ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF May 27, 2009
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: **Indovina, Astorino, Hall, Serrao, Haskell**

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

A. <u>Approval of Meeting Minutes</u>

Mr. Indovina asked for approval of minutes. The minutes for April, 2009 were accepted and approved.

B. <u>Correspondence</u>

Mr. Brown noted no correspondence.

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

a. Mellon Park Walled Garden Restoration

- Susan Rademacher, Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
- Natalie Byrd, LaQuatra Bonci Architects
- Renee Piechocki, Office of Public Art

Susan Rademacher of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy introduced herself. On behalf of the Conservancy and the partners, she stated that they appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Commission for the final review of Mellon Park Walled Garden Restoration, in memory of Ann Katherine Seamans.

Ms. Rademacher briefly explained slides from previous Art Commission hearing about the location of Mellon Park and the Walled Garden within it. The Walled Garden was specifically created for weddings, designed as spring garden. They developed the plants with input from several entities, including Department of Public Works, Citiparks, community and Phipps Conservatory.

Ms. Rademacher then introduced the following speaker, Natalie Byrd and Renee Piechocki.

Natalie Byrd, of LaQuatra Bonci Architects, explained the construction review of the Garden. She stated that the Park is partly restored at this time, and proceeded to walk through slides of the proposed new renovations.

Ms. Byrd stated that the frog will be moved to the north end of the park and explained that since the frog was so loved and known by the community, Elizabeth Seamans suggested having a community event for the moving of the Frog.

Ms. Byrd reviewed the Garden plan, which is similar to the one presented conceptually (formerly). She stated that since the last presentation, they refined it and included details as a construction package.

Ms. Byrd demonstrated location of four seating areas and trees. Planting beds were pulled back and historical tree lines were brought back. Observation areas were added and the lawn will contain the artwork – “stars”(by Janet Zweig). The sandstone terrace and seating will also be brought back to original shape.

Ms. Byrd stated that they have an existing condition plan, which they will work with the City to decide what to keep, throw away and give to others. She showed the excavation plan, in which they excavated the lawn that has a profile similar to the Schenley Plaza.

The artwork “stars” will be presented separately in the coming months. Currently, they have decided upon the foundation and structures of the “stars”, and they have included details such as benches and paving. They have been working with the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy on the planting plans. It was also reviewed and approved by Phipps. The Park will be set up with seasonal color and evergreen, that maintains the historic look that is not too modern.

Natalie Byrd then introduced Renee Piechocki. Renee Piechocki, Director of Office of Public Art, gave quick updates on public process.

Since last hearing with artist Janet Zweig, there have been lot of design team meetings, community meetings and stakeholder meetings. The most recent presentation on April 24 and 25 had received very good feedback. Overall the community meetings have discerned that the project is considered a good integration to the site and that it does not distract from the historical nature of the Garden.

There had been great collaboration between the artists and Ms Zweig is working on material tests such as the fiber optics and material disc. Ms Piechocki stated that the artists shall be back to the Arts Commission meeting in June or July.

Mr. Indovina asked if there are any comments from the Commission. Ms. Hall asked if there is signage planned for the site.

Ms. Rademacher stated that there is no separate signage in the garden. However, the center steps on the riser will be inscribed with “Mellon Park Wall Garden”. She added that there will be two plinths on either side of the steps that support reproduction urns. On the left plinth will be the inscription about the original designer and original construction date of the Garden. On the right will be the date of restoration and the inscription in memory of Ann Katherine Seamans. On the observatory rise, there will be an interpretory plaque that describes the artwork that will be further explained later by the Artist in a subsequent hearing.

Ms. Hall reconfirmed that the plaque will be part of the artist approval package.

Ms. Rademacher affirmed.

Mr. Indovina asked about the Park opening hours and the lighting operation time.

Ms. Rademacher explained that the Park is and will be opened from dawn to 11pm. Lightings will be set on timer and will be adjusted seasonally, so that it will be on at dusk and be off an hour before the Park is closed.

Mr. Astorino asked if this is the final approval.

Mr. Brown clarified that it is the final approval for the Mellon Park Walled Garden restoration, not the artwork. He stated that the artwork at either June or July.

Mr. Indovina asked if any audience would like to speak in favor or opposed.

Mr. Indovina asked if there is any comment from the audience. Mr. Indovina asked if there is any comment from the Commission. Mr. Serrao made final comment that it will be a great project. The Commission as a whole agreed.

MOTION: Project as presented received Final approval of project as submitted.

MOVED: Haskell **SECONDED: Serrao**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

b. Pittsburgh Center for the Arts Exhibit in Mellon Park

- Laura Domencic, Director of Pittsburgh Center for the Arts
- Tim Kaulen, Artist of *Garden of Earthly Delights*

Laura Domencic, director of Pittsburgh Center for the Arts, introduced herself and Tim Kaulen, *Artist of the Year 2009* for the Center. She stated that this is the conceptual and final review for temporary installation of Tim Kaulen and Sheila Klein's contemporary works at the Center.

Ms. Domencic briefly described the Center's mission and vision, which to advance the distinct excellence of the visual arts and across all media with film, video and photography. She stated that this project in particular would be a great way to extend the gallery space into a beautiful lawn.

The first project is Tim Kaulen's *Garden of Earthly Delight*, which would involve three works to be installed at the beginning of August, up through the late Spring. This would coincide with the interior exhibition from September 25 to the early part of November.

The *Garden of Earthly Delight* is a set of three large-scale art pieces that are site-specific. They will be located at the main lawn in front of the fifth avenue. The material includes the reclaimed steel, plastics. There are fair amount of community support, collaborating with Manchester Craftsman Guild and volunteers of different organizations. They have been also consulting with Messaro Construction Company as far as the actual engineering.

The work is a reflection on the ongoing fascination of relationship between sculpture and the architecture in the urban landscape. The work consists of a lot of different recycled material that invite public interaction and response.

Ms. Domencic explained the first piece, *Tin Duck*. It is based on nostalgic tin toys, with a 10' height and 12' profile. It has a concrete base of 2' x 2' and there are topiary elements that are removable. The second piece, *Giraffe*, is similar to the first piece with 12' height and the concrete base. There are topiary elements that can be removed to take care of. The third piece is *Horseman*, with a 10' height with concrete base.

Ms. Domencic showed the exact location where the three pieces are on a map, and she showed scale views of the pieces.

The second project is Sheila Klein's *Bitmap Bonnet*. Ms. Klein is also the artist working on the East Liberty Pedestrian Bridge. Through the collaboration with the Glass Center, there is an interior exhibition of her work, as well as an outdoor piece.

The *Bitmap Bonnet* acts as stage, a confessional, a sunshade, a soapbox, and a refuge, where viewers will be invited to enter into the space. It is 11.5" height 8" width and 11.5" long, and it will be located in front of the Scaife building along Shady Avenue in the large lawn.

Ms. Domencic showed pictures of the piece, which is currently located in Washington State. The fabric is a mesh that allows wind to pass through and it will be anchored 12" into the ground.

Mr. Serrao questioned on the color of the first project and the fabric sample and color of the second project.

Ms. Domencic stated that there are actual images in the package, and explained that that is the color of the fabric.

Ms. Haskell asked about the wheels, whether it will serve the moving purpose.

Ms. Domencic said it will be more likely to be a visual element.

Mr. Kaulen stated that he would like them to be functional in terms of transportation but he did not intend to have movable parts and they will be bolted into the earth with concrete base.

Ms. Hall asked if there is any philosophy in setting the height and location of the piece.

Ms. Domencic stated that the sloped area will allow *Horseman* to exaggerate the height. *Tin Duck* and *Giraffe* are located at a flat plain area that allows a good view from the street. She stated that they intended to have a cluster that created a large visual impact.

Ms. Hall asked about the planting material and the color of the plants since the sculpture will be installed after the planting season. She also asked about the planting proportion to the sculpture.

Mr. Kaulen stated that the planting material will be a variety of plants, including grasses, dogwood shrubs, and native plants. He stated that Bidwell Center and Manchester have been helping him with student support to raise the plants in the summer. He also stated that the color of the plants will be selected based on the seasons. In terms of the planting proportion, he will allow *Tin Duck* and *Horseman* to have their own shape, but the planting will work as anatomy of the *Giraffe.*

Ms. Haskell asked if the plants can be changed over the seasons and who will be responsible for watering the plants.

Mr. Kaulen stated that the plants will be changed over the seasons and there are permanent baskets that are implanted to the sculpture. The plants can be rotated and they will be nurtured during the Fall and Winter seasons. For maintenance, he stated that they are working with a few community groups as community engagement. However, as the total plant area is only 30 square feet, he suggested that it will not be an enormous concern.

Ms. Haskell asked if the plants for *Horseman* and *Giraffe* represent the manes.

Mr. Kaulen said yes in two of the sculptures, but in the duck, the planting sits as more of a planter.

Ms. Hall asked if it is possible to have a cost-efficient method of PCA installing permanent concrete bases and re-using them, instead of the temporary concrete base, since they have been doing this on regular basis.

Ms. Domencic stated that they are considering to have concrete bases in place permanently, so that they artworks can anchored to them directly.

For Sheila's piece with 12" deep armature, Ms. Hall asked if it was engineered.

Ms. Domencic stated that the depth is exactly the same as the artwork in Washington.

Mr. Astorino asked if the fabric will be lifted off by wind.

Ms. Domencic stated that there are holes in the fabric and the artwork is currently worked in a very windy area.

Ms. Hall asked about the lighting elements.

Ms. Domencic stated that it is dependant on funding, but the pieces should be illuminating from the buildings.

Mr. Indovina asked if the pictures are accurate in representing the real works.

Mr. Kaulen stated that those are his inspiration sources and they do not realistically represent the shapes, but do reflect the contour and color of the works.

Mr. Indovina asked if it is a silhouette-typed piece and he asked if the curves are one dimension. He also questioned the color of the works.

Mr. Kaulen stated that it is primarily silhouette-typed. The curves are extracted from smoke stock, which is not spherical and comprised of two body panels to incorporate the shape. For the color of the works, Mr. Kaulen stated that he is still developing the pieces to create a playful, fun and colorful idea. He stated that he is currently considering attaching other mosaic types.

Since the pieces are made of plate steel, and the concrete bases are very heavy, Mr. Indovina asked if the bases have been engineered, which he thought should be a requirement.

Mr. Kaulen stated that since the scale of the works is very big, he assured that the scale would not increase, and that if anything, the scale will only be reduced and he will comply with the requirement to engineer the bases.

Mr. Indovina asked if there is anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor of the project.

Elizabeth Seamans, a community member, stood up and stated that she was delighted with this project and thought that is would be well-accepted by the community.

Mr. Indovina stated concern that this is an ambitious project to be installed and de-installed within a short amount of time. Why the short time period?

Ms. Domencic stated that they do not want permanent sculpture because they will consider other works to come in at a later time. However, she stated that they might consider having one as a permanent piece.

Mr. Astorino asked if the artist had already started any of the pieces.

Mr. Kaulen stated that he had started *Tin Duck* and he is confident that he could be productive in the coming two months. He also invited the Commission members to have a tour to see the progress of the production.

Ms. Haskell asked if the artist is working on site.

Mr. Kaulen stated that he shared a work site in Hazelwood and the works will be built there.

Mr. Astorino stated that they were only reviewing on faith because the works have not yet been created, and that he cannot see a complete rendering showing the exact proposed designs.

Mr. Serrao agreed that it would be helpful to understand what the pieces will look like before granting approval.

Mr.Astorino suggested that a maquette or rendering providing more exact design details be provided before approval is given.

Ms. Haskell also suggested to have photos the progression of the pieces in the studio so as to give the Commission a better since of scale and form of the work.

Mr. Kaulen stated that he will be glad to provide a rendering if that helps the Commission's understanding.

Ms. Domencic stated that the artist has a link on his website with documented photos of his work.

Ms. Hall asked about the location of the works after the temporary exhibition at PCA.

Ms. Domencic stated that she was still working on it and she was considering having them permanently at some local sites, such as public organizations or schools. She stated that the works are large pieces and are a big commitment.

Mr. Indovina responded that it would be nice to install them permanently somewhere else in the city once they are de-installed at PCA.

Ms. Domencic agreed and also stated that Mike Gable approved the placement of the sculpture.

Mr. Astorino and Mr. Serrao stated that it was necessary for Mr. Kaulen to provide photographs of the works in progress and either renderings and/or maquettes of the proposed finished sculptures before the Commission can grant final approval.

MOTION: To grant conceptual approval for *Garden of Earthly Delight* at the Pittsburgh Center for the Arts, pending final approval next month with submission of details on more visual information. To grant conceptual and final approval on *Bitmap Bonnet* as submitted.

MOVED: Serrao **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

c. Frick Museum Signage

- Bill Kolano, Kolano Design

Bill Kolano, of Kolano Design introduced himself and stated that he was tasked few months ago to come up with a new signage master plan for the Frick site.

Mr. Kolano first provided a quick overview of the site. He stated that there are gated entry pylons along South Homewood Avenue. By walking down Reynolds Street, one could view the sign adjacent to the entry pylons on the left.

Mr. Kolano stated that when the sign was brought to City Planning in January, they were told that the sign is within code and could apply for a permit. He stated that since that time there had been a clarification of ownership of the property. He explained that the Frick technically owned all parcels of land except the parcel that encompasses the front building along Reynolds which is owned by the City.

Mr. Kolano stated that Mr. Brown suggested this project be brought to the Art Commission for informational purposes and as a courtesy review.

Mr. Kolano described the sign. It is 32 square feet, with the exact type of limestone that the museum is made from and the blocks are of the exact size as before. On the side of the museum, it has chiseled lettering that is painted with gold leaf. He stated that pier caps are set on the existing low walls that surround the Frick site. In addition to that, two pylons will be placed at the entry.

Mr. Kolano presented few photos that were taken in the morning to show the sign structure and the construction progress. Ms. Hall asked if the sign was lit. Mr. Kolano stated that it was currently not. Instead, it was considered to have remote lighting because they wanted to impact the site as little as possible. He further stated that it was up to further review.

Mr. Indovina asked if that is a courtesy review. Mr. Brown explained that intially no one, including the Frick, knew that the frontage parcel was on City land until it was too late—the project had already begun. Therefore, it would be most appropriate to be considered as courtesy review with a voting approval.

MOTION: To grant courtesy review as submitted and built.

MOVED: Serrao **SECONDED: Hall**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

d. Morrow Park Master Plan and Gateway Sign

- Jonathan Kline, Principal, Studio for Spatial Practice LLC
- Janet Scullion, Bloomfield Citizen Council
- Patty Ladasky, Bloomfield Citizen Council

Jonathan Kline of the Studio for Spatial Practice introduced himself and stated that he would like to start by clarifying what they were asking for.

Mr. Kline stated that they were coming back for final approval on the master plan and for the sign at the southern tip of the park, which said “Morrow Park” and “Bloomfield”. He explained that elements of the master plan, including the small interpretive signage and banners, were not being presented for final approval because it was not within their scope of work. Mr. Kline stated that their goal is to locate those elements conceptually within the plan, but the actual look and content of those elements would be presented at a later date when they are designed.

Mr. Kline stated that the plan drawing was similar to the one presented previously in the conceptual review. He then stated the change to the gateway sign and gave more details on fabrication, materials, and vandalism prevention. Aesthetically, the color and size of the sign looks the same but it will be constructed and fabricated differently.

Originally, the sign was proposed as a low limestone flat wall with a series of cut metal letters that would be bolted to the top as free standing elements. As the Commission stated last time that these could be damaged easily, they were now proposing that the free standing letters would be cut out of an integral quarter inch steel plate.

The plate will serve as the background field for “Bloomfield”, and “Morrow Park” will be laser cut out of that same single plate. The letters will be powder-coated and will be integrally connected to the back plate.

With this design, Mr. Kline stated that the only vandalism concern will be the graffiti. The powder coating is suitable for removal of graffiti.

Mr. Kline further addressed the safety concern of people climbing on the structure, and he proposed to use surrounding plantings as a strategy to keep people away from it. That is, they will use a series of plantings to indicate pedestrians and park users not to stand there or to approach the sign.

Mr. Kline stated that banners will be set along with City-standard lighting poles. He stated that it is part of the master plan, but the content and actual design is not within their scope to design, therefore these elements of the plan will come back for Commission review when appropriate.

Ms. Hall asked if the banners were considered as part of the master plan, would approval of the master plan also approve banners as part of the master plan.

Mr. Kline explained that they were looking for approval to conceptually locate the banners, as part of the master plan. Mr. Brown further explained that the design and content of the banners is not established at this time.

Mr. Kline mentioned three small interpretive signs that were also not within their scope of work, and they were only seeking approval of the location of these signs within the park. As he was not the currently the designer of these signs, he was unable to provide any further information. He stated that the Bloomfield Citizen Council was working on the signs and they should be able present those to the Commission for final approval later during the summer.

Ms. Hall brought up a previous discussion about the sculpture. She asked if the sculpture is behind a tree, and whether the sculpture can be seen from the southern tip.

Mr. Kline explained that currently there is a smaller apple tree that is proposed to be removed, then replanted, therefore the sculpture cannot be seen very well under current condition and even after the re-planting, the sculpture will not be completely visible from the southern vantage point. He further explained that the majority of the design of the master plan is to enhance the environment of the sculpture. As the Morrow Park is a very small park, the monument is dominating and has a formal geometry in terms of the way it is laid out now.

Mr. Kline stated that they thought the geometry should be respected. It will be altered slightly in order to create some space around the monument, which will allow additional seats at the interior of the park, creating a closer relationship to the monuments.

Mr. Kline stated that almost everything they did is in a relationship to create a setting for the monument. Historically, there should be two more trees other than the existing apple trees. They were trying to maintain the condition of the trees because there is a historical significance of the apple trees from a song from World War II.

Mr. Indovina asked about the lighting.

Mr. Kline explained that they were having three kinds of light. Along Liberty Avenue, there are taller street lighting poles, which they were working with Mike Gable to reach the city standard for street lighting. Back in the park, there are shorter poles of a 14 foot height and a pair will be set at the entrance of Liberty Avenue. The third type of lighting will be three new uplights into the lawn and in front of the sign.

Ms. Haskell questioned the length of the benches.

Mr. Kline stated that the benches are historic City park benches that Public Works is trying to re-implement. The benches should be 6 feet long and they have an ornate metal piece that supports the sides and rises and cuts through the middle of the benches. This is a legitimate concern to add seats that are primarily for people who use the park as enjoyment, and disallow sleeping on the benches.

Ms. Haskell stated concerned about people harmed by the cutout metal letters when they try to climb up to the sign.

Mr. Kline stated that the metal will not be sharp on its edges. Injury would only be possible if someone rushed into the cutout metal. However, he stated that there is a lot of metal signage in public realm without incident and there are plantings to keep people away from the sign.

Mr. Serrao asked about the sign and he thought the words “Morrow Park” are almost invisible in comparison to the Frick sign. In terms of the letter size and the color, he thought “Morrow Park” should stand out visually.

Mr. Kline explained that the contrast between the signs will be stronger after the plantings are set. He also stated that they put “Morrow Park” on the top to reinforce it.

Mr. Serrao respectfully disagreed because he would read “Bloomfield” first, which might be caused by function of the red color of those letters as well as the typeface. Mr. Serrao stated that the sign is a difficult graphic to read.

Mr. Serrao stated that if you squint, one can only see Bloomfield, due to its size, placement and especially its red color. The Morrow Park letters in color, design and the way it is manufactured is technically and visually the background and therefore subservient to the Bloomfield letters.

Mr. Serrao used the Frick signage (formerly presented by Kolano in this hearing) as an example of letter height and color contrast to point out how in that sign, Frick is the most prominent idea presented among the subsequent lettering.

Mr. Kline stated that his clients had requested the sign to also function as Bloomfield gateway sign, but did perceive the hierarchy to be on Morrow Park, with a secondary attention on Bloomfield.

Ms. Hall asked if the priority for using the funding is the sign, not the park.

Mr. Kline explained that they are working on interior of the park as well, so he would not say there is a priority on the sign or the park.

Mr. Indovina asked to clarify that the Master Plan is reflected in the site plan provided and the gateway signage details.

Mr. Kline confirmed that point.

Ms. Hall asked if the flag pole had been in place in the previous plan, and if so, was it just not rendered in the previous design.

Mr. Kline explained that the flag pole was noted in text in the previous plan, but was not rendered in the elevations. The flagpole was a direct response to the Bloomfield community meeting. Almost everyone in the meeting voted to include a flag because it is important to the war memorial and historical nature of the park.

Ms. Hall stated that the war memorial, now, in her opinion is secondary to the sign.

Mr. Kline stated that perhaps that were true from the southern view perspective of this rendering, but also explained that the rendering was meant to emphasize the view of the sign and the flag, not the monument. However, from other point of view, this element will be secondary.

Mr. Indovina asked if someone will be responsible for putting up or lowering the flag.

Ms. Scullion stated that it would be unnecessary to lower the flag as long has you have it lighted at night.

Mr. Brown asked where the lighting for the flagpole would be located.

Mr. Kline stated that the lights would reside behind the sign.

Mr. Indovina asked if Mike Gable was considering implementing the plan, will there be more detailed construction drawings.

Mr. Kline explained they were not contracted to do the drawing but he did send out drawings for cost estimation. (He also provided simplified version of the drawing during the meeting). He explained that Public Works would carry through with the implementation based upon these drawings.

Mr. Brown referred back to Ms Hall's previous concern about the sightline of the sculpture. He stated that the flag pole that lines up with the sculpture might actually destroy the view of the sculpture from the southern perspective.

Mr. Kline explained that the sculpture can neither be seen currently nor after replacing the apple tree. However, once pedestrian passes the point of the triangle, the whole oblique view will emphasize the monument. He further stated that they intended to draw pedestrian's attention to the monument.

Mr. Kline explained their original scope of work for the Urban Redevelopment Authority was to develop an urban design study of the Liberty Avenue corridor and the park. After working with the community, it

evolved into more of a landscape renovation of the park and was beyond their scope of work. However, Mr. Kline stated that they are confident to handle this project.

Mr. Indovina stated that the master plan was thoughtfully done and he would like to have more details about the garbage receptacles, lighting, and fountain, before granting approval.

Ms. Ismail stated that those elements would need to meet the City standards.

Mr. Kline agreed and he stated he was currently working with Mike Gable to meet those standards.

Ms. Haskell asked if the lighting will only be set along the Liberty Avenue and not on Aiken.

Mr. Kline explained that the lighting will function more as park lighting than as continuous sidewalk light as in a business district.

Mr. Indovina commented on the symmetrical park layout in contrast to the asymmetrical lighting location.

Mr. Kline explained it is due to the cost-saving reason, and he asked if it would be more effective to set pair of lights at the entrances.

Mr. Indovina agreed.

Mr. Serrao suggested to pull the light into the park, so that there will be more tendency to light the park rather than the street.

Mr. Kline responded that they are willing to change because he agreed that other elements of the construction are enhancing this symmetry of the park.

Mr. Indovina asked for further comments from the Commission.

Mr. Indovina asked for comments from the audience.

Mr. Kolano asked if the sign is part of the larger branding strategy for Bloomfield, and added that a few months ago, he saw a project submitted to CDAP (of which he is a member), which proposed a sign of "Welcome to Bloomfield" at the new GetGo (Baum Boulevard) that intended to emphasize "Bloomfield". He stated that in any case there should be a consistent branding look among new and future signs in Bloomfield.

Ms. Scullion argued that the sign at the GetGo was not "Welcome to Bloomfield", but a sign that represents the historical part of Pittsburgh's auto row. She emphasized that it is not branding, but is meant to signify historic auto row and she mentioned several buildings in regard to their historical significance and the renovations that were soon coming to these historical structures. The GetGo sign is not part of any other signage effort in Bloomfield.

Ms. Hall asked if this signage should be part of a larger signage initiative, stating her concern about the overall look of the signage and banners in the area: Questioning the Morrow Park sign existing with the GetGo signage in proximity, or even in the same neighborhood without having a consistent look and feel.

Ms. Scullion stated that other "Bloomfield" signs are blocks away, which the business community did as designation of "Pittsburgh Little Italy". The sign in the Morrow Park aimed at patriotism and a credit to Morrow, who very few people have recognized.

Ms. Hall concerned whether the sign itself would be the best example of a gateway sign within the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Indovina asked if there was any thought of having consistent gateway signage at various gateway points of entry to Bloomfield.

Ms. Scullion stated that the “Pittsburgh Little Italy” theme was meant to establish Bloomfield as a destination of restaurants and shops. It is a very small business district of less than five blocks. Ms. Scullion mentioned that Lawrenceville has several gateway signs in the neighborhood, but none match that of the signage for Doughboy Square.

Mr. Serrao referred to the example of the Northside community signage initiative, which came in as a single package. He suggested if Bloomfield were looking to establish an identity, they should design a comprehensive neighborhood signage plan and present that to the Commission so that some consistency would develop in the signage aesthetic in the community.

Ms. Scullion stated that they were not intending to establish a signage program or further establish their identity. They have no hidden agenda to do so.

Mr. Serrao stated that the current design of the sign does not match Ms. Scullion’s intention. He stated that if Morrow Park is the priority of the sign, then Morrow Park should be more visually prominent in the sign. This is something that should be worked out. He also said that if there are to be any further signs, those signs should come to the Commission as a master plan for signage, and not submitted piecemeal.

Ms. Scullion stated that this is not heir intention, and they have no hidden agenda.

Ms. Serrao stated that he is not saying there is any hidden agenda, but that he sits on CDAP as well and that he too saw the GetGo signage presented and is now concerned that there is going to be further signage implemented without any aesthetic connectivity and/or consistency. He also pointed out that the GetGo sign also seemed to present Bloomfield as the priority, with the subservient historic auto row text.

Mr. Serrao stated again that the current Morrow Park design places a hierarchy of priority on Bloomfield and suggested that they work on that.

Ms. Scullion stated that this was not their intention.

Mr. Astorino agreed and he suggested clarifying whether it is “Morrow Park” or “Bloomfield Morrow Park” that is the message for this signage.

Ms. Scullion said there is a marriage here between the Park and the monument because the monument is a creation of grassroots people.

Ms. Haskell suggested different scale between the text of “Bloomfield” and “Morrow Park”.

Ms. Scullion stated that might be a solution.

Ms. Ladasky expressed her deep emotional connection with the park and Bloomfield.

Mr. Serrao agreed that there is a marriage between the Park and Bloomfield, but he suggested that something had to take the priority.

Mr. Indovina suggested that they might use different typeface, lighter in color, or smaller font size.
Mr. Serrao stated that if it is not the intention that this sign signify Bloomfield in highest priority, then the sign needs some work.

Ms. Scullion stated that that was not the intention of the sign.

Mr. Serrao and Ms Scullion both agreed that the sign needs some work.

Mr. Indovina asked if there was further comment from the audience.

Mr. Indovina asked if there was comment from the Commission.

Ms. Hall stated that she felt that the gateway sign should be put in the conceptual area of review with the interpretive signs and the banners. She stated that they were all part of sign package of the Park. That the master plan could receive final review today, but the signage package would have to come back for review when and if the designs for those is finished.

Mr. Indovina stated that today would be an approval for master plan, but not the construction of the Park.

MOTION 1: To grant Final Approval for the Morrow Park Master Plan with aforementioned changes to the lighting

MOVED: Hall **SECONDED: Astorino**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

MOTION 2: To grant conceptual approval for signage package, including gateway sign, interpretative signs, possibly banners and other signage that would identify the park and park elements.

MOVED: Hall **SECONDED: Serrao**

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None **CARRIED**

Meeting Adjourned