



**ACTION MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
Design Commission**

**Tuesday June 12, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.
City Hall, Council Chambers – Room S249
100 N. Garfield Avenue, Pasadena CA 91101**

1. **ROLL CALL** – Chair Yoo called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.
Present: Commissioners Edwards, Chiao, Toro, Floyd, Rawlings, Loomis, Keane and Yoo
Absent: None
Staff: Leon White, Amanda Landry, Rodrigo Pelayo and Claudia Burciaga-Ramos
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - None
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA** – No comments received.
4. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA ORDER**
The order of the agenda was changed as follows:
Items 5.A (Action item), 6.A (Information Item), and 8.A (Concept Design Review, continued) as listed on the agenda were moved to after items 7.A and 7.B listed under Preliminary Consultation.
5. **ACTION ITEM**
 - A. **Establish nominating committee for FY2018-2019 Officers**
The Commission established a nominating committee (Commissioners Rawlings and Loomis) to select new officers for the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year.
6. **INFORMATION ITEM**
 - A. **290 E. Colorado Boulevard (Paseo Colorado Commercial Development) - (Council District 6)**
Staff gave a brief update on the individual tenant storefront review process. Storefront reviews will be conducted at the Director (staff) level.

(Case Planner: Leon White)
7. **PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION**
 - A. **1005 Armada Drive - (Council District 1)**
New construction of a two-story, 2,130 square foot, multi-purpose room/innovation laboratory building with a second story deck and roof terrace at an existing K-8 school campus (The Chandler School).

Public comments:
Arnold Siegel

Commission comments:
The Commission gave the following comments: study how the massing and architectural character of the proposed building is compatible with the existing buildings within the school site, surrounding context, and the architectural character and legacy of Pasadena; the proposed structure bears more relation to the middle school building than the parking structure, there is concern that it does not conform to the existing design;

consider a less “innovative” architectural style approach in order to create a more cohesive design that can blend in better with the existing building and the surrounding context; the proposed elevator tower element has a starkness and gives the effect of being a lighthouse when viewed from the Arroyo; the application of materials on the west elevation give a tower effect and on the north elevation they give a horizontal building effect, both sides (north and west) are seen differently although the same materials are being utilized; consider adding more details or elements that may be tied together with the other Craftsman era style building or other elements on site; the proposed abstraction of historic elements such as porches, trellises, and balcony railing are not clearly expressed in the building design; reconsider the choice of historical reference elements to incorporate in the abstract design, for example, the building design may have a highly articulated balcony and roof framing that references the intricate wood joinery and detailing of Craftsman style architecture; the existing middle school and proposed building connect in an abrupt fashion; the stairs may be redesigned to enhance the transition between floor levels, program, materials, architectural styles, and different spaces; consider integrating the interior of the building with the outside and explore connecting the first floor of the existing building with the proposed maker space; the 1st floor machine room of the new building may be relocated to help open up the space to the courtyard area; the second floor height of the proposed building should be lowered so that the top of the parapet is not taller than the existing middle school building’s roof ridge; consider exploring other trellis designs or methods of providing shade to create a holistic project design; consider re-designing the second level to accommodate program intended to be on the roof terrace; a basement may also serve as a more flexible and practical space; the multi-purpose room and maker space are required to be highly flexible in order to function optimally; reconsider the scale, height, form and materials so that the building can clearly express its programmatic flexibility, as intended.

B. 141 South Lake Avenue - (Council District 7)

New construction of a five-story approximately 127,161 square-foot, mixed-use project consisting of 2,794 square feet of ground-level and second floor commercial (restaurant and office) space, 70 residential units, and 205 parking spaces.

Public comments:

Dennis Dipietro

Commission Comments:

The Commission made the following comments: the current design does not clearly respond to the surrounding context and appears to be a generic design that can be found in many different contexts; consider taking more inspiration from the curtain wall (of glass or concrete) design of early modern design; the proposed design should also take into consideration the modern historic resources in the general vicinity of the project site, including the national register eligible historic resource directly to the north, at 123 South Lake Avenue; significant and pedestrian friendly entries and lobbies on both the Lake Avenue and Hudson Avenue elevations should be included in the overall design; there is no residential entrance or lobby on the west elevation facing Hudson Avenue, and one should be provided; provide more detailed information about bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular circulation to and from as well as within the site and clarify how residents will access the building from both Hudson Avenue and Lake Avenue as well as access and engage with the split-level courtyard; consider further differentiating how the architectural character of the residential portion of the project is distinguished from the commercial portions, particularly as viewed from South Lake Avenue and refine the treatment of style and materials for each use; provide interior elevations that better explain the relationship of units to the proposed courtyards; the lightly supported mass of the second story office space and the balcony above appears to inappropriately dominate the primary elevation rather than enhance or compliment other significant building features; explore ways to better integrate this feature into the overall design concept of the building; study ways to better engage the outdoor dining and the projecting mass of the second floor office space on the east elevation with the rest of the building design and further explain how the outdoor dining relates to the adjacent properties and the street continuity in the immediate context; if height averaging continues to be proposed, additional details will be necessary to fully evaluate the request; resolve the architectural detailing on all elevations and ensure the same level of quality and detailing is reflected on all visible portions of the building; reconsider the connection between the internal circulation within the building and the exterior elevations, especially the north and south elevations; explore ways to provide daylight to the internal corridors, via nodes by elevators or at the end of the corridors or other means as appropriate which would provide additional openings to the exterior;

the design of the north elevation is unresolved and should be further studied and refined to include a full array of architectural features and detailing that appropriately responds to the adjacent eligible historic resource; study the design and location of the access to the parking garage off of South Hudson Avenue to ensure it is well integrated into the project design and will avoid the appearance of a large open tunnel from the street; study the scale of the parking entrance to determine if it can better relate to the scale of other openings along the street, including the large parking entrance directly to the south of the property; study the grade difference between the sidewalk and the unit entryways along South Hudson Avenue to ensure an appropriate and gradual transition; sunken entryways are strongly discouraged; the provided elevations should show the actual elevations of adjacent building, in order to provide additional context and allow the Design Commission to better understand how the proposed building relates to the surrounding environment.

8. CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW

A. 2180 East Foothill Boulevard – (Council District 2)

Staff recommends that the Design Commission continue this item to a date uncertain.

New construction of a two-story, 84,650 square-foot transit operations and maintenance facility. This item was continued from the May 8, 2018 Design Commission meeting.

(Case Planner: Kevin Johnson)

Owner: City of Pasadena

Applicant/Architect: Maintenance Design Group

9. COMMENTS AND REPORTS FROM STAFF

Leon White, Principal Planner reported:

- On June 18, staff will present recommendations of the Civic Center Task Force to the City Council.
- The Preservation Awards were held on May 24 at the Fowler Garden at the Ambassador Gardens.
- On June 7, staff had a workshop for the proposed Madison Heights Landmark District (27th landmark district).

10. COMMENTS AND REPORTS FROM COMMISSION – No comments.

11. COMMENTS AND REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

1. **Urban Forestry Advisory Committee** - (Rawlings) No report.
2. **Historic Preservation Commission** – (Floyd) No report.
3. **Planning Commission** - (Keane) Reported: At the last Planning Commission meeting there was an information item on Mansionation rules and concerns and at the next meeting on June 13, there will be a workshop on hotel conversions for affordable housing.
4. **Transportation Advisory Commission** - (Edwards) No report.
5. **Arts & Culture Commission** - (Vacant) No report.
6. **Rose Bowl Subcommittee** - (Rawlings) No report.
7. **Concept Design Review Application Subcommittee** - (Loomis, Toro)
8. **Las Encinas Psychiatric Hospital & Barn Subcommittee** - (Floyd, Rawlings) No report.
9. **Specific Plan Implementation Process Subcommittee** - (Loomis, Keane) There is a schedule conflict with the upcoming Central District Specific Plan Community Workshop that is on the same day and time as the next Design Commission meeting; Commissioners attending the workshop will arrive late to the Design Commission.
10. **100 West Walnut St. Subcommittee (PARSONS)** – (Loomis, Rawlings, Toro) No report.
11. **Alexandria Subcommittee** - (Keane, Yoo, Stern) No report.

12. ADJOURNMENT – Chair Yoo adjourned the meeting at 10:31 p.m.



Patricia Keane, Chair



Claudia Burciaga-Ramos, Recording Secretary