

**NEW  
CORRESPONDENCE**

**Rodriguez, Jane**

---

**From:** Alex [alexbark@dslextreme.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 04, 2008 11:07 PM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** Whispering Waters Association Historic consideration

Unit 207

Emily,

Can the historic committee or city council assure us that we may leave the pool empty and line the pool shell with a pressed concrete flagstone of other stone design and convert the area into a garden area?

THIS IS THE MAIN CONCERN OF THE OWNERS THAT OBJECT TO HISTORIC DESIGNATION.

Alex

## Jomsky, Mark

---

**From:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 9:25 AM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Jomsky, Mark  
**Subject:** FW: correct address



RE: correct address

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Will [mailto:Cappa2@webtv.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 04, 2008 1:17 PM  
**To:** Stadnicki , Emily F; a-realtyco@msn.com; J.Barkauskas@att.net; MirianaB\_2000@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** RE: correct address

Dear Emily. I wish to go on record as being opposed to the Historic status. I am William Evison, curent board member, Whispering Waters (unit 102). My father was an architect and was NOT impressed with this building. Sure, the water feature was nice at the time, but maintenance was expensive even in the 60s!

My concern is that when doing new work on our condos, licences, permits and inpections would cost us a lot of money and delay. I have spoken to contractors AND realtors who say the Historic status can and does cause problems...especially since many owners are not at all wealthy.

Yours truly, William Evison

**Jomsky, Mark**

---

**From:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 9:26 AM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Jomsky, Mark  
**Subject:** FW: Whispering Waters meeting

---

**From:** Mary Miller [mailto:mbythree@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 02, 2008 9:15 PM  
**To:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Subject:** Whispering Waters meeting

Emily,

Thank you so much for taking the time to explain the historic status implications to the owners of Whispering Waters tonight. I thought you did a great job conveying information objectively and managing the discussion to stay focused on the relevant points.

I will be in Mexico on a business trip next week so won't be able to attend the meeting, but just wanted to indicate my support for the historic status. The way I see it, there is little downside and quite a bit of upside in our obtaining the historic status. I know the decision doesn't really hinge upon owner input, but I thought it might help to have some supportive comments.

Best regards,

Mary Miller  
Unit 401

**Jomsky, Mark**

---

**From:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 12:03 PM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Jomsky, Mark  
**Subject:** FW: Pasadena City Council regarding Historical Status meeting 1000 Cordova

---

**From:** Craig Lucas [mailto:craig@clucaslaw.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 12:02 PM  
**To:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Subject:** RE: Pasadena City Council regarding Historical Status meeting 1000 Cordova

As court-appointed personal representative of the Doris Taggart estate and by that capacity the owner of unit 309, I am opposed to the building at 1000 Cordova being designated as a historical landmark.

Craig D. Lucas  
301 E. Colorado Blvd. # 325  
Pasadena, CA 91101  
626-796-7194  
FAX 626-449-6296

**Rodriguez, Jane**

**From:** Mary Miller [mbythree@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 1:14 PM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Subject:** Whispering Waters Historic Designation

To the Pasadena City Council:

I am a homeowner at Whispering Waters at 1000 Cordova St. in Pasadena, and wish to express my support for the historic designation under consideration. I will be out of the country on business next week so will be unable to attend the discussion Monday evening.

Although my husband and I were initially opposed to it, after attending the discussion led by Emily Stadnicki clarifying the pros and cons, we decided it would actually be a good thing for our building. This decision is based on our understanding that:

- Historic designation often increases property values.
- It does not necessarily increase the cost of maintaining a building; in fact it can reduce costs by not requiring an older building to be brought up to current code when a renovation project is undertaken.
- Homeowners would have the opportunity to apply for property tax reduction under the Mills Act. This reduction has averaged 52% for those units qualifying for the reduction at other historic properties.
- Whispering Waters could have a number of options for the design of the front of the building, including landscaping, rocks and potted plants, and water features. Historic designation would not require restoration of the original pools, or indeed any water feature, as long as alterations would not permanently prevent the pools from being restored by future owners.

We obtained our understanding by attending the discussion on June 2 and listening to the facts for ourselves. Many homeowners are formulating their opinions based on fears that costs will increase, and fears that historic designation will require Whispering Waters to restore the front of the building to its original design with pools and fountains. These fears are being fanned by emails such as the two I've attached below which were circulated to owners by Whispering Waters Board members. I've highlighted some misleading and/or inflammatory statements made in these emails.

The reason I point this out is that you may receive communications from other owners expressing that they do not support historic status. However, most of these owners are basing their opinion on inflammatory or incorrect emails such as the two attached below, rather than talking with objective parties such as the City of Pasadena to resolve their questions and concerns.

It is my hope that City Council will make this decision based on what the facts suggest as to whether Whispering Waters is indeed a historic landmark, as well as the benefits that could accrue to homeowners if historic designation were granted to our property. With so many buildings coveting such a status, surely it will be a good thing for our building if we get it, even if some owners don't appreciate or understand the benefits just yet.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Mary Miller  
Owner, Unit 401

---

6/5/2008

From: Cappa2@webtv.net  
 Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2008 06:49:30 -0700  
 To: a-realtyco@msn.com; anahit@hotmail.com; caspi@caltech.edu; dobsondanae@aol.com; fep0234@yahoo.com; friedwilson@cs.com; J.Barkauskas@att.net; mkwhite2002@aol.com; lindm@ncat.edu; mbythree@msn.com; marylzb@comcast.net; MGDarch@aol.com; MirianaB\_2000@yahoo.com; susantabakian@sbcglobal.net; sjahad@kpcc.org; stevenljulian893@aol.com  
 Subject: Governor of California, Arny, declares CA in "Official Drought"

This would appear to put the kybosh on any WW water feature, except that...for some insane reason, the "Historic" status for our condo currently in the debate stage can legally ignore ANY ecological concerns such as a drought.

Go figure.

Please take this into consideration. The City has announced they may have to increase water fees by 15%.

Will

---

From: j.barkauskas@att.net  
 To: MGDarch@aol.com; cappa2@webtv.net  
 CC: barbara.robison@sbcglobal.net; josephine\_90042@yahoo.com; a-realtyco@msn.com; moonman6@earthlink.net; craig@clucaslaw.com; carolmdawes@yahoo.com; cappa2@webtv.net; Cappa1@webtv.net; anahit@hotmail.com; caspi@caltech.edu; DobsonDanae@aol.com; fep0234@yahoo.com; FriedWilson@cs.com; J.Barkauskas@att.net; Mkwhite2002@aol.com; lindm@ncat.edu; mbythree@msn.com; marylzb@comcast.net; MirianaB\_2000@yahoo.com; susantabakian@sbcglobal.net; sjahad@kpcc.org; Stevenljulian893@aol.com  
 Subject: Re: Governor of California, Arny, declares CA in "Official Drought"  
 Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2008 16:20:54 +0000

Matt, Will, and other WWA members,

I attended the meeting last Monday with the representative for the City regarding the upcoming vote on the historical status. (note: The vote on this will be next Monday at the City Council Meeting- 145 N. Garfield.) I did learn one thing at the meeting which I would like to pass on to owners. The concept that I had prior to the meeting was that those who purchased their home in the last five years could apply and get their taxes reduced by about 50%. I learned that it is not that simple. After the building gets the Historical Status they submit a 10 year plan for restoration. The money is available for the tax reduction thru the Mills Act. It is a competition as to who gets the money for tax reduction. A Whispering Waters owner asked at the meeting "If a building is not doing major renovation and is operating in maintenance mode; is it likely that they would get any tax breaks to the few owners who recently purchased" The answer from the city rep. was "I think it is not likely". Prior to this meeting I had the impression that it was a done deal-apply,...get the money! It seems not to be the case. I also attended the first hearing by the Historical Preservation Committee. One question which they asked Matt was: "When you restore the pools are you having jets which shoot water into the air every 6 inches for the full length of the block?" This tells me that they want water!!! While they have said that they would allow us to not put the water in, now (presumably because of the water shortage in Calif.) they also said that we could not do anything to the pools which would keep them from being restored in the future. It seems our decision making on the front would be greatly hampered. This constraint would limit our choices considerably for the front. I personally do not want to be stuck forever with a pile of cracked concrete out front which are the remains from an ill-designed cooling system which did not work in the first place. If any of you agree with me now is the time to act. Send an email to city council for the next meeting. (cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net)  
 Thats my take on the historical status- It is bad for owners-bad for the city!!! Jean

6/5/2008

**Rodriguez, Jane**

**From:** Elaine Porter [fep0234@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 3:55 PM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Stadnicki , Emily F  
**Subject:** Re: Vote For Historic Designation of 1000 Cordova Street

To the City Clerk:

Please deliver the below message to each member of the Pasadena City Council before the meeting on Monday, June 9, 2008:

I am the owner of apartment 209 at 1000 Cordova Street in Pasadena. I am one of many owners opposed to this building being given historic status.

The push for historic status is the work of three people who live in our building. They are determined to restore the pools and fountains of Whispering Waters, without regard for the cost of construction or maintenance. Seeking historical status is their way of restoring the pools regardless of the wish of the other owners. At a time when Pasadena Water and Power is warning residents to conserve water, the use of water for decorative purposes is wasteful.

However, if 1000 Cordova is given historic status, we will be forced to retain the pool shapes whether water is added or not, making it difficult and expensive to renovate the front the way the majority of the owners would like.

A survey was taken by the Board and a majority of the owners voted against the pools and historic designation. I believe this survey was sent to the City Council. Please do not ignore the majority's desires. We pay taxes and feel our voices should be heard in any decision on historic status.

Sincerely,

Frances Elaine Porter  
Owner of Apt. 209  
1000 Cordova, Pasadena 91106

6/5/2008



## Rodriguez, Jane

---

**From:** Cappa [cappa1@webtv.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 12:39 PM  
**To:** cityclerk; alexbark@dslextreme.com; j.barkauskas@att.net; mirianab\_2000@yahoo.com; Stevenjulian893@aol.com; Cappa2@webtv.net  
**Subject:** Regarding Historic status for Whispering Waters condos.

I am William Evison, resident and HOA board member at Whispering Waters, unit 102.

I wish to go on record as strenuously opposing the Historic Status.

My father was a respected architect (A.I.A.), well known in this area (Leland L. Evison)... and didn't find the design of WW very interesting. It wasn't even created by a real architect! I have reviewed the pros and cons of the status and have concluded that:

A. The old water feature from the 60s was impressive at the time, but would be extraordinarily expensive NOW to reproduce, even in part. And the maintenance of the water alone was estimated a few years ago to increase dues by \$79 per month! No doubt that amt. has escalated.

B. The vast majority of owners at WW signed a statement of opposition a year ago, but those communications were conveniently (?) lost. They were mailed again later, but I still don't know if the Commission received or even considered them. This is supposed to be a democracy.

C. Realtors and contractors have told the board that even though there are some code advantages, the permits and fees make remodelling much more time consuming and expensive.

D. We have on premises an owner who daily remodels old estates in Pasadena and the immediate environs. He told me personally that he objects to the Historic status in the strongest possible language. He says that every aspect of Historic change requires inspections, committee consideration, filing and permits, fees and licenses. He tells me it's VERY time consuming and much more expensive...and restrictive in nature... than normal board repair projects.

E. The tax reductions are complicated and restrictive in nature and various properties must compete for those advantages, laying out a complicated 10 year plan, etc.

F. The governor of California today pronounced our state as being "In a state of drought"...which implies 'Watch water features'.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my position and others.

William Evison