

**ART COMMISSION**

Minutes of the meeting Wednesday, July 23, 2014  
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

**PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:** Indovina, Lockett, Slavick

**PRESENT OF THE STAFF:** Morton Brown  
Mike Gable

**AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1. <b>ExteNet Proposed Distributive Antenna Systems</b>	<b>1</b>
2. <b>Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium, New Food Service Building and Restaurant</b>	<b>2</b>

**A. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

April and May minutes were approved.

**B. Correspondence**

Mr. Brown presented two letters of support for the Zoo project.

**C. Items for Review**

- 1. ***ExteNet Proposed Distributive Antenna Systems (Final)***  
***Michael Bortz***

Mr. Bortz reminded the commission that they had presented in June, and based on those conversations they went back and redesigned the poles based on the art commission's comments. He explained that the team had gone back and redesigned the bases and collers dependant on the archetecural nature of the neighborhoods where they will be placed.

Mr. Indovina commended the group on taking the effort to redesign the nodes.

Mr. Gable expressed that they might want to double check the design of the Point State Park node, and that the since this is a state park they might need to seek support from state as City has no purview.

**MOTION:**      **Final Approval**  
**MOVED BY**      Slavick  
**IN FAVOR**        All  
**OPPOSED**        None

**SECONDED BY**      Lockett

**CARRIED**

## **2. Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium, New Food Service Building and Restaurant (Courtesy Briefing)**

*Charles C. Coltharp, Principal, Indovina Associates Architects*

Mr. Astorino recused himself and left the hearing room, as his firm is involved in the project design. Ms. Lockett assumed the role of Acting Chair of the Commission in his stead.

Mr. Cartieri, of the Pittsburgh Zoo, explained that the goal of this project is to enhance visitor's views in the seating area, as well as expand food options. He then introduced Mr. Coltharp.

Mr. Coltharp explained the project, where the goal was to provide better views and use more natural materials and conserve energy.

Mr. Brown asked if the thatched roof and siding materials were used elsewhere in the park.

Mr. Coltharp responded that it was. He explained that the roof was designed to hide the mechanical/HVAC equipment.

Ms. Slavick asked if the hardy plank was natural.

Mr. Coltharp explained that it's a durable cement material.

Ms. Lockett asked why the rendering was scaled back.

Mr. Coltharp explained that at the much steeper height, there was a lot of area that was being heated and cooled for no reason, so it was more energy efficient to scale the roof back. He further stated that in reality, the views are not as dramatic as they look in the drawings.

Ms. Lockett asked if there would be signage in the area.

Mr. Coltharp said that there would be directional signage, including free standing, and also on the building. The graphics department handles projects of that nature.

Ms. Slavick asked if the proximity to the animals causes an influx of bugs to the food, and if the zoo had done research into where these food plaza is placed in relation to other zoos.

Mr. Coltharp said that the food plaza is strategically placed near the center of the zoo. Most zoos locate their food so that there is a view of an animal area. He said that the biggest complaint is about the birds that live in the canopy area, and that they steal food.

Ms. Lockett asked what the lighting at night was light.

Mr. Coltharp said that it's more of a mood lighting, as the zoo is generally not open to the public at night. The zoo is mostly open at night for event rentals.

Ms. Slavick asked what things they had done in this design to reduce the carbon footprint.

Mr. Coltharp said that generally there are many things that the zoo has done in this vein, but in terms of this building, they were looking at the scale in terms of what exactly needs to be under a roof. Operationally, the consultants look at all that can be done on the food side,

including recyclable products versus linens and real silverware. On the building, many of the parts are made of bamboo, the rock is a regional material. The hardy board is the only product that doesn't necessarily fit into that mission. He further explained that in their botanical gardens they had tried to replace this type of product with something more sustainable, however they are spending a lot of money in the replacement and upkeep of that product when it may have likely been more environmentally friendly to go with a more durable product in the first place.

Ms. Luckett asked what the size difference between the existing building and the proposed building.

Mr. Coltharp said that this building will be converted to do what the two existing buildings already do.

Mr. Gable expressed his support for the project, but would ask that the Zoo follows through with the lease agreement that was issued by the Engineer and Construction formerly, now the Bureau of Transportation and Engineering. This agreement can then be considered a letter of support.

Ms. Luckett asked about the landscaping.

Mr. Coltharp said that the zoo has a horticulturalist on staff, so that scope is not part of the proposed project. He explained that the landscaping on the rendering is just for graphical purposes. They will be investigating keeping as much of the existing plant material as possible. They will bring more details about the landscaping when they return.

**MOTION:     Courtesy, no motion**

**Meeting Adjourned**