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A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from June 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Young. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. **Frick Park Extension Public Art – Tim Kaulen Conceptual Review**

Kaulen presents this public art project, which will be located in a park space located in the Summerset at Frick Park residential community. The land is currently owned by the URA. After completion of the park project, the City will take ownership of the land and it will be included as an extension of Frick Park. The park design received Final Art Commission Approval in October 2020.

Quintanilla confirms that they are discussing the placement of the artwork today. Kaulen says yes. Quintanilla says what he thinks is important is that the art pieces can be seen not only from inside the park but also from the roads leading to the park. He says the plans being presented do not show much of the context or long views of the park.
Leach asks if there is a reason those sites for the artwork were selected. Kaulen says they are contemplative locations that do not take away from the other amenities of the park. He says that putting the artwork in the middle of the green spaces would defeat the purpose of the spaces being multi-use. They selected sites that celebrated the serenity of the park.

Leach asks if the trees are already there. Kaulen says some are.

Goulia points out she lives in this neighborhood, and it is important to make sure that the sculptures do not become something that kids climb on. She says the locations are not the best, and she wishes the sculptures could be more visible. Leach asks if these will be like Tony Tasset’s Magnolia Trees downtown, with the artwork being more visible in some seasons than others. Kaulen says there will be a harmony between manmade and natural elements, and he doesn’t think the sculptures will be hidden, just sited thoughtfully within the natural setting. He suggests that there are ways to incorporate the landscaping to discourage climbing.

Parsakian asks if Kaulen has had meetings with the community. Kaulen says there have been two meetings, and the community has been very supportive and trusting of his process. He says he would like to have one more workshop with the neighborhood in developing the project. Parsakian says that he would prefer the sculptures not have concrete bases, but would defer to an engineer on making that call. Kaulen says it is typical to have a concrete pad as a counterbalance. Parsakian asks if he is using recycled materials. Kaulen says he is open to any aesthetic suggestions but will be coming back for approval of the design prior to production. Parsakian says that using recycled materials would elevate Kaulen’s work.

Quintanilla says he is having trouble understanding the topography and street views from the submitted plans. He says he can’t make comments on the placement of the art because he does not have enough information. Minnaert says that the park plan came for Art Commission approval the previous year and they could pull up those plans if it would help.

Kaulen says he would like to get approval for the general idea of three sculptures thoughtfully placed, with community consensus. He says that he’s happy to meet on site to get any advice from the Commissioners on placement.

Moss agrees that it is hard to make a judgement on the placement of the sculptures, but that three sculptures in a park this size seems appropriate. He says he personally doesn’t have any issues with the proposal.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval for artworks at the three locations**

MOVED BY: Parsakian  
SECONDED BY: Goulia  
IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

2. Robert E. Williams Memorial Park – Department of Public Works

**Conceptual Review**

Joe Adiutori Jr of the Department of Public Works introduces the project, which is for the demolition of the existing recreation building in Robert E. Williams Memorial Park and construction of new community facility with rooftop plaza, basketball court, playground, and parking. A Percent For Art project is being discussed and will be presented in the future. Naomi Williams of R3A Architecture goes through the presentation.

Moss says that the siting of the building makes sense with the topography of the park, and the roof access seems appropriate. He says it seems there is a missed opportunity in how the rooftop will be used. He says that if it was made into a green roof or divided into usable spaces it would be more dynamic.
Moss says that the basketball court, playground, and rooftop seem to be at the same level and perhaps the grade could be adjusted on the playground, or the basketball court lowered so as not to need such a large retaining wall.

Andrea Ketzel of DPW says that they presented a multi-level playground to the community, but they preferred it to all be on one level.

Quintanilla says that it’s an exciting project and he thinks there will be a great view from the roof. He suggests that there be some protection from sun and weather for people using the roof. He asks why they have shifted the building so that it doesn’t align with the park access. Williams says that the placement has to do partially with existing water lines from the reservoir above. Quintanilla encourages them to do something with the access coming from the existing park monument. Williams says this access currently continues up to the playground area.

Goulatia asks if this is a green building. Williams says they used sustainable practices within the budget that they had, but they are not going for LEED certification. Goulatia says that is a missed opportunity for the City. She asks why the siding is made to look like wood, and says that it should either be actual wood or just look like siding. Williams says they looked at materials that were durable but also cost-effective. Goulatia says that the artificial wood cheapens the building. Moss says he agrees that they shouldn’t use materials that pretend to be something they are not.

Parsakian agrees that the roof should be more welcoming. He asks if the roof would support a tent, and also says that there will be a lot of skateboarding if they use pavers, which could be a liability concern.

Leach asks if the doors will be accessible. Williams says the building meets all ADA requirements, including an accessible mother’s room. Leach asks how many mothers can fit into the mother’s room. Williams says it is for single use. Leach suggests that they increase the capacity of the mother’s room for those using the playground. Williams says this building is for rentals and events and will not be used by people visiting the playground. Leach asks if playground users can use the bathrooms in the building. Williams says no. Moss asks if they are providing other bathrooms for the park. Adiutori says they are following current operational processes by providing portable toilets. Cas Pellegrini of DPW says that the building and the surrounding playground do not operate as one unit, and they restrict rentals to the building so that the public can always access the playground.

Leach asks if handicapped accessibility is from the street or only from the parking lot. Williams says it is from the parking lot, because the steepness of the hills make the sidewalks inaccessible. She says there is accessible parking at the playground level and at the building.

Goulatia asks about the blue color in the renderings of the playground(?) and if that reflects the materials to be used. Ketzel says it is just the rendering, but those materials will be updated for the Final Review. Goulatia asks if there is an opportunity for an artist to design the surface. Ketzel says on the basketball court they can, but on the playground safety surfacing it would present a maintenance issue. Goulatia says this could be done on the terrace as well. Young agrees.

Pellegrini says that they have had an initial meeting with the Public Art & Civic Design Division about the Percent For Art project, and that they are determining whether the budget for the Percent For Art for the site itself should be different than the budget for the building. He says they’d like to bring an artist in to respond to the site plans as opposed to prescribing where the art should go.

Leach says that there is a similar building to this at the West End Overlook. She says the proposed building doesn’t reflect the history of the Hill District. Pellegrini says that the art is undetermined at this point but they will be bringing the community in to gain their insights. Goulatia says if they are considering different budgets for the art, they should go with the higher budget. Moss says that the question is more whether to do a combined project or separate ones for the site and building. Pellegrini says they are looking for the Commission’s guidance. Moss says that the Commission is not in the position to guide them as to how to incorporate the artwork, but he wishes their process had already been started so that...
the art could be part of the Conceptual Review. Moss says their preference is that art be incorporated into the design and not added on afterwards.

Leach asks if it would be possible to have an image of Robert E. Williams on the front door.

Arbie Bankston speaks as a community member of the Upper Hill. He says that the community wants the roof to be functional and to use it as a space to watch their children in the playground; that they would like the playground and basketball court stay in the original locations, with green space on the hill behind them; and that they would like retaining walls, fencing, and steps to be minimized. He says the community would prefer the building to be usable year-round, including bathrooms accessible from outside. He says that the community voted to use the name “Schenley Heights Pavilion”. He says that they would like to commemorate Robert E. Williams in some way, perhaps with art.

Quintanilla says that he understands that the topography of the City creates difficulties for people with mobility issues, but it seems like there is something wrong with a neighborhood park that has to be driven to. He says there could be a series of ramps to get to the roof.

Moss says that a ramp connecting the building to the play areas could have been incorporated. Parsakian says that the Port Authority creates ramps for its accessible hillsides, so it could be done. Quintanilla says that some people are able to deal with some steeper topography but steps could present a problem. Pellegrini agrees that they do not want to separate people with disabilities, and they have attempted to incorporate universal design as best they could, but the site is so steep that it presents significant challenges. He says the previous design did not address the needs of people with disabilities. Pellegrini says that in previous years, parking was not provided in parks at all.

Quintanilla says that parents with strollers and people with bikes would have a hard time getting to the top. Pellegrini says that they have not avoided the issue of people with disabilities, and they are still in the early stages of site design. He says they have considered a ramp coming up from the entrance at Adelaide St. He says they are pushing the limits of their budget but hopefully additional funds will come in to improve accessibility.

Leach says she used to live on Adelaide St and a ramp would be a good idea. She says its important to raise that extra money, and all residents should have access to this park. Pellegrini says they will make every effort they can.

Goulatia asks why there can’t be a ramp next to the steps. Moss says it would be possible. Moss asks if landscaping is being designed for this project. Ketzel says she is the landscape architect and there is a civil engineer. She says they can’t implement a lot of plant material due to maintenance issues but they will be planting some trees for shade. Moss asks how the deep depression for storm water will be planted. Ketzel says that hasn’t been planned yet, but ideally they would have an agreement with PWSA which would allow them to create more of a storm water facility.

Moss says that Wightman Park came to them previously as a very well-integrated design, and that this project is very different. Ketzel says that park had a much higher budget, and PWSA was a funder for that project due to its prioritization of storm water management.

**MOTION:** Conceptual Approval, with further attention to be given to the design of the roofscape, the integration of art, the landscape details, and the accessibility throughout the site including the bathrooms.

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Parsakian
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

3. **Oliver Bath House – Department of Public Works**  
   Conceptual/Final Review
Joe Adiutori Jr of DPW introduces the project, which is a partial renovation of the historic Oliver Bath House, including masonry, windows, fixtures, roofing, and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.

Elijah Dolly of Buchart Horn gives the presentation for this project. Chris Urban, also of Buchart Horn, and Bill Brennan, historic preservation specialist, are present as well. A Percent For Art project has been preliminarily discussed between DPW and PACD, but the applicants are concerned that locations for it are limited and that it will compete with the historic fabric of the building. Dolly points out several locations where art could be considered, but requests that the Percent For Art be used at another site so as not to compromise the historic integrity of the building.

Moss confirms that they have provided possible sites for artwork, but that their preference is not to include it for this project. Dolly says that is their recommendation, but they didn’t want to come without options. Brennan says they are seeking the Commission’s input on this.

Quintanilla agrees that the building is itself a piece of art and something shouldn’t be forced on it, but he says there are ways to use art in other manners, such as planters. Moss agrees and encourages the project to use the Percent For Art on site. He gives the example of the metal railing outside of the building and says he is sure there are other opportunities to include art without compromising the architectural integrity. Goulatia cites the Louvre as an example of how it could be done well. She says a mural wouldn’t be a good idea but suggests something complementary on the wall facing the hotel.

Parsakian agrees that the railing is a possibility. He says the building has a lot of history and that he is very grateful it is being restored.

Leach asks if there is a reason that they want to use the Percent For Art elsewhere, and asks where it would then be used. Dolly says they do not want to distract from the historic character, and that the existing options for artwork are not highly visible. He says they have discussed the railing but since it is always viewed with the rest of the façade they did not consider it a good option. Leach asks where they would use the Percent For Art if not here. Dolly says they do not have a site selected, but they thought the funds could be better used somewhere else. Brennan says their concern with the railing was that it would distract from the façade. Leach says it seems like they think art is a distraction. Brennan says the building is art, and putting something in front of it would detract from both. Leach and Moss disagree. Leach says she is not sure if the building is art, but that an artist would be capable of producing artwork that complements the building.

Quintanilla says small interventions may be a solution. Dolly says that they have discussed options like the railing and the lanterns that will be created by artisans, but that artists need to have a certain amount of leeway that they feel has ruled out artists working here.

Goulatia disagrees and says that she thinks there is always a way to incorporate art in a way that doesn’t compete with the building.

Leach says art shouldn’t be forced on something but that artists are sensitive enough to be able to incorporate it.

Moss says that artist-designed lanterns are a possibility, but if they are meant to closely replicate the historic image then it is not an appropriate use for the Percent For Art.

Parsakian asks if they intend to remove the railing. Dolly says it will be replaced in some way. Parsakian says it could be artist-designed in a subtle way so as not to distract. Dolly says yes, but that everything they do on this building has to be approved by both the State Historic Preservation Office and the Historic Review Commission. Leach asks if the railing was originally part of the design. Dolly says no. Leach asks why it needs to be incorporated. Brennan says the sidewalk is narrow and it is for safety.

Goulatia suggests bike racks for the art project. Dolly says they have discussed this, and if they were included they would be best on Bingham St, because 10th St is very narrow. He says they have talked to the City and they do not see a lot of bike traffic at this location.
Moss says he is concerned with setting a precedent to push the Percent For Art to other sites. He says the art could be done in small iterations as they all seem to be in agreement that they do not want the art to compromise the integrity of the facade. Goulatia agrees and cites the examples of the dandelions near the Brewhouse, or suggests manhole covers.

**MOTION:** Conceptual/Final Approval, with consideration given to how to use the Percent For Art as an integral part of the project.

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

4. **DPW 4th Division Facility & Campus – Department of Public Works**

   **Final Review**

   Calli Baker of DPW describes the project. It is for a new maintenance facility and supporting assets to serve DPW’s 4th Division. The project will include a new building, landscaping and stormwater management features, traffic pattern changes, an outdoor material storage area, parking areas, a pedestrian-friendly pathway, and yard debris drop-off area. The project previously received Conceptual Art Commission Approval in April 2021(?), and a Percent For Art project is being planned.

   Moss says that the changes made to the pedestrian path appear to be an improvement.

   Parsakian suggests that the public art project have something to do with lighting.

   Quintanilla says that lighting is a critical component to the pathway to make it seem inviting.

   **MOTION:** Final Approval

   MOVED BY: Parsakian
   SECONDED BY: Leach
   IN FAVOR: All
   OPPOSED: None

5. **Olympia Park Shelter House – Department of Public Works**

   **Conceptual/Final Review**

   Calli Baker of DPW presents this proposal for the partial demolition and rebuild of the multi-purpose park building, including exterior doors, paint, and two possible options for windows. A Percent For Art project is being preliminarily discussed.

   Moss says he is pleased the City is working to keep and restore this building. He states that the larger windows are preferable but the construction cost challenges are understandable.

   Leach asks how free they can be with the paint color when restoring historic places. Baker says this building is not a designated historic structure so they have some leeway. She says that the original photos they have are black and white, but you can tell that the paint is light in color. She says they are trying to keep the color subtle and complementary to the brick. Leach says Pittsburgh can look very grey during the day and asks if they can’t have a different color, like turquoise. Moss says there are no restrictions on the color they can paint it. Baker says the building renovation will happen before the park redesign, but that they wanted to fit within the context of the park Master Plan.

   Moss says the roof is quite prominent when approaching the building, and asks about the exhaust fans. Baker says that most have been removed and they are still finishing the HVAC design, but currently there only needs to be one or two vents on the roof. Moss asks if there will be a new roof. Baker says there is already a new roof on the building as of a couple of years ago.
Goulatia asks how much the cost difference is between the small and large windows. She asks if the Percent For Art budget would compensate for the windows. Baker says she does not know and they are still working on costs from the contractors.

Parsakian says he is a fan of Arts and Crafts buildings and says they take their colors from nature, so turquoise may not be appropriate. He understands wanting to bring more color to the city, but in this case he would want a restoration that keeps the original architect’s intent. He asks about the railings, and Baker says that the railings along the steps will be repaired but kept as is. Parsakian asks if that would be an opportunity for Percent For Art. He asks about the railing on the deck, and Baker says it would be a mix of wood and composite to keep it as simple as possible. Parsakian says it should not look like something too new on the building that doesn’t belong.

Leach asks if there is a way to keep the windows full size. Baker says that the large windows are preferred but it will depend on cost. Parsakian says the small and large options are hard to discuss without knowing the cost difference.

Moss says the Commission has a clear preference for the larger window option and reiterates the need to keep the back deck from looking too new and out of place. He asks that the detailing for the deck be brought to staff for a final review.

Moss asks if Option A (larger windows) would require a smaller amount of masonry work. Baker says Option B (smaller windows) would take less masonry work. Leach asks if the windows need to be done now. Baker says yes, as part of the full scope of work. Leach asks what the lighting is like inside the building. Baker says that Option B would still give more lighting than there currently is, as they are opening up some previously blocked openings. The interior lighting is still being designed.

Parsakian asks about the construction timeline, and Baker says they are hoping to begin before the end of the year and finish in the spring.

Moss says putting in the full size windows would make a substantial difference to the building. Baker shows the original full size window openings from 1912. Goulatia says if you don’t do justice to the restoration then it is pointless.

**MOTION:** Final Approval, using Window Option A as presented, with the Percent For Art project to return to a future hearing.

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

6. Highland Park Super Playground – Department of Public Works
Final Review

Andrea Ketzel of DPW presents the design revisions for the playground equipment for this project and the community engagement strategy they have been employing, which included a series of storybook readings for children. The full project is a renovation of the existing playground and includes the replacement of all play structures, play surfacing, and the addition of new site improvements including site furniture, entrance, and landscaping. In June 2021, the project received Conceptual/Final Approval of the site plan for the Highland Park Super Playground, with the exception of the playground equipment, which should be thematically reconsidered and return to a future hearing.

Goulatia thanks Ketzel for the changes made. She asks if the slides will be grey or if they can be colored. Ketzel says they are aluminum, and could be colored if plastic. She says testing showed aluminum gets less hot than the plastic.
Leach thanks Ketzel and says she loves the colors and the addition of sea creatures. Goulatia asks if there can be QR codes in the park to access the storybooks. Leach asks about the climbing features on the boats, and Ketzel explains the climbing features and the transfer station that will allow children with disabilities to access the higher levels.

Goulatia asks if the shade sail could have color. Ketzel says they would have to look into it but she assumes they can be colored. Parsakian asks if they can incorporate an experience in the playground for blind children. He says he is concerned there are not enough benches. Ketzel says they hear the need for seating a lot from parents. She is unsure of the exact number of benches to be included but can be sure to take a look at that aspect of the project.

Goulatia asks if there could be a button to play audio books. Ketzel says they can talk to their accessibility consultant. Parsakian suggests they visit the School for the Blind in Oakland to see how they address accessibility.

Goulatia mentions musical instruments that she saw as part of a public park in Copenhagen as a way for visually challenged people to engage with playgrounds.

**MOTION: Final Approval, with the consideration of adding extra benches**

MOVED BY: Leach  
SECONDED BY: Goulatia  
IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

C. **Correspondence**  
None.

D. **Public Comment**  
None.

E. **Director & Staff Report**  
Minnaert discusses the Cantini Mosaic Reconceptualization Project and says that they will be holding a public meeting on August 2 to gather public comments. She gives a brief overview of the project.

F. **Adjournment**  
The meeting adjourned at 5:07 P.M.