

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DESIGN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE  
HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 2010**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Vavoulis called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.
- II. **ROLL:** Present were Commissioners Hoopes, Roberts, and Chair Vavoulis, Planners Gjolme and Clarke and Consulting Architect Cantrell.
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** The Flag Salute was recited.
- IV. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** None
- V. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
  - A. Minutes – February 4, 2010 DC Meeting. Minutes were approved 3-0
- VI. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
  - A. **Design Review 08-24;** 2197 Rockridge Terrace; new 3-unit condominium building. Final review and approval.

Consultant architect Cantrell gave an overview of the project.

Chair Vavoulis agreed with architect Cantrell about the recommendation to continue the item to another meeting. He stated that there was no reason to continue with discussion as required changes were not made to the plans. He was in favor of a continuance at this point.

Steve Shin (applicant) and Augie Augustin (designer/architect) introduced themselves to the Commission.

Chair Vavoulis said that he had heard these issues before and noted that the project was sent back by the Commission for corrections. He was concerned why changes were not made to the plans.

Designer/architect Augustin said that some changes had been made to the plans since it was last reviewed by the Commission. He agreed that they need to improve on window details shown on the plans. The proposed balconies are now wrought iron instead of the wood as originally proposed.

Chair Vavoulis asked if the proposed wrought iron would comply with the Zoning Code.

Architect Cantrell noted that the Zoning Code for balconies required 50% opacity in balcony railings.

Chair Vavoulis asked about the pedestrian entryway and what was changed from the initial proposal.

Designer/architect Augustin said they created a patio entry instead of the original basic entry and that he will provide more landscaping in revised plans.

Chair Vavoulis said that issues were still unresolved since the last meeting.

Commissioner Hoopes noted the pedestrian entry and asked how they interpreted the comments made by the Commission. He noted that a linear pathway was requested but that attractive porches were provided.

Designer/architect Cantrell said that the previous direction from the Commission was for the pedestrian entry to be better defined.

Commissioner Hoopes agreed that it needed more definition.

Designer/architect Augustin agreed to revise plans to enhance the entry area.

Chair Vavoulis asked if the applicants needed guidance or if they were confused.

Applicant Shin said that there was a change in the project architect due to health reasons. He thought that issues were addressed in the plans but they were not.

Neighbor to north of site noted concern with the project.

Commissioner Roberts stated need for color and material boards with the exact colors shown.

Commissioner Hoopes noted that color copies can not reproduce colors accurately.

M/S/C Hoopes/Roberts to continue the project to March 4, 2010. Approved 3-0.

## **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. Design Review 10-02; 966 Foothill Blvd.; Flintridge Tailoring; new wall signs.**

Planner Gjolme gave an overview of the proposed project.

Chair Vavoulis agreed with staff that a second sign in the alleyway was not necessary and that it could be an eyesore. He agreed with staff comments about the dark brown color and massing for the sign. He preferred the alternative proposed by staff as it was more pleasing to the eye. However, he was not sure about what to do with the type font proposed as it left something to be desired.

Commissioner Hoopes said that the proposal was terrible. He stated that this was a critical location in the city as it was the main entrance to the city. He asked if City funds could be used to help the business. He noted that the building had some good elements which could be made into something charming. He noted that the photo shown with the plans is not dark as shown on the Powerpoint presentation and that it would be hard to see the white copy.

Planner Gjolme said that the applicant wanted to use the white copy for the business.

Commissioner Hoopes suggested painting the building a darker color. Currently, it looks like an appendage to the bookstore next door. This is an opportunity for color change and dimensional elements could be used. The building could be a cute piece of architecture and avoid being a pimple at an entrance to the city.

Chair Vavoulis agreed with Commissioner Hoopes and noted that Commissioner Friedmann could meet with the applicants but that he was not in attendance at this meeting to confirm.

Planner Gjolme stated that up to \$2,000 in matching funds are allowed per project. Applicants were required to stay within scope of work approved. Overall, the owner would have to agree to go the extra step in the design process.

Commissioner Hoopes asked about the planter on the west side of the building. He was not sure where the property line was located and the building may not have been built on the property line. He suggested that a planter be installed. He noted that water was provided from the neighboring restaurant and not the bookstore. He also noted that there is a flag pole in the planter area which is an unusual location for one.

Planner Gjolme will discuss the issues raised by the Commission with the property owner. However, the approval conditions may be going beyond the sign application findings as required by the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Hoopes thought that it was better to have the applicant present to discuss case. He thought that it was a good place for a blade sign as it could be seen up and down the boulevard.

Commissioner Roberts thought that the site was a charming place for a blade sign. He suggested a simple sign just identifying the type and not the name of the business. He supported pin mounted letters on building. He thought that the white color was distracting but that it was hard to dictate color.

Planner Gjolme noted the absence of the applicant at the meeting made it difficult to make final determination on the proposal. He provided the Commission the business card of the applicant showing the colors.

Chair Vavoulis said that a lot of good ideas were discussed by the Commission for such a prominent location in the city. He suggested that a subcommittee of Commissioners Hoopes and Friedmann meet with the applicant to discuss options and how the City could help. He noted that the blade sign idea was great but that it needed the business owner to consider as the application was only for wall signs. He asked for a continuance to the next Commission meeting and that there be a meeting with the applicant before that meeting to explore possibilities.

Planner Gjolme asked the Design Commission for direction on font style.

Commissioner Roberts noted that the business card had great serifs. He also liked the use of a hanger on the blade sign.

Commissioner Hoopes noted that it was the exact direction for this type of sign.

M/S/C Hoopes/Roberts to continue the project to March 4, 2010. Approved 3-0.

Subcommittee to contact applicant to discuss options for signs and other amenities and that the applicant be made aware of matching funds policy of the City.

**VIII. OTHER BUSINESS:** None.

**IX. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS:** None

**X. COMMENTS FROM STAFF:**

Planner Gjolme asked Commissioner Hoopes of his availability to meet next week. He also gave an overview of the cases for the upcoming meeting.

Commissioner Hoopes asked about future Jiffy Lube case and the changes done at the business over time.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT:** 8:35 am.