Jomsky, Mark

Subject: FW: City Council Meeting 12/05/11 Raymond Esther Landmark District
Attachments: Email promised answers never given.docx; Reply from the Mayor.docx; No Reply from District Representative.docx

From: bisqit@live.com
To: mjomsky@cityofopasadena.net
Subject: City Council Meeting 12/05/11 Raymond Esther Landmark District
Date: Mon, 5 Dec 2011 16:30:05 -0800

Hi Mark,

Please distribute this information to all City Council members regarding the proposed Raymond/Esther Lamdmark District that is on the agenda for tonights meeting 12/05/11.
Please also distribute all of the attachements as well. Please let me know that you recieved this email. Thank you

The following illegal practices and undemocratic procedures have been occurring at the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the proposed Raymond/Esther Landmark District.

1. The minutes for September 19, 2011 for the Historic Preservation Commission has Item 4C. Application for a new landmark district. -- 1. Raymond/Esther landmark district. Staff Recommendation. This item should not be in the minutes for September 19, 2011 as this specific item was removed from the Agenda. Item 4C in the minutes for September 19, 2011 was never discussed at this meeting. There was clearly no staff recommendation discussed for this proposed district at the September 19, 2011 meeting. There was no staff presentation presented for Item 4C. at this meeting. This item was actually postponed at the beginning of the meeting on September 19, 2011. We received a phone call from the Historical Preservation Commission on September 19, 2011 informing us that this item was removed from the agenda for a later date and that there was no reason for us to attend the meeting on September 19, 2011. Item 4C includes 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave as included in this proposed district and this is incorrect. Item 4C in its entirety should be removed from the minutes for September 19, 2011. This item should have been included in the minutes for October 17, 2011 with address 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave removed from this proposed district. Item 4C also includes "Aurora Wright as being in favor" of this district. This is clearly incorrect as Aurora simply stated that she would be willing to share information such as the Mills Act with us. She never stated that she approved. Why is the Historic Preservation Commission including blatant lies in their minutes. All you have to do is listen to the recorded audio of this meeting. This makes the proposal that the Planning Commission received from the Historic Preservation Commission regarding this proposed landmark district null and void.

Item No. 5
12/05/11

I emailed The Historic Planning Commission regarding this matter on October 27, 2011 and still have not received a reply.

Why is the Historic Preservation Commission taking it upon itself to lie to the Planning Commission and to the public at large regarding something that never happened. This is clearly illegal, undemocratic and needs to be investigated.

2. The minutes for September 19, 2011were never posted online. I wrote an email to the Historic Preservation Commission on October 27, 2011 asking them why the minutes for October 3, 2011 and the minutes for October 17, 2011 were online in the city website but the minutes for September 19, 2011 were not online. I asked what the Historic Preservation Commission was trying to hide. Were they keeping all of our comments and concerns a secret from the public and from the Planning Commission as well. It was not until October 31, 2011 that the minutes which should include our issues and concerns from the public, because it is a recording, were placed online. Why did I have to email the Historic Preservation Commission and request for them to act on such a simple matter of public record?

Why were the minutes for September 19, 2011 approved on October 17, 2011 with the most obvious error -- Item 4C, which at the beginning of the meeting the Chair clearly stated that this item would be postponed and would not be discussed and clearly was not discussed at the September 19, 2011 meeting? The Chair did allow time for public comments regarding the proposed Raymond/Esther Landmark District based on the email that I had sent making everyone aware of the illegal practices and undemocratic procedures regarding the proposal. The Chair did make an effort to hear us and stated if someone from Altadena or West Los Angeles was in the meeting they would have an opportunity to be heard. But he also made it very clear to the entire Historic Preservation Commission that they would not be allowed to ask questions or discuss the matter. All you have to do is listen to the minutes to verify what I have just stated.

The proposal that you have been presented with for the Raymond/Esther Landmark District has made it's way to you with illegal practices and undemocratic procedures.

On September 18, 2011 I emailed the Historic Preservation Commission with the following issues and concerns. Answers were promised and none have been provided to date.

1. The property owner at 570 N Raymond Ave was never notified by the City of Pasadena that this property was being considered to be included in the landmark district designation. We never received a letter. Even the resident who initiated this entire process (Laurie at 580 N Raymond Ave) told me personally that she never received a letter in the mail. Yet the Historic Preservation Commission produced a list of addresses as their proof that the notices were indeed mailed to everyone the list. A list of addresses is hardly proof at all.

2. The rights of the property owner have been violated by the City in attempting to impose restrictions on the property without the owner's consent.

3. The Person(s) submitting the petition never approached/inquired/or notified the property owner at 570 N Raymond Ave. that they wanted to include this property in their petition.

4. The property owner did not sign the petition requesting that this property be included.

5. The addresses for 570 N. Raymond and 595 N. Raymond were not even included in the petition that was passed around. A copy of which I have.

6. The public notice poster was placed in a vicinity that ensured the property owner would not see it, therefore not even know about the public hearing coming up.

7. The property owner was not informed of the positive nor negative impacts this landmark designation would have on the property.

8. The staff report says "none of the property owners have indicated opposition to the district" That is an incorrect statement as NOT ALL HOMEOWNERS WERE NOTIFIED NOR APPROACHED FOR THEIR INPUT. We were deliberately left out of the entire process. You would think the Historic Preservation Commission would want the input from the residents of a Greene and Greene home. Instead they chose to illegally and undemocratically exclude us. I spoke with Emily Stadnicki and discussed this with her and she told me that a democratic procedure was followed. A Democracy is about inclusion not exclusion. When the Historic Preservation Commission received the petition from the other 5 residents they clearly saw 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave were not included. Yet they went out of their way to include 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave in the city notice that was supposedly mailed out to all resident and was posted on one light post. How is this a democratic process?

9. Emily Stadnicki also shared with me that when the Historic Preservation Commission deals with big districts they have workshops for the owners. When they deal with small districts they do not have the manpower to have workshops for the owners. Why did the Historic Preservation Commission not make a worthy effort to host a workshop for

all residents of the homes for this proposed district since it clearly has such great historic significance. A Greene and Greene home was potentially involved yet the Historic Preservation Commission did not seem to think that this was Historic enough to notify us first and have a workshop for all owners. This clearly does not reflect the Historic Preservation Commission Mission.

9. If it had not been for a neighbor (not from the petitioning group) asking us why our address was posted on a flyer on a light post in front of 580 N Raymond Ave (a direction in which we never walk) we never would have found out about this proposed district. This was a deliberate attempt to keep the owner of 570 N Raymond Ave from learning anything about the application process for this landmark district as well as the City of Pasadena's proposals. Again, blatant exclusion and clearly un-democratic.

10. The entire process was sneaky and underhanded. The address for 570 N Raymond Ave did not appear on the petition nor were we ever approached and given the opportunity to either sign or not sign the petition.

11. When I spoke to Emily Stadnicki in regards to the posting of the notices on the light post, she assured me that the notices were posted on 5 different posts in front of the proposed homes. She provided me with a map clearly marking the designations as well a signed document from the Design and Historic Preservation signed by what appears to be two city employees, stating that they posted 5 copies of said notice on September 2, 2011. Even the resident (Laurie at 580 N Raymond) who initiated the petition shared with me personally that she only saw one notice posted on one light post which just happened to be in front of her house. Emily promised me an investigation into this matter. I have yet to receive an answer.

In the Staff Report for this evenings meeting under item #2:

"Acknowledge the determination of October 17, 2011.." as of Monday November 7, 2011 the minutes for October 17, 2011 for the Historic Preservation Commission have not been approved. After the meeting adjourned on November 7, 2011 Emily Stadnicki stated to the council that she was still reviewing the minutes.

In the Staff Report for this evenings meeting under "Background" it states "570 N Raymond Ave was not informed of the process by petitioners..." We were also not informed by the Historic Preservation Commission even after they saw that our

address was not included in the petition (a copy of which I have) yet they still included our address in the city's letter and posting.

In the Staff Report for this evenings meeting under "Analysis" it states "when reviewing the boundaries originally proposed..." "the two owner who hadn't signed the petition..." this statement is incorrect as we were never presented a petition to sign and our addresses does not even appear on said petition.

In the Staff Report for this evenings meeting under "Boundaries" it states "two additional properties identified as potential contributors..." We were never notified by the Historic Preservation Commission that we were potential contributors, this is a misleading statement.

At the meeting for the Historic Preservation Commission on November 7, 2011, after the meeting was adjourned Emily Stadnicki along with Julia the secretary was having a confusing discussion of which minutes had been approved or not approved for (according to them) October 17, 2011 or September 17, 2011. All of the commissioners present at the meeting were clearly confused and the Chair kept asking "so are we going to approve October 17, 2011 or not ?" Emily kept changing her answer and finally advised them that they would not approve them as she had to research those minutes further.

It is clearly obvious to me that the proposed landmark district which has been forwarded to you by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission was created with many illegal practices and undemocratic procedures. I strongly encourage the City Council to send this proposal back to the Historic Preservation Commission and mandate that a detailed investigation be completed by a third party. I also strongly encourage the City Council to mandate that this proposal be found null and void and mandate that a period of two years pass before it can be re-initiated. I also encourage the City Council to mandate that the Historic Preservation Commission cease and desist from proposing any further landmark districts until a detailed investigation into their illegal practices and un-democratic procedures be completed.

The Historic Preservation Commission has promised me answers to my

emailed questions over the phone (twice) and live in person at

their meeting on 11/07/11. To date I have not received any answers.

Someone at the Planning Commission Meeting on 11/09/11 stated that the process of notification to residents had been fixed. This was one of the answers that I was promised and was never given to date. What this person did not mention was how it was fixed, what the new process is

for notification to residents and where the public find this fixed notification information.

I highly encourage the Pasadena City Council to not endorse the illegal practices and undemocratic procedures going on at the Historic Preservation Commission as the Planning Commission has chosen to endorse them.

Thank you

Jose Rodriguez

570 N Raymond Ave

From: bisqit@live.com
To: jgarzon@cityofpasadena.net; jwasmund@cityofpasadena.net
CC: estadnicki@cityofpasadena.net; lwhite@cityofpasadena.net; sohpas@hotmail.com
Subject: Incorrect Minutes for September 19 2011
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 2011 21:31:40 -0700

Hi Julia,

Please forward this email to all members of the Historic Preservation Commission and please provide us with answers to all of the questions below. Please cc me on the email when you forward it. I appreciate your help with this matter.

1. For the minutes of September 19, 2011 our comments at the end of the meeting do not appear. Why do our comments not appear? What is your standard procedure in regards to including comments from the public in your printed minutes?

2. Attachment A is not included in the printed minutes that you provided us. How can we get a copy of Attachment A?

3. In the printed minutes under item 4C 3 there is an entry for "Aurora Wright – in favor." Aurora Wright never said she was in favor. She simply offered us help with information specific to the Mills Act etc. This item needs to be corrected.

4. Item 4C. Application for a new landmark district. -- 1. Raymond/Esther landmark district. Staff Recommendation. This item should not be in the minutes for September 19, 2011 as it was removed from the Agenda. Item 4C in the minutes for September 19, 2011 was never discussed at this meeting. There was clearly no staff recommendations discussed for this proposed district at the September 19, 2011 meeting. This item was actually postponed at the beginning of the meeting on September 19, 2011. Item 4C includes 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave as included in this proposed district and this is incorrect. Item 4C in its entirety needs to be removed from the minutes for September 19, 2011. This item should have been included in the minutes for October 17, 2011 with address 570 N Raymond Ave and 595 N Raymond Ave removed from this proposed district.

5. Why were the minutes for September 19, 2011 approved on October 17, 2011 and not earlier? In the City of Pasadena website http://pasadena.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=20under Historic Preservation Commission, the minutes for September 19, 2011 do not appear, yet the minutes for October 3, 2011 and the minutes for October 17, 2011 do appear. Why is that? Why are the minutes for September 19, 2011 not posted online?

The minutes for September 19, 2011 are incorrect. This leads us to believe that there is a secret agenda going on with the Historic Preservation Commission and the City of Pasadena Planning Department. Why are these blatant un-Democratic procedures continually being followed? Why are the minutes that should be online being withheld from the public? Why is item 4C on the printed minutes for September 19, 2011 when it was removed from the agenda for a later date and clearly never discussed on September 19, 2011?

Question for the Vice-Chair Darrel Cozen. Why did you approve the printed minutes for September 19, 2011 with the most obvious error -- Item 4C, which you yourself stated at the beginning of this meeting, would be postponed and would not be discussed and clearly was not discussed at the September 19, 2011 meeting?

We, the entire Pasadena community and the public at large are requesting answers to all of these questions.

We also request that the printed minutes for September 19, 2011 be corrected immediately and made available to the public.

We are also requesting that the minutes for September 19, 2011 be placed online immediately and made available to the public.

Thank you

Jose Rodriguez 570 N Raymond Ave

From: janastewart@cityofpasadena.net
To: bisqit@live.com
Subject: Historic Preservation Commission - Possible Historic District
Date: Mon, 14 Nov 2011 23:32:57 +0000

The following is a message from Mayor Bill Bogaard. You may respond directly to him atbbogaard@cityofpasadena.net, with a cc: to me.
Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

I have your message regarding the event that occurred on September 19 and will attempt to make inquiries regarding this matter. No information has previously come to my attention, but your communication is helpful in knowing what to inquire about.
Thank you very much for taking time to bring this matter to my attention.
BILL BOGAARD
Mayor
Jana Stewart
Office of the Mayor & City Council
From: Jose Rodriguez [mailto:bisqit@live.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2011 12:23 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill; Nagahiro, Lorain
Cc: Stone, Rhonda; Stewart, Jana
Subject: Andrea Rawlings Rude, Discourteous and un-professional behavior at public meeting September 19, 2011
Can you please forward this email to Mayor Bill Bogaard.
Hi Bill,
At the Historic Preservation Commission meeting on September 19, 2011, I and several other residents of the proposed Raymond/Esther landmark district had the opportunity to address the Commission at the end of this meeting.
The chair made it clear that if any member of the public were there to speak and be heard, whether they came from West Los Angeles or Altadena, they would have the opportunity to speak and be heard. The chair also made it clear to all members of the commission that this item had been removed from the agenda and that they (commissioners) would not be discussing it.
After I expressed my opinions and concerns and sat down so the next public speaker could speak. Andrea Rawlings took it upon herself to interrupt the public comments section of the meeting to ridicule me in front of everyone present. In her hand was a property list of homes with addresses and details regarding the architecture of each home. She and everyone present had the same document. While she held the property list up, in her hand, looking straight at it, she asked me if I was speaking about 570 N Raymond Ave. I said yes. While still holding the property list up in her hand and looking straight at it she then asked me if it was a Greene and Greene. This time with a disgusting smirk on her face, I said yes. She then gave me another dirty look in front of everyone present and placed the document down. The members of the public that were with me and witnessed this blatant rude and un-professional behavior agreed that she deliberately went out of her way to ridicule me. As if to say that I had no idea what a grand historic house I reside in. My family has owned this house for almost 45 years and we have been and are very well aware of our Greene and Greene and its historic significance in this great city of Pasadena.
Why would a member of the Historic Preservation Commission, after receiving detailed information from the staff of the Historical Preservation Commission ask if a home is a Greene and Greene? Why would a member of the Historical Preservation Commission, while clearly holding up and looking at detailed information which clearly states that the house she is clearly looking at is a Greene and Greene, ask a member of the Public if the house is indeed a Greene and Greene? Is she incompetent and not qualified to be a member of the Historic Preservation Commission because she does not know about Greene and Greene? Or is she ridiculing a member of the public while the floor is open to public comment and it is her responsibility as a member of the Historic Preservation Commission to listen during this time set aside for

public comment. Either way it comes down to not being qualified to be a member of the Historic Preservation Commission.
The Historica Preservation Commission meetings are open to the public so they may express their views, concerns and ask questions. These meetings are not an opportunity for members of the Historic Preservation Commission to ridicule members of the public while they express their views and concerns. All members of the Historical Preservation Commission should conduct themselves with civil and courteous behavior toward the public. Sarcastic comments, sarcastic questions with the intent to make members of the public look stupid, and snickering at people while individuals are expressing their views in a public meeting is not appropriate behavior. Appointments reflect the good judgement of our elected officials which we entrust to serve as our representatives and protect our views, opinions, safety etc.
Thank you

Jose Rodriguez
570 N Raymond Ave

From: VDeLaCuba@cityofpasadena.net
To: vgordo@cityofpasadena.net
CC: bisqit@live.com
Subject: FW: Discourteous behavor of Marica Sola at public meeting September 19 2011
Date: Fri, 28 Oct 2011 06:34:48 +0000

Victor,

Mr. Rodriguez has asked that I forward to you his email expressing his concerns regarding our District 5 representative on the Historic Preservation Commission. I have copied him on this email so that you may respond directly to him.

V.

Vannia De La Cuba
Field Representative to Councilmember Victor M. Gordo
City of Pasadena - District 5
100 N. Garfield Ave., Suite S228
Pasadena, CA 91109
Tel: (626) 744-4741
Fax: (626) 398-1836

From: Jose Rodriguez [bisqit@live.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 10:57 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia
Subject: Discourteous behavor of Marica Sola at public meeting September 19 2011

Hi Vannia,

Can you please forward this email to Victor Gordo. Please cc me when you forward it to him. I appreciate your help.

At the Historical Preservation Commission meeting on September 19, 2011, I and several other residents of the proposed Raymond/Esther landmark district had the opportunity to address the Commission at the end of this meeting.

While several of us expressed our opinions and views, Marcia Sola (representative for District 5 as a member of this commission) took it upon herself to laugh at us. She recused herself from this part of the meeting and sat at the front row, with the public, facing her colleagues on the commission.

Several members of the public could clearly see her laughing at us and giggling very rudely and un-professionally at us when we spoke to the Historical Preservation Commission on September 19, 2011 expressing our views and concerns as well as asking questions.

The Historical Preservation Commission meetings are open to the public so they may express their views, concerns and ask questions. These meetings are not an opportunity for members of the Historical Preservation Commission to ridicule members of the public while they express their views and concerns. All members of the Historical Preservation Commission should

conduct themselves with civil and courteous behavior toward the public. Sarcastic comments and laughing at people while individuals are expressing their views in a public meeting is not appropriate behavior. Appointments reflect the good judgement of our elected officials which we entrust to serve as our representatives and protect our views, opinions, safety etc.

Thank you

Jose Rodriguez 626-676-0014

Jomsky, Mark

Subject: Proposed Raymond-Esther Landmark District in Pasadena, California - City Council & Comminity Development Commission Meeting of 12/05/2011

From: MARIA RODRIGUEZ [mailto:2489gana@prodigy.net]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 2:49 PM
To: Nagahiro, Lorain
Subject: Fw: Proposed Raymond-Esther Landmark District in Pasadena, California - City Council & Comminity Development Commission Meeting of 12/05/2011

.Plese forward this e-mail to all members of the City Council & Community Developmen t Commission regarding the proposed Raymond-Esther Landmark District for tonight's meeting of 12/05/2011. Thank you.

My name is Maria Rodriguez and I reside at 570 N Raymond Ave., Pasadena. 626-449-3762.

My family and I have been residents of Pasadena for 50 years and are going on our 45th year residing at 570 N Raymonc Ave.

I am requesting that the city of Pasadena and its various departments, specifically the Planning Department:

1) Respect homeowners property rights

2) The property at 570 N Raymond Ave. NOT be included in this proposed Raymond-Esther Landmark District now nor in the future, or any other property whose owners do not wish to be part of any proposed district.

3) Review and change as appropriate the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts to assure property rights are observed and individual homeowner's property rights are not violated. The 51% requirement in the guidelines should be 100% approval of those affected property owners.

4) Notification is given to each property owner in a timely manner so that each homeowner may be able to prepare and agree or disagree with any proposals the City of Pasadena or its various departrments/representataives/residents may propose and take appropriate action.

History:

In September 2011 I received a call from a neighbor asking me what was going on with our property. She had seen a poster in front of 580 N Raymond Ave., indicating there was going to be some kind of meeing.

I went to check and sure enough there was one notice attached to the lightpost in front of 580 N Raymond Ave about a meeting that included 570-592 Raymond Ave., on east side and 569-595 on the west side. I checked on both sides of the street and there were no other posters anywhere except this one.

We were never approached by any one, neither neighbor nor City of Pasadena personnel, nor received any written notification about this proposed landmark district that included our property. Subsequently we found that the same had occurred with the property on 595 N Raymond Ave.

We called the contact person and were finally given the inofrmation that 5 property owners had presented a petition requesting this in April of 2011. We were NOT in the petition, but were arbitrarily placed in the proposed district without our consent, without taking our wishes into consideration, without notification, and if not for that one call, we would never have known abut this. I spoke to Emily Stadnicki and expressed my disagreement with the proposal and was informed that it only required 51% of property ownes to agree anyway. She also informed me that our property was a landmark anyway. I said I knew we were a Greene and Greene but no one at this property had ever asked to be on the national register, nor requested to be a historic landmark. Emily was unable to tell me when, who, or under what authority this hac

12/05/2011
Item 5

been done. The City Planning Dept. obviously then knew we had never requested to be part of the proposed landmark district and that we were not part of and had never been notified of this proposed landmark district.

I attended the September 19th meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission and expressed my disagreent with the proposal and my reasons why. Not only did I wish to be removed from the proposed landmark district now but in the future as well. I respect other peoples right to do with their property as they see fit and request the same be given to me. If they wish to have restrictions on their property and others making their decisions, that is their right. I do not want that. I do not wish more restriction than are already there via the building permit process for safety. I do not want some one from the outside telling me my window frame can only be 2 1/2 inches if I want 3 inches. I want to retain full homeowner property rights.

I was subsequently contacted by Emily and advised that 570 and 595 had been removed from the proposed landmark district for now.

I also attended the October meeting and again expressed my views. My family want to retain full property rights. We do not wish to be part of this proposed district and do not want others imposing their views on us or any other property owner. We do not want anyone adding us to this proposed district in the future without our written consent.

Emily said she would discuss this with me later but assured this would not not happen.

I spoke to Emily the first week of November 2011. I asked her again, can someone from the city or a neighbor submit our property for inclusion in this proposed landmark district in the future? Her answer: "Technically Yes but not likely" . As this has happened twice, I do not wish for it to happen a third time.

In Amendment 5 to the Constitution of the United States of America it states that "no person....be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compnesation."

I feel we have been deprived of due process, no notification, no consent from our part, and if placed as part of this proposed landmark district in the future without our consent would be using our property for public use without just compensation.

In addition, the purpose stated for the proposed landmark district is a)ecnomic health - there is no evidence that the landmark designation will improve anyone's income in the neighborhood, b) residential quality - I have been in this neighborhood for 50 years and I am as quality today as I was then, we are a hardworking community with ups and downs not a wealthy area - we want everyday normal good people here. c) enhance the value of property - I think it will be the opposite. The community needs affordable housing not unaffordable. Very few people wish to land themselves with restriction upon restriction to their property. When they do, they purchase in a plannded urban development. My family wanted to have freedom of choice and purchased a "home" not a museum. d) After residing at this property going on 45 years, it is clear we do not need some one from outside telling us what what to do. We have maintained our property as best we could throughoutt these years as close to the original as possible because we like it that way. The home was purchased because we appreciated the look, style, and feel of it.

I have received a package from the City of Pasadena where the Planning Department took it upon themselves to submit our property at 570 N Raymond Ave., Pasadenca, CA without our knowledge or consent for national historic register status. This is a clear violation of property rights. I request that the City of Pasadena correct this gross error and restore our property to non national histroic register status immediately.

Thank you,

Maria Rodriguez

Peter & Margaret Alexandre
581 North Raymond Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91103
626-744-0236

December 5, 2011

City Council
c/o Design & Historic Preservation Section
Planning Department
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Proposal to Designate the Raymond-Esther Landmark District

Hearing December 5, 2011, 7:00 pm, City Hall Council Chambers, Room S249, 100 No. Garfield Ave., Pasadena, CA

Dear Members of the Pasadena City Council,

We are the property owners and residents of 581 North Raymond Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91103 and have been so since 2000.

The opportunity to become part of an historic district in Northwest Pasadena is an honor. We are proud to participate in the Landmark District and we fully support the Landmark District Designation, which includes our property.

Respectfully,

Peter Alexandre

Margaret Alexandre

12/05/2011
Item 5