

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DESIGN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE  
HELD ON FEBRUARY 3, 2011**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Vice-chair Hoopes called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.
- II. **ROLL:** Present were Commissioners Moldafsky, Roberts, Tobias, Director of Community Development Stanley, Planner Gjolme and Consulting Architect Cantrell. Chairman Vavoulis arrived at 7:34 a.m.
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** The Flag Salute was recited.
- IV. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** There were no comments offered.
- V. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
  - A. **Minutes** – January 6, 2011 meeting. Approved 4-0.
- VI. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
  - A. **Design Review 10-12;** Henry's Market; 920 Foothill Blvd.; final review of new grocery store and related site improvements.

Planner Cantrell recapped the project and noted changes/additional information provided since the last meeting, including colored elevations, a photo simulation of Foothill Blvd. view, building details, catalog cuts, and a simple yet effective landscape plan. He noted the offsite streetscape improvements required in conjunction with the CUP, and that further exploration of these items would be needed. Project approval was recommended subject to confirmation of the offsite improvements.

Jim Cary - architect – distributed a bike rack plan and explained that the issue had been resolved. The bike racks were concentrated near the front of the market in a reasonable location. A spec sheet for the racks was distributed.

Commissioner Hoopes noted that 4 racks were proposed in the plaza circle. He thought the configuration might be too constrained considering the number of tables and people that would be in the area.

Mr. Cary explained that each rack would have 3'-4' of clearance which should be more than adequate.

Commissioner Tobias confirmed that the red highlights on the plan were the footprint of two bikes on the rack, rather than just the rack itself. Given this, he noted that bikes would not be sticking out toward tables, but would rather parallel the adjacent wall.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Mr. Cary commented that two racks were proposed in the parking lot near the building as well.

Commissioner Moldafsky stated that as a cyclist himself, the racks were appropriately sited near the "hub" of activity on the site.

Commissioner Tobias questioned the need and location of the parking lot racks, but had no objection to them as proposed.

Commissioner Hoopes confirmed which rack was proposed via the catalog cut that was submitted.

Chairman Vavoulis confirmed that the building's signage would return for review at a later date.

Commissioner Roberts inquired about the type of signs that would be proposed.

Mr. Cary explained that internally lit LED plex face signs would likely be used. Gooseneck lighting would not be above/around the signs as currently configured.

Mr. Cary explained that the onsite improvements have been revised to address all City Council issues. The final plans actually do reflect the offsite improvements per condition #30 of the CUP approval.

The applicant, Commission and staff reviewed the plans and confirmed that the offsite improvements had been adequately addressed.

Commissioner Tobias inquired if decorative sidewalks would be provided.

Director of Community Development Stanley responded that they were proposed along Foothill Blvd. and Beulah Drive as required by code.

Commissioner Tobias stated that the four decorative street lights associated with the offsite improvements could be confirmed by staff at a later date.

Director Stanley confirmed their provision after review of the plans.

Commissioner Hoopes questioned the flow line on the south side of the parking lot, noting diamond callouts that appeared to inhibit an already minimal 1.25% slope.

Mr. Cary stated that a minimum slope of .05% is actually adequate and that the civil engineer felt the flow restrictors as proposed were appropriate.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Commissioner Roberts inquired about the trellises within the building's arched alcoves along Foothill Blvd.

Mr. Cary replied that the trellises would be industrial light-weight steel painted dark green.

Commissioner Tobias expressed his gratitude and appreciation for working with a great applicant. This was a huge project that was made relatively easy because of the efforts by the applicant.

Commissioner Roberts noted that the lightest paint color on the proposed palette was very light and would appear even lighter when applied to the building and viewed in 'real' light. He recommended that the hue be reduced.

Mr. Cary stated that a material/color sample panel would be built and that the Commission could review it onsite for confirmation of colors, etc.

Commissioner Roberts agreed completely and stated that sample panels should be prepared for all major projects.

Commissioner Moldafsky noted the colors of the light fixtures as indicated on the sample sheets and inquired if the colors were representative of those actually proposed.

Mr. Cary explained that variants in actual color were likely a printing issue. Fixture colors could be conditioned to be dark bronze, etc., per the Commission's discretion.

Commissioner Roberts was concerned with the extent and type of grasses proposed. *Stipa Gigantea* (giant feather grass) gets very wild and is difficult to maintain. He felt an alternative species should be used in at least some of the areas where proposed. He also noted exposure problems when landscaping along the base of the building thins out over time, and noted the situation at Conrad's Restaurant, which should have been more thoroughly addressed during review of the Von's project.

Chairman Vavoulis asked if Commissioner Roberts' comment was a recommendation or a concern that would be addressed through a formal condition of approval.

Commissioner Roberts replied he could approve the project with a condition for further review of the landscaping plan.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Robert Curley - landscape architect - commented that painting the foundation a very dark color to blend with the landscaping is effective. He felt that ample landscaping was proposed and visibility would not be an issue. He respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Roberts and thought Stipa worked well and was a good selection.

Director Stanley stated that a subcommittee could be formed to resolve landscaping issues at a later date.

Commissioner Roberts volunteered to review colors and landscaping.

Commissioner Hoopes questioned the location of a water dispenser near the front entrance and whether a proximate wall would adequately screen it.

Mr. Cary responded that the dispenser was cut into a large column and that it would not be visible from the street.

M/S/C Tobias/Moldafsky to approve the project subject to separate review of signs and further review of landscaping and building colors by Commissioner Roberts. Unanimous 5-0.

**B. Design Review 10-06; Conoco 76; 1001 Foothill Blvd.; refurbish/remodel existing service station building in conjunction with convenience store expansion and installation of new pump island canopies.**

Consulting Architect/Planner Cantrell gave an overview of the project. He noted that the convenience store had been revised per staff's direction and was no longer an issue. Canopy issues were identified at the last meeting and direction was given to redesign. The new canopy eliminates problematic corporate color bands and uses a simple beige color with a small Unocal logo. With refinements including a top molding and reveal, the canopy is appropriate. Mr. Cantrell recommended concept approval with further review of building details, landscaping, lighting, etc. at a later date in order to allow the commencement of plan check, permit issuance and initial construction, noting that a first inspection would not be possible until final Design Review approval was granted.

Chairman Vavoulis agreed with Mr. Cantrell's comments and asked if a rendering had been prepared showing the revised canopy in profile with the new building.

Mr. Cantrell stated that although a good idea, such a rendering was not available.

Commissioner Tobias addressed the view of the canopy from Angeles Crest Hwy. He was concerned that the flat roof would look odd from higher vantage points to the north when traveling southbound toward Foothill Blvd.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Consultant Cantrell responded that the angle of available views and convenience store building would likely negate most long-range views. However, Commissioner Tobias' point was well taken and further study should be completed.

Commissioner Hoopes did not recall seeing the existing canopy when driving southbound on Angeles Crest Hwy.

Commissioner Roberts inquired about the need for two driveways along Angeles Crest Hwy., while acknowledging that it was likely a result of prior CUP review.

Director Stanley responded that two driveways were needed for the ingress and egress of tanker trucks and were part of prior CUP approval and could not be modified.

Chairman Vavoulis confirmed that concept approval was sought at this time to allow the project to progress. He stated that the revisions were a huge improvement and with minor refinements and additional details, approval could be possible. He suggested that the Commission identify items of concern and give direction to the applicant as needed.

Regarding the elevations, consultant Cantrell clarified that the line drawings show changes to the building as recommended at the last meeting, but the colored elevations do not as of yet.

Commissioner Hoopes noted the location where the ends of the front arch strike the column caps. The arch ends need to be extended outward to better overlap said caps. He also felt rafter tails were unnecessary along the sides of the building and that the depth of the front gable was still insufficient, similar to the early issue with the Henry's project. Referring to the side elevation, he called the Commission's attention to front entry area above the arch that projected forward beyond the columns. He suggested recessing the area to align with the column caps. He also noted that the hatching on the east side of the front elevation was incorrectly shown and needed to be reversed - shown on the other side of the tiering line.

Commissioner Roberts was uncertain of the actual colors proposed and commented on the need for an actual color/material board. He preferred the use of ledgerstone along the base of the building to match the columns, as opposed to the tile currently shown. He also felt a shingle face of a single color would improve the building's overall appearance.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Commissioner Tobias noted the use of aluminum for the front doors and windows and preferred a bronze/oil color to better blend with the building. The Commission acknowledged and agreed with the suggestion.

Applicant Ahmad Ghaderi sought clarification on which canopy design option was preferred by the Commission.

Commissioner Tobias preference was the darker grey canopy.

Commissioner Roberts felt that something between options 1 and 2 was most appropriate.

Commissioner Hoopes suggested use of the color wheel to select a color.

A brief discussion ensued and the Commission decided that final color selection for the canopy would not be possible until the building's colors had been reviewed and finalized.

Commissioner Roberts referred to a paved decorative walkway that goes to the front of the building. He questioned if it could be widened to improve the appearance.

Director Stanley commented that ADA requirements would have to be confirmed.

M/S/C Hoopes/Moldafsky to grant concept approval subject to the following conditions based on the previous discussion:

Landscaping, lighting, building and site details (including revisions to the canopy per City Alternate drawing), colors and materials, offsite improvements per Conditional Use Permit approval, permanent signage, and the following store building concerns identified by the Design Commission subject to further Design Commission review and approval prior to first Building & Safety Department inspection clearance:

- a. Deepen the front gable to or past the ridge;
- b. Spread the bottom arch stones out to allow a 2"-3" reveal between them and the cap below;
- c. Delete the rafter tails along the side elevations;
- d. Recess front entry surface above the arch to align with stone caps;
- e. Reverse hatching indication on east side of front elevation;
- f. Use the same ledgestone on the building base as on the columns;
- g. Consider the use of shingle siding on walls (may be cementitious);
- h. Use of bronze finish on storefront metal.

DC Minutes - 2/3/2011 Meeting

Unanimous 5-0.

- VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:** There were none.
- VIII. OTHER BUSINESS:** There was no other business
- IX. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS:** There were none.
- X. COMMENTS FROM STAFF:** There were no comments.
- XI. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 a.m.