

## ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting Wednesday, March 25, 2015  
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

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

**PRESENT OF THE STAFF:** Ray Gastil  
Morton Brown  
Ben Carlise

### AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. <b>Faces of Hazelwood</b>	<b>1</b>
2. <b>Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Knoxville</b>	<b>3</b>
3. <b>Louis A. Venson Enrichment Park</b>	<b>3</b>
4. <b>Greenfield Bridge</b>	<b>4</b>

#### A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The January and February meeting minutes were approved, motioned by Slavick and seconded by Lockett.

#### B. Correspondence

A letter of support was presented from the Hazelwood Carnegie Library in support of the Faces of Hazelwood banner project. Carlise noted that there is not a letter of support from the Department of Public Works for that project, but the department does indeed support the project.

#### C. Items for Review

##### 1. ***Faces of Hazelwood (Conceptual and Final Approval)*** *Kate Hansen, Office of Public Art, and Darnell Chambers, artist*

Hansen presented the mission of the Artist in the Public Realm Residency Program at the Carnegie Library of Hazelwood. The residency is divided into two phases. The first phase allowed the artists to spend time with the community, to listen to the community, and participate in the community. The second phase is the realization of projects that are derived from the artists' time spent with the community and in collaboration with the community. Edith Abeyta was chosen as the lead artist for the program, and Darnell Chambers was chosen as a collaborating artist. Abeyta and Chambers spent the last several months hosting workshops and programs that introduce the community to creative pursuits. The artists are currently hosting community meetings to understand what projects the community would like to pursue and complete in their neighborhood.

The Faces of Hazelwood project is the most popular community choice.

Chambers explained the banners. He wanted to produce something that would represent the community. The banners will run along Second Avenue. They will be two sided banners, with text on one side and the image on the other. When driving by, you will be able to see faces or texts.

Slavick asked if the banners would be facing different directions, so drivers or pedestrians could see both text and images. Chambers said that they will be installed as such.

Luckett asked how many banners there will be. Chambers answered that there will be between 12 and 15 banners. He is still in contact with parents to receive approval for the images.

Luckett inquired about the diversity of the children: will the banners be diverse? Chambers responded that he has been in touch with the Hazelwood Initiative to increase the diversity, at the moment he only has been working with African American children.

Indovina asked about the time length of the project. The project will be installed for one year. Brown noted that the maximum permit is two years.

Mariann McCard, the library services manager at the Carnegie Library – Hazelwood, spoke in favor of the project. It is the first time that the library has been involved in a project like the residency program. The community is on board with the project – this project in particular really stood out. The community really connected with the banner project and see art as a way to express themselves.

Eric Stoller, program manager for The Heinz Endowments, spoke in favor of the project. The Heinz Endowments is the seed funder for the project and is thrilled with how it has worked out. The neighborhood has run with the opportunity in a really great way.

Gastil asked if the City law department was aware of the project. Hansen answered that Chambers will not be installing any banners without permits from the parents of all of the represented children. Brown noted that the City will require to see the waivers.

Luckett asked how Chambers came up with the background. Chambers answered that that is the view of the City he sees while walking down Second Avenue. The background for the portraits is similar, it's what he sees as Pittsburgh.

<b><u>MOTION:</u></b>	<b>Conceptual and Final Approval</b>		
MOVED BY	Slavick	SECONDED BY	Luckett
IN FAVOR	All		
OPPOSED	None		

**CARRIED**

**2. Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh -- Knoxville (Conceptual)**

*Amanda Markiewick, GBBN Architects*

Markiewick presented the building as it currently stands. It is brutalist architecture, dramatic, and has a lot of natural light in the space. The building does, however, provide some difficiencies. There are many accessibility issues; the ramp is not to code. Two deeply recessed entrances promote vandalism and delinquency in those entrances. Graffiti has been a problem, and a chainlink fence was built to block people out. Energy conservation is an issue as well. There is no insulation in the concrete block or the roof.

GBBN met with the community to start the planning process. The community wants the building to be more open and less bunkerlike. They would still like to respect the building’s architecture, but provide the required updates and community needs.

The plans call for additional restrooms and pushing the storefront out. A concrete, perforated panel will be installed on the one façade. At night, this panel will transform and be lit from within, which would allow the public to see the perforations at night from the street. The roof will be updated, and new glass will be added for the skylights and reinstalled vertical so they can be maintained.

Indovina asked about the glazing of the monitors, would it be dark or clear. Markiewick answered that the glazing would be clear. Indovina asked if the windows could be pushed back and asked if the building could be modified as little as possible.

Luckett commented that they did a good job of maintaining the integrity of the design but also incorporating modernity. Luckett asked if they were doing anything with the landscape. The landscape is not completely developed yet, but it is in process.

Slavick commented about conserving the brutalist architecture and modernizing it. She asked about a horizontal bar running along the outside and the deck outside. The deck is a usable outdoor space.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY  
IN FAVOR  
OPPOSED

Slavick  
All

SECONDED BY Luckett

**CARRIED**

**3. Louis A. Venson Enrichment Park (Conceptual and Final Approval)**

*Thor Erickson, Design Center of Pittsburgh, Nicole Stevens, Beltzhoover Civic Association, and Ashley Holloway, Department of City Planning*

Erickson presented the project to change a currently used parklet into something a safer and more usable for community celebrations. They received a grant to clean up the space and achieve these goals. The bulletin board is not allowed on City property, which the space is, so although the bulletin board is in the conceptual design, it will not be implemented. The Department of City Planning also recommended that a bike rack would be a good addition to

the parklet. They will work with the Department of Public Works to find the appropriate location for that feature.

There will be a new curb cut, for accessibility, and a new landscaping plan. There will be two quotes inlaid in the path, one by Barack Obama and one by Nelson Mandella.

Slavick asked about the size of the sign, it looks bigger than 8 foot by 1 foot. Erickson noted that the sign will be small. Slavick also asked if there is enough seating for the parklet, since there is only 3 benches shown. Stevens answered that the parklet has always had three benches, when there are events, they bring in seating or ask people to bring in seating. The park does get used for many community activities.

The project will be started in four to six weeks, and full completion in about another year.

A motion for approval was made by Slavick with the addition of the real quotes that are to be included instead of the placeholder quotes.

**MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval with considerations**  
MOVED BY Slavick SECONDED BY Luckett  
IN FAVOR All  
OPPOSED

**CARRIED**

**3. Greenfield Bridge (Conceptual and Final Approval)**  
*Patrick Hassett, Department of Public Works*

Hassett presented the project to the Commission. The project budget is \$16 million, and \$20 million in total. It is one of the biggest, if not the biggest project in DPW history. The current bridge is actually two bridges, with one built in 2004 to catch debris from the upper bridge. In the 1980s, a lot of the ornamentation on the bridge was removed. The four pylons will be reinstalled and the remaining ornamentations, which includes five urns and one obelisk, will also be reinstalled.

They will be able to do an arch bridge, which is a nod to history. It will be very similar in structure to the bridge it is replacing. They will be staining the concrete to match the sandstone pylons. Once the pylons are cleaned, they will do a field match to match the concrete to the pylons. The community liked the contextual colors, the muted greens and blues. Lighter green will be used for the fencing on top and a darker green will be used for the infrastructure below.

City standard light posts will be used, the teardrops, that is replication of what was used in the 1920s. It is the light post that is used throughout Schenley Park.

DPW held two public meetings, they discussed the color and how to use the space on top of the bridge. The bridge deck has been a source of considerable discussion. The bridge will be widening by five feet, but they are shifting around the deck space. They will be maintaining the three lanes, they will be widened to 11 feet wide, with one lane coming out of the park being 14 feet to be shared with bikes. There will be a 10 sidewalk, a four foot bike lane, three traffic lanes, and a bike lane of five feet on the other side.



Slavick said it would be great to have an easy template with photos online, get rid of the ten copies of Commission applications. She also noted that the Commission does not have to review raised garden beds. Set some standards, but the Commission doesn't have to consider it. Built environments would count.

Indovina agreed that if something is sitting on the landscape, as a built environment, the Art Commission should be able to review it.

There should be a tool kit with best practices examples. It will give groups ideas and make everyone's jobs easier.

Brown agreed that the Commission should go paperless. He said he could do it next month, by putting the PDF online. The Commission can review the Vacant Lot Toolkit, in either a courtesy presentation or an email.

Indovina requested a presentation.

Dash asked if things like paths or landscape design would trigger Art Commission? Is that something that is desired to continue? Indovina answered that it would be dependent on staff review and send to the Art Commission. Slavick answered that if it is under a year, its not obtrusive, and isn't damaging to the landscape, the Art Commission doesn't need to see it.

The guidelines and toolkit can outline the paths, the materials that are acceptable, and set the standards. The toolkit could outline specificity and an array of options and guidelines.

**Meeting Adjourned**