briggs said neither did she.

Ms. Rhor pointed out that the community support has been big, so she suggested they move ahead.

Ms. Rhor then stated in regards to the dog park she thinks the great community support is wonderful and a great idea as well. She said she feels from her perspective and in looking at the plans that there is just not enough information for her to understand from the images. She said there also seems to be contradictions

in some of the things that have been said and some of the images. She said in moving ahead, she does not think the dog park is ready for Final Approval at all.

Ms. Klavon asked if it is ready for Conceptual Approval.

Ms. Briggs said she thinks it is ready for Conceptual Approval to the degree that it is a dog park on this site on the Southside, and thinks this is a great idea. She said she would encourage the Mayor's office to either ask their landscape designers to do more research and spend more time on the project, and at the very least do a better job of creating documents to communicate the designs or solicit designs of other landscape architects. She said she is not at all convinced by the quality with this set of documents in front of her. She said granted she does not know this landscape architect or their works, but from the plans, construction documents, and drawings the quality is not convincing at all. She said it is a very expensive dog park for sure which she said is fine, but she does not look at the documents and see this expense. Ms. Briggs said she has been to a lot of dog parks around the country, but she has never been to one with grass ever. She pointed out that the American Kennel Association recommends that you put up a 6' fence around your yard to prevent your dog from running away, but if your dog has this tendency, you don't take it to an open leash dog park in the first place. She said this is the same thing if you have a dog that is combative or aggressive. Therefore, she said she does not think this dog park has to be designed to for every possible erratic dog, but for the general dog population. She said she finds the design unconvincing, but she would feel comfortable approving it at the Conceptual level. However, in order to convince her this is worth a \$230,000 city expenditure, she would need to see much better documents and more information about the plantings, type of fencing, and as what was brought up early, make sure the money is not spent on things that the dogs can destroy.

Ms. Klavon said she is in agreement with this.

Ms. Slavick said that given the degree of information they have received from other projects, there is a lot of information missing in terms of the shape and actual benches. She said since the sculpture area has a very specific kind of planting, it would be nice if the vegetation from the fire that comes from the cauldron of the sculpture be repeated in the park if they wanted an aesthetic linkage between these spaces. Ms. Slavick said she thinks it would be very unsightly if the grass disappeared and it was just raw ground and thinks there ought to be some other option.

Ms. Klavon said the problem with giving Conceptual Approval is that they get to come back at Final.

Mr. Brown said if they like the design of the park, there are some material selections, planting solutions, fencing, etc. examples. He said if they like this overall design, this is enough information to give it Final Approval.

Ms. Briggs, Ms. Rhor, and Ms. Klavon stated they disagree.

Mr. Brown said it is missing some details about the shade pavilions and benches, but his point is that this is enough information for Conceptual Approval at least. He said if they could give clear directions at this time, it should be fine to see this project again for Final Approval or give Final Approval with the condition that these details be followed through with staff.

Ms. Slavick said that given the Southside Community wanted this dog park yesterday, she would like to deliver on this if they can, but they should give very specific guidance.

Ms. Lockett asked how much input from Mr. Kaulen helped guide the design of the landscape component where the sculpture will be situated.

Mr. Brown said he has been apart of several meetings where he has seen Mr. Kaulen collaborate on this concept. He said a lot of the design was proposed by the architect, but he had many discussions with Mr. Kaulen.

Ms. Klavon asked them to discuss the height of the fence and the material.

Ms. Rhor asked if they are discussing the height or having the fence at all.

Ms. Briggs said she does not think not having the fence is an option. She said there are people, bicycles, train tracks, etc.

Ms. Rhor then agreed they should discuss the material of the fence.

Ms. Briggs said there are not really any other options besides vinyl chain link, since it is the least expensive.

Ms. Lockett said she thinks they should still explore other fences.

Mr. Gable said black vinyl chain link is the standard the city uses.

Ms. Rhor asked if they should suggest City Park standards for benches.

Mr. Gable said they do not have a standard backless bench.

Ms. Slavick questioned why it needs to be backless. She said she personally prefers a bench with a back.

Ms. Rhor said that they should include a condition that when including furniture, city standards should be followed.

Ms. Klavon said landscaping should use indigenous plant material that is low maintenance and maintenance free.

Ms. Rhor asked if there should be a plan in the future for replanting.

Ms. Klavon said there is not going to be one. She said the plants need to be really durable and really low maintenance.

Ms. Rhor reiterated Ms. Slavick's point that the plantings in the park should refer to the ones around the sculpture.

Ms. Slavick said she does not want to add to the expense of this, but she would just like to see something that connects the park and sculpture more.

Ms. Lockett said the plan seems over-engineered. She asked if this was the most expensive dog park to date.

Ms. Klavon stated this is on slag, so they will have to improve the soil conditions.

Mr. Simpson said one of the needs for the cost is that new fill material will need to be brought in based on the geotechnical portion. He said basically it is all slag material which can contain contaminants, so it will require a soil cap on top. He said unfortunately this is expensive.

Ms. Briggs asked if this would be included in the earth work.

Mr. Simpson said yes. He said the soil cap will prevent any contaminants such as lead from rising to the surface.

Ms. Rhor stated they should discuss the shade pavilions.

Ms. Klavon said she wondered why they needed these in the first place.

Ms. Slavick said she thinks they should match the benches and furniture in some way. Ms. Slavick said that during the winter it would be especially nice to have some shelter, so she asked if there could be some other material besides cloth that could stay up year round.

Ms. Rhor asked if they would require signage during Final Approval.

Mr. Brown asked Ms. Turner if the signage had been designed yet, since he knows there have been talks on this.

Ms. Turner said no, but they would go with whatever the standards DPW sets for signage, so they can be consistent throughout all of their parks.

Ms. Briggs said that in reading the drawing there is no entryway from the river side, and asked if this was correct.

Ms. Klavon said this is a steep grade on this edge.

Ms. Briggs said a lot of people will be coming from the path and not driving to the dog park.

Mr. Simpson said the reason there is no entrance is because there is no sidewalk on this side, and also the steep grade. He said it is not possible to make it ADA accessible, let alone it would be difficult for anyone to enter in this location.

Ms. Briggs said fair enough.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to make a motion on the project.

Ms. Rhor moved to first separate the two proposals, the first being Final Approval for Tim Kaulen's sculpture installed in Southside Park, and the second being Conceptual Approval for the dog park on the Southside with conditions.

Ms. Rhor said that when she was referring to the landscaping, she meant for the entire Southside Park, which includes the sculpture, and not just the dog park. She clarified and said she is moving for Final Approval of installing Mr. Kaulen's sculpture in Southside Park, and for Conceptual Approval for the entire landscaping of Southside Park including the area surrounding the sculpture.

MOTION: To grant final approval for the installation of Tim Kaulen's Two Steel Workers Sculpture in Southside Park, and to grant Conceptual Approval for the entire landscaping of Southside Park including the area surrounding Tim Kaulen's sculpture with the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant revisit the height of the fence, and state more clearly the materials that will be used for the fence.**
- 2. The park furniture for Final Approval returns with specific examples following City standards whenever possible.**
- 3. The final plan should also come with a specific planting plan using indigenous materials that are durable, and whenever possible, try to create a visual consistency for the plantings to allow for a more visually cohesive plan.**
- 4. Specific plans and examples of the shade pavilions that match or at least create a visual consistency with the rest of the park furniture be provided.**
- 5. Signage must be included in the final packet.**

MOVED: Rhor

SECONDED: Briggs

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- e. Lawrenceville Streetscape Planter Project: Final Approval
 - o Maya Henry, Lawrenceville Corporation

Mr. Brown explained that this project came before to the Art Commission very early in its process, and the Commission gave artist selection advice. Therefore, this group was now seeking Final Approval, having at this time selected the artist.

Ms. Maya Henry introduced herself as the Business District Manager at the Lawrenceville Corporation. She said they first brought this project for artist designed streetscape planters to the Art Commission in April for Conceptual Approval. She said that since April, they released their RFQ in which they received eight submissions, and appointed a six-member selection committee of business owners who have experience in art and design, a gallery owner, a plate designer, and Lawrenceville residents who are involved in art and design. The six member selection committee reviewed the eight proposals, and selected three artists to interview, and two artists were selected for an honorarium to present preliminary designs

that would include preliminary materials, budget information, and location suggestions. She said they also asked the artists how their designs would withstand weather and vandalism. After this, Will Schlough was chosen as the artist for the project.

Ms. Henry stated that Mr. Schlow has had extensive experience creating public art in many different areas. The committee also felt his design best fit the mission for the project, and were confident it could withstand vandalism and harsh weather conditions.

Mr. Will Schlow introduced himself as the artist for the Lawrenceville streetscape planters. He showed the Commission a few of his initial sketches for the project. He said he understood that the design of the planters needed to be something more than what you could buy, but at the same time, still function as a planter. He said he did not want the sculptures to overpower the plants put in them. He said he tried to create a design that would speak to this history of the old mill industry. He also wanted to create a green design that would reference the old smokestacks. These would have plants growing out of them instead of pollution however.

Mr. Schlow said the materials used would be laid brick, which would make it sturdy and heavy, on top of a concrete base. They would have a plastic tub that would be designed for many things, including planters, inserted into the top of a ledge that would be built into the brickwork. Then there would be soil and flowers on top. He said they will also incorporate cast iron soot doors into the brickwork, which will help speak to the concept of the old smokestacks, as opposed to them just being brick cylinders. He said these inserts are necessary to accommodate for freezing temperatures.

Ms. Henry stated that one comment they definitely heard from the Art Commission in April was that the locations should not interfere with the existing uniqueness of the architecture or the planters already in the streetscape that business owners were utilizing. Therefore, they looked at taking locations that do not engage as well with the streetscape and do not have a lot of greening already. She said in this particular location, they do have a relationship with the property owner to try to open the area up slightly. She said this was a way to draw people to an area that would not normally be a pleasant pedestrian experience.

Ms. Henry said they are just finalizing getting Mr. Schlow a studio location in Lawrenceville. As part of the project, they are going to have a day where the community can come and observe the construction of a planter. Based on selection committee feedback, they will be reaching out to some local union masonry groups to see if they can engage some masons out in the neighborhood to possibly be involved in the fabrication stage.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Slavick said she noticed on one of the drawings that there are doors on two sides of the planter.

Ms. Henry said there will be doors on both sides of all of the planters. She said the doors would face both the pedestrian and the street. She said Lawrenceville Corporation works very closely with Public Works, and own their own trash cans and banners. She said they know that DPW will have to conduct site assessments for each of the planter sites, and they are very familiar with this process. She said each property and business owner who will be maintaining the planter will be applying for an encroachment permit from the city.

Ms. Briggs asked who exactly will fabricate the planters.

Ms. Henry said the artist.

Ms. Briggs asked Mr. Schlow if he has any masonry experience.

Ms. Schlow said he has not built anything like this before, but he has done a lot of restoration work at friends' houses where he has replaced chimneys. He said he believes he has enough knowledge to at least get the process started. He said they have just increased the budget, so there is a possibility of hiring additional people on, but initially he would be the one fabricating them.

Ms. Henry added this is also why they will have a local mason work in the preliminary stage with the artist.

Ms. Briggs said as an aside the American Masonry Federation runs a masonry camp on Deer Island which is fully funded.

Mr. Schlow said he is also meeting with experts to make sure everything with the design looks good.

Ms. Briggs said that would have been a good idea to do before coming for Final Approval.

Ms. Briggs then stated that from the drawings the planters are 36" in diameter, and the actual bin they go in is 28", so there is 8" between the outside and inside diameter. She asked if there was a physical gap between the plastic and the brick.

Mr. Schlow said he is splitting the brick so that he can have the header side out, which will minimize the gap between the mortar joint. He said the gap between the 36" and the 28" will just be half the brick. He said it is possible to also split the bricks into thirds to even further minimize that joint and make the outside each more like a 32-33". He said as far as between the planters and the tub, there will not be any gap to speak of.

Ms. Briggs said she only asked this question because people like to throw garbage in these kinds of places. She asked if the door could be opened in theory.

Mr. Schlow said they believe it may be best for the doors to be kept shut, because they do not want this to become an area where people do throw trash.

Ms. Briggs asked how water will run out of the planter.

Mr. Schlow acknowledged the concrete base is solid in the current design, but it is more likely that it will be in the shape of a donut. He said this will then allow drainage through the tub, and allow the water to move through the planter as well.

Ms. Briggs said there is nothing in the application that indicates where these planters are going, or what the phased proposals are.

Ms. Slavick asked if the planter location was discussed with each business owner of the property sites.

Ms. Henry said they were waiting to show the property owners the final design, so it is hard to know at what point they wanted to get agreements with them. She said they are thinking in terms of having the planters as artist designed amenities, but they are also thinking of strategic places to site them. She said a site plan is something they can submit at a later date.

Mr. Brown stated this would also have to be negotiated with Public Works as well.

Ms. Briggs then added that the width of the planter and how it sits on the sidewalk has not been as well considered as it could be.

Ms. Rohr asked who would be maintaining the planters.

Ms. Henry said the way the project was conceived, the property or business owner would become the steward of the individual planters. She said they would also decide what the plantings would be.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Gable if he thought the Law Department would want the city to enter into a License and Maintenance agreement with Lawrenceville Corporation, and hold Lawrenceville Corporation responsible for maintenance oversight.

Mr. Gable said possibly. He said the encroachment permit might take care of it.

Mr. Brown said this is something they can figure out. He also stated that with tree pits that were put in last year, there was an issue with people parking their cars and having trouble opening their doors. He said he could see the same issue happening with the planters. He said he really thinks the iron doors on the planters should be welded shut.

Ms. Henry agreed.

Mr. Gable said he was also going to mention the doors for the same liability issues as Mr. Brown. He said it also does not look good, and encourages people to throw debris in there. He then asked if the planters would be up year round.

Ms. Henry said yes.

Mr. Gable asked what they will do in the winter.

Ms. Henry said this will be up to the property owner. She said if some of them want them to be dormant during the winter, the planters in themselves are interesting enough to allow this.

Mr. Gable said that during the winter months, this is when the planters are more prone to being trash receptacles. He said this could be prevented just by placing something green in them.

Ms. Lockett said you can even cover them up. She said she thinks the element itself is really decorative.

Mr. Brown said he believed having a license and maintenance agreement to hold one party accountable would be better than having 32 different encroachment licenses.

Ms. Klavon said that she again does not support this project, and does not believe that Lawrenceville needs planters. She said she has said this before. She said they are adding something else to the streetscape, when they have showed tree grades that they are not even taking care of. She said there is no way anyone is going to take care of these planters, and they will be dormant in both the summer and winter.

Ms. Klavon then added that the designs they had originally showed were very contemporary, and this new design was nothing like the originals. She said she did not believe they were showing the planters in context with their trashcans which are very large. She said she also does not think the planters suit the design for the rest of their Lawrenceville logo and branding. She said she did not know why they wanted to spend money on these planters when they are such a maintenance nightmare. She asked why not put the money toward adding more trees to the pits that are already there.

Ms. Henry said in their community meetings, they identified a need for more green-scape. She said the business owners wanted to have planters where they could grow flowers and plants to essentially beautify the streetscape.

Ms. Klavon said the planters are so hard to maintain and keep the plants watered and healthy throughout the year. She said they need constant upkeep. She said they are asking the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy to remove their planters from the streetscape in Downtown, except for strategic locations. She said she thinks there is a better way to use the money than planters.

Ms. Klavon said she will not support this project.

Ms. Ismail pointed out the planters are something the community agreed to have. She said she wanted to make the Committee aware that there was a laborious and intense process to involve the community.

Ms. Lockett said that in comparison to the planters Downtown, there is a lot more activity in Lawrenceville, especially in the evening. She said she respectfully disagreed with Ms. Klavon.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of the project.

Ms. Lea Donatelli from the Office of Public Art stated she wanted to speak on behalf of the project. She said she is a Lawrenceville resident and the Chair of the Public Art Committee of the Lawrenceville Planning Team. She said that when they began discussing public art ideas with the community, there was a real want to do something other than a mural. This is when they came up with an idea to do something along the streetscape. Ms. Donatelli said many business owners already having their own versions of planters along the street, are very excited by this idea of having an artist-designed planter.

Ms. Donatelli added that she was very excited by the way the Lawrenceville Corporation handled the artist selection process. As part of the selection committee herself, she said she and the committee were all very excited about Mr. Schlow's concept for the planters. She said she looks forward to seeing these planters in her neighborhood. She said the business owners who will be engaged in maintaining them will be very excited about the planters. She said she is very supportive of this project.

Ms. Rhor said that in the last meeting, they wanted Lawrenceville Corporation to really broaden their scope for who they were finding as artists. She said she was surprised by the low number of entries and submissions for this project. She asked where this call to artists went out to.

Ms. Henry said they sent the RFQ locally out to their lists, and posted it on their website and Facebook page. She said it was also featured in an article in PopCity Magazine, and sent out on the Greater Pittsburgh Arts Council listserv.

Ms. Donatelli said this is called the “Artist’s Opportunities” listserv, and it goes out to about 2,900 people. She also pointed out that this is a small budget for what will be a very time intensive project for the artist.

Ms. Henry said they have been able to allocate more funds to the project. Originally they had a budget of only \$12,000.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss the project.

Ms. Slavick said she hears Ms. Klavon’s concerns, but feels there is a big difference between Downtown and Lawrenceville. She said she is optimistic that people who have something right in front of their business will have more incentive to take care of it.

Ms. Klavon said she really liked the original planter designs Lawrenceville displayed in the April meeting. She said the planters fit contextually with the buildings and were organic. She said it was not this plopping of things down. Ms. Klavon said she also gives Lawrenceville a lot of credit for their community process and inclusion of artists, but she feels they already have a lot of visual clutter in their streetscapes and this only adds to that.

Ms. Briggs said she agrees with Ms. Klavon entirely. She said this was not a negative criticism to the artist or the folks in Lawrenceville. She said first, she would be very hard-pressed to call this a “public art” project. She said this is an industrial design project with street furniture. She said she believes that public projects that are not exceptional because the budget is small, in her personal opinion, need to stop coming to the Art Commission and the City of Pittsburgh. She said she would rather see one, really well-funded, beautifully executed public art project, instead of four, totally underfunded, executed in a mediocre way. She said this is not a criticism to the Lawrenceville Corporation, because they can only make so much money, and do so much with the money they have.

Ms. Briggs said she also fundamentally disagrees with artist and artisan made industrial pieces. She said asking an artist to create a permanent piece, when years of research go into the selection of materials alone, is a backwards approach. She said that if she were looking to relocate to Lawrenceville, these kitschy designs, not to criticize the artist, would drive her nuts. She said it would make her think that Pittsburgh is the kind of place that is not looking forward in a contemporary way. She said there is nothing wrong with looking back to steel, but they have got to start looking forward.

Ms. Briggs said she believes they need to work out all the kinks before the planters come to the Commission for Final Approval. She said if they had also come today with 15 letters from businesses stating, “Yes, I want this design in front of my store,” that would add to the argument that there is a lot of community support. Right now, she said, this layer is a bit unconvincing.

Ms. Rhor said she is not as opposed to the project as Ms. Klavon or Ms. Briggs, but she does have a reservation about the total number of planters. She asked how many there would be.

Ms. Henry answered 30.

Ms. Rhor said she does think this could benefit from having some buy-in from the business residents with letters saying they will maintain it. She said she is more hopeful than Ms. Klavon is in terms of the kind of buy-in you can get in Lawrenceville, and she feels this will not be as big a problem as it could be elsewhere. She then stated she does think the planters are a bit overloaded in the terms of the number, but in terms of the design, she said she thinks these can still be an interesting element.

Ms. Rhor said that in thinking about Tim Kaulen’s piece and this piece, there is a dominate motif that is happening. She said this motif is seen in a lot of the projects that come before the Art Commission.

Ms. Briggs said, in her opinion, unfortunately.

Ms. Rhor said her biggest concern is just having an overload of the motif with the total number of proposed planters. Ms. Rhor said she is not opposed to the planters, and she really likes the community support.

Ms. Slavick said in response to Ms. Brigg's statement, community members are not likely to pool their money together for a major single project, because where would their money go and which neighborhood would it serve. She said in an ideal world, this would be nice if they had money to commission forward-looking pieces. However, from what she has heard about the process, they have gone through the artist selection process in the correct way, and there is community buy-in, whether commissioners like it or not.

Ms. Klavon said this is their job, they are the subjective body. Ms. Klavon said they did do the process right, but she is sorry, the outcome and result of the process is not that great.

Ms. Lockett said let's not forget there were some highly educated people who were involved in the selection committee that are part of the community of Lawrenceville. She said instead of being dismissive, she asked the Commission not to forget about this process and the people involved.

Ms. Briggs said just because there has been a good process, does not mean that by de facto it is going to yield the highest quality product. She said they are looking at the product, and she would call this a very low quality street furniture product. She added she is not trying to take away from the artist or the community members' involvement. She said she would be more convinced if an actual mason had come forward with the design.

Ms. Slavick said she disagrees with the notion that artists are incapable of masonry design.

Ms. Briggs said she was referring to Mr. Schlow's inexperience. She said if this were Tim Kaulen, it would be a different story. Ms. Briggs said that she finds Mr. Schlow's design very backward looking.

Ms. Briggs asked the artist if he had gone over the design with any mentors, former faculty, or other artists and designers, and did he receive critical feedback.

Mr. Schlow said he has received a lot of feedback from old teachers and friends involved in brickwork.

Ms. Klavon said she has seen a number of brick planters crumble in her lifetime.

Mr. Gable said he agrees, but maintenance-wise, DPW is not maintaining them.

Mr. Brown said that normally they would have a license and maintenance agreement with Lawrenceville Corporation and they would maintain it. He said if they do not maintain them, they will have to be removed.

Ms. Lockett asked if they had given any thought to staining brick.

Mr. Schlow said not particularly.

Ms. Henry asked if they could bring back some of the documents the Art Commission had been referring to at a later date when they are a bit further along with the process. She said it is hard to know when to take something to the community if the design will change substantially.

Ms. Slavick asked if in the license and maintenance agreement there could be something in addition to maintaining the planter themselves, to having the other party agree to keep something attractive in the planters. She asked is there a way to keep someone responsible for keeping these planters filled and looking attractive. She asked if they could also have drawings that were true to scale that would have the actual circumference and diameter of the planter on the actual sidewalk.

Ms. Slavick also stated that the originally inspiration for the design, the smokestack, is a much more slender, elegant form than the current design. She wondered if it could just be attenuated a little bit more to take up less room on the sidewalk.

Mr. Gable said it has to be a certain width to allow ADA access on the sidewalk.

Ms. Klavon asked if they have to be brick.

Ms. Briggs said that it is very difficult to move brick structures, so either they will have to make them all on site, or they will have to move them. She said if they are planning on transporting them, she encouraged them to put a lot of thought in how to move them stably.

Ms. Luckett said she thinks they should also evolve the design they have today into something more elegant.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to make a motion.

Ms. Briggs moved to deny with conditions.

MOTION: To deny final approval of the project as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) **The applicant shall provide evidence from individual business owners stating they will maintain the planter in front of his or her property.**
- 2) **The applicant further consider alternate design iterations of the current smokestack design or other organic design. (Simpler, and less squat)**
- 3) **The applicant further consider whether it should use “real” brick as the material for the planters.**

***The Commission also waives the 3 month waiting period for this project under the rules of denial with conditions.**

MOVED: Briggs

SECONDED: Rhor

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- f. Squirrel Hill Banners: Conceptual and Final Approval
 - o Mardi Isler, SHUC Gateway Committee

Mr. Brown pointed out that Mardi Isler from the SHUC Gateway Committee would not be presenting the Squirrel Hill Banners during this meeting.

I. Meeting Adjourned