In Attendance
Moss
Loftness
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present
Dash
Minnaert

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brookline Community Mural</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arsenal Park Phase 1</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hazelwood Green Bus Shelters</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lincoln Place Fire &amp; Medic Station</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Carnegie Library Main Branch Renovations</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from March 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Loftness. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. **Brookline Community Mural – Brookline Together**
   **Final Review**

   Blake Plavchak presents the proposal for a mural celebrating Brookline’s history and residents.

   Parsakian asks about the map in the mural’s composition. Plavchak says that they wanted to try to represent the whole community. Parsakian says he is drawn to the right section depicting homes, and suggests that having another section of the homes instead of the map would strengthen the composition. He compliments the overall style of the mural.

   Plavchak notes that local teens will help with the installation.

   Project artist Randi Stewart says that the mural design changed several times during planning and agrees with Parsakian’s comments. She says that a design change could be submitted to the community.
Loftness says the houses are compelling but the rendering appears to be in the style of different artists. Stewart explains that the mural will be more painterly as the rendering is simplified. Loftness says it will be a great addition and advocates for applying the same style to the whole mural as is shown in the section with the houses.

Stewart notes that the wall includes a 90 degree angle so all parts of it will not be seen linearly at all times. Loftness asks if the wall includes doors. Stewart says there are both garage doors and man doors, so they used rectangles of colors to disguise them. Moss clarifies that the mural will continue over the doors, and Stewart says yes. Moss asks if they have considered the placement of mural elements given that at times the doors will be open. Stewart says yes. Loftness says it would be helpful to show that in the renderings.

Parsakian suggests reconsidering the map section.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

2. **Arsenal Park Phase 1 – Department of Public Works Final Review**

Andrea Ketzel of DPW, Eric Brightman of Pashek+MTR, and Howard Graves of Graves Design Group present the proposal for this renovation to Arsenal Park, including accessible entrances, play area, water play area, shelter, restroom, and stormwater/nature play elements.

Loftness asks for clarification on if the frame is wood or steel. Graves says that it is steel but it will all be clad in wood, except for the beams within the pavilion. She asks if the steel was cheaper than doing all wood. Graves says yes and it was less complicated. He says that the internal spans will be painted steel. Moss asks how they will curve the wood that will clad the beams. Graves says their size will make them relatively easy to bend.

Loftness asks about the colors of the play equipment and surfaces. Brightman says that the spray features will have a concrete base, but that the play surface will be in the colors shown, only a bit more muted as the color will have black dappled in. Loftness says she prefers it muted. Moss asks if the two areas will have different shades of blue as shown in the rendering, and Brightman says yes, but the shading shown in the renderings is meant to indicate topography. Loftness says it would be great if the manufacturers of play surfaces would create more subtle shading. Loftness says that the applicants need to pay attention to the detailing and keep as much natural material in the design as possible, as she has some worries that the contrast between natural and artificial materials could make the design not work as well.

Graves says that they have had some issues with pre-cast stone and will have to do several mock-ups, but are comfortable with how the wood detailing is turning out.

Parsakian asks about the longevity of the wood and steel surfaces. Graves says the wood will not be painted and will be allowed to age. Moss asks what kind of wood the cladding will be. Graves says cedar and the ceiling will be a plywood surface that can be painted. Parsakian asks what the longevity of the paint would be. Graves says it will not receive direct rain and he suspects ten years before it would need to be repainted.

Parsakian asks if collected rainwater will be repurposed for the landscaping. Brightman says that they are discussing incorporating the gutters into the raingarden but are not sure yet if that is possible. Loftness says it should be designed as a raingarden and that the stormwater should not just go into a drain. Parsakian agrees.
Loftness asks about the light fixtures and says they seem glaring. Graves says they looked at various options, but they are following the City's request for vandal-proof fixtures. Moss asks if he has a sample of the lighting. Graves says no but he can send that to them.

Moss says there are aspects of the renderings that do not seem to portray what the final visuals will be. Graves says the renderings depict the final design and the lighting in them was stipulated by the City. Brightman says that the lighting fixture is a recent change and it is a low profile fixture. Moss says that he is unclear on the painted steel and ceiling and if the colors shown represent the paint colors. Graves says that they haven't selected the exact colors yet. Ketzel says what is represented will be very similar to how it will look, and that it has been presented to the public in this form.

Quintanilla asks what will be over the columns. Graves explains the columns and how they are cladded. He says the only thing that might be tweaked is changing the aluminum cap on the column base to a stone cap for longevity. Quintanilla asks if there will be a slope on it, and Graves says yes.

Loftness says that any substitutions made to what they're seeing should be reviewed. Moss says they would normally expect final specifications for a Final Review. Ketzel says the variability comes down to cost and what happens to the budget when it is bid out. She says that they have considered all of the Commission's comments that were made in Conceptual Review and would like to incorporate them, but it all comes down to cost.

Graves says they are confident with where they've ended up with the designs and the final materials will be budgetary decisions, but the visual will look as presented.

Minnaert suggests that any material changes could be given staff review if the Commission wished. Loftness says there are also detailing concerns that need to be represented, and they would like to see photographs of the details. Ketzel notes that DPW would not let the project proceed with details that are not durable or cannot be maintained.

Loftness asks where the electrical lines will be. Graves says that there will be outlets adjacent to the building but not within the enclosed space. Moss asks why they wouldn't put outlets on the columns. Ketzel says the City asks for lockable outlets which are available for use when someone has a permit for the shelter. Parsakian asks if the outlet is on the exterior or the interior of the building. Graves says it is on the exterior.

Loftness asks why the maintenance door is the same color as the bathroom door. Graves says it could be painted to match the stone. Loftness says there will need to be signage for the bathroom. Graves says there will be.

**MOTION:** Final Approval, with the condition that PACD Staff review final materials selection, detailing of those materials, and roof drainage, and that staff inform Art Commission of any major changes to those materials and details.

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

3. **Hazelwood Green Bus Shelters – evolveEA**  
   **Conceptual Review**

Daniel Klein of evolveEA, artists Carin Mincemoyer and Alisha Wormsley, and Sallyann Kluz of the Office For Public Art present the proposal for 8-10 artist-designed bus shelters within Hazelwood Green and along the local business corridor.

Moss commends the project and presentation. Parsakian compliments their team and process. Loftness agrees. She asks if there can be more greenery in the spaces around the shelters. She says she loves the word messaging but says the wording seems dense. She says that some of the ideas in their art
reminds her of Damien Hirsch which can be unnerving, and asks if that could make people uncomfortable. Mincemoyer says that they will probably be looking at using photographs on glass instead of actual artifacts, which can also be more easily changed out at a later date.

Lucas compliments the project and notes that DOMI submitted questions about the project which the applicant had previously answered. She says that it would be difficult for DOMI to maintain these shelters, but if they were maintained by others then DOMI would be supportive. She notes that if they are meant to be lit by the surrounding streetlights, the light may be disrupted by the solid roof which could lead to a darker space that is less comfortable and safe. She also wants to make sure that the project is being coordinated with Port Authority to make sure that there are no upcoming changes planned to the bus lines, and that accessibility is taken into consideration.

Klein says they are coordinating with the relevant agencies and that they are making sure that the shelters are moveable in case of any needed changes in the future. Kluz says that they have been working with Port Authority, DOMI, and PennDOT, as well as community stakeholders.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

4. Lincoln Place Fire & Medic Station – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review

Claire Mastroberardino of the Department of Public Works and Roberto Vega-Peralta of AE7 present the proposal for a new fire & paramedic station to better support the Fire and EMS programs, incorporate current network and monitoring infrastructure, and utilize Passive House strategies to comply with code. The new building will replace the existing Fire Station 20 and Medic 12 and will include a Percent For Art project.

Moss says the building design seems appropriate and thoughtful. He says that there are opportunities for better integration of an art project. Mastroberardino discusses their considerations of the large parcel space and that she did not want an artist to be limited by the design of the building. Vega-Peralta says that they would like to consider the opportunities for the art budget being used for an amenity to the community that this large site could afford.

Loftness says that it is an elegant design. She says she is not convinced that the community can walk to this location and the possibilities of the large parcel space should be considered in terms of public and pedestrian space. She asks what might be planned for the rest of the site. Mastroberardino says they have discussed this with the community and they are still figuring out what the community wants for this area. She says that this programming would be passed along to another division or entity to plan.

Minnaert asks if there is a rough idea of the budget for the Percent For Art. Mastroberardino says that the total project budget is about twelve million.

Loftness says that this could be an addition to the neighborhood that brings people together and the design currently seems unfinished and too focused on parking. Mastroberardino says that the URA is involved with what happens with the rest of the site. Loftness says that their design team could do something that will inspire the future use of the site. Mastroberardino says they are limited in their scope. Moss says the overflow parking is also not part of their scope and he is concerned that the art component is attached to the future overflow parking site.

Parsakian asks if this also functions as a community center. Mastroberardino says that there will be a community room to use for meetings. Parsakian asks if pedestrians would come to the building, and Mastroberardino says they could. Parsakian says it is not a pedestrian-friendly building and he’d like to see a connection from the doors to the sidewalk. Mastroberardino says that the first priority for the
building is as a firehouse and medic station. Parsakian says the Percent For Art should be an integral part of the building.

Parsakian asks if they will have a landscape plan. Vego-Peralta says yes. Parsakian asks if there is a floor plan. Mastroberardino says there is but they do not release the interiors of public safety buildings.

Moss asks if the parking could all be put on one side of the building to allow the building to be closer to the road. Mastroberardino says some of the parking will change before the design is finalized, but they want to separate the public parking from the personnel parking.

Vego-Peralta says there are a number of utilities near the street edge which would be a challenge if the building was placed closer to the street. He says that the site is also sloped, which dictated where the building entrances were placed.

The Commission asks that the applicant consider asking architects to take a deliberative look at the entire site, including pedestrian areas.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

5. Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Main Branch Renovations Conceptual Review

Sergei Matveiev of elagin architecture and Ron Graziano of CLoP present the proposal for renovations including in-kind replacement of the deteriorated Schenley Plaza Grand Stair, a shaft-enclosed elevator, and new paved pedestrian routes.

Moss clarifies that they are lowering the entrance. Matveiev says yes and gives details on this. Loftness asks for clarification of the slope of the walkway.

Loftness says that the handicapped entrance is critical but is concerned that the paving looks more like circulation paths and less like a garden.

Matveiev gives clarification on the archway doors and the vestibule. Loftness asks if there will still be a step in the vestibule. Matveiev says the step will be eliminated. He discusses the entranceway and their options for the interior.

Loftness asks where the handicapped lift will bring someone. Matveiev shows where the lift will enter the vestibule. Loftness says that walking up a ramp and going over a step could be dangerous. Matveiev says they are eliminating the step. He says the bronze doors stay open during the day and the interior doors will automatically open.

Quintanilla says his concern is that the walkways would not be integrated into the symmetry of the building. Matveiev says that integrating a ramp into the stairs would not be approved by preservationists. He says that the walkways are placed to maintain the visual symmetry from Schenley Drive. Quintanilla says that the walkway does not work visually with the building’s symmetry. Matveiev says he understands but the actual visual will read differently than the plan view.

Moss suggests that the landscaping could create a better pedestrian environment. Graziano says they are not opposed to landscaping if it was low maintenance. He says that the shortened entry path could be removed, but they think it will be a valuable amenity to people traveling from Forbes Ave and that it will visually disappear. Quintanilla says it will not disappear. Matveiev asks if the Commission is requesting that they soften the edges.
Loftness says that this is a good accessibility solution but not a landscape solution. Quintanilla asks if the walkway could come from the opposite side. Moss says that this would not serve the purpose of providing a shorter route. Quintanilla says that people also approach from that direction. Moss says they have another path there already. Matveiev says that this is the only way to include a walkway with a low enough slope to not need handrails.

Loftness says the walkway should be treated as a landscape design. Matveiev says they can put that in. Graziano agrees and says that the City just needs to be able to get a mower in to cut the grass.

The Commission asks that the applicant consider nesting the accessible paths into the landscaping.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes that the Commission has received the following correspondence: A letter of support for the Lincoln Place Fire & Medic Station, and a letter regarding the art in Frick Park that was reviewed in March.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert notes that there were two Over-The-Counter reviews conducted this month, which were forwarded to the Commission.

Moss requests an update on the Fern Hollow Bridge.

Loftness notes the letter regarding the artwork in Frick Park and asks if they need to respond. Minnaert notes the process and deadlines for receiving correspondence prior to hearings and that this correspondence was received after that deadline. She says that it is no longer an item for decision on the agenda but that it can be discussed now if they wish. Moss agrees.

Loftness notes that some of the applicants at today’s hearing did not provide up-to-date or finalized drawings. Moss says that they can request additional information from applicants. Parsakian says at in-person hearings they were able to see material samples. Quintanilla says that clear site plans are necessary to understand the applications.

The Commission discusses application requirements, the Commission’s purview over landscaping, and landscaping as an art medium.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.