

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2021 7:25 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #15

Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #15

Name: David Delgado
Email:

Phone: (

Address:

Avenue, Pasadena, CA
91104

Comments:

As a longtime Pasadena resident, I second the comments from Julianna Delgado, Tina Miller, Garfield Heights, Bungalow Heaven, and Pasadena Heritage. Poor staff decisions and recommendations have been made absent clear measures preventing mansionization and other inappropriate changes to non-contributors in historic districts. One need only drive by the now out-of-scale 1167 N. Catalina “remodeling” (in quotes) to understand its negative impact on my neighbors’ privacy and home values, establishing an unfortunate precedent.

Partly to blame is the inability of building inspectors – through lack of training, knowledge, or authority—to respect and enforce conditions of approval during on-site inspections and issue stop work orders or citations if violated. Had the Historic Preservation Commission’s conditions been considered, the Catalina house might not have been demolished without a permit and its historic materials destroyed. On-site enforcement should support a democratic entitlement process.

Like for Santa Monica and other cities, I also urge explicit realtor disclosure filed with the City Clerk upon changes of ownership, memorializing that new owners understand the development limitations in historic districts and have received an applicable conservation plan or provisions of

MC Chapter 17. This was strongly recommended to staff but not included in the revisions before you.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 10, 2021 at 7:24 pm

- Provide summary, easy to read, pre-purchase information about preservation guidelines to prospective buyers. Such information currently does not exist at all. Potential buyers need advance knowledge of the ongoing responsibilities of ownership in a Landmark District.
- Provide information and reminders to existing homeowners in Landmark Districts of preservation guidelines and available resources for assistance.

Thank you for accepting this informational comment.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 11, 2021 at 9:50 am

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:49 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Name: Matthew Gelfand
of Californians for
Homeownership

Email:

Phone:

Address:
 , LOS
ANGELES, CA 90020

Comments:

Californians for Homeownership is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization that uses impact litigation to address California's housing crisis. I am writing as part of our work monitoring compliance with state law limits on the rejection of critically needed new housing based on historic preservation arguments. Under SB 330, which went into effect on January 1, 2020 City must make any historic site determination at the time an application to build new housing is deemed complete.

As you consider updates to the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, you must keep these limits in mind. To the extent that the Ordinance would require or allow the City to make a determination about the historic nature of a site after a housing development application is complete, that is unlawful.

We note that the City has existing policies regarding undesignated sites. We trust that the City has ceased enforcing these policies to the extent incompatible with SB 330. If not, the City is exposed to the serious risk of litigation.

A more complete discussion of these issues is provided in the letter we sent earlier today. We look forward to reviewing the specific language of the City's new Historic Preservation Ordinance once it is available.

01/11/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:56 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Name: Pasadena
Heritage - Andrew
Salimian
Email:
Phone:
Address: (Pasadena, CA 91105

Comments:

Pasadena Heritage is pleased these Historic Preservation Ordinance updates are before you and ask you to please support them. We submitted a letter before the December 14th Meeting with detailed recommendations. We find the proposed regulations on exterior fabric are still not strong enough and will still allow the removal the majority of exterior fabric for designated properties. We ask that at least 75% of exterior fabric on primary façades be retained, or 50% on all façades. Too many projects have been approved that removed entire façades needlessly. We hope this will be discussed between City Staff and City Council. We also support amendments proposed by Bungalow Heaven and by Julianna Delgado, which address some unresolved issues in Bungalow Heaven, other Conservation Plans, and Historic Districts. Thank you for your continued support of preservation of Pasadena's historic resources, which are vital and valuable assets for the whole City. To ensure transparency, please ask staff to create a public presentation on these changes along with the Mansionization ordinance in the near future to explain and show how these changes will affect future development. Thank you.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 11, 2021 at 2:56 pm

01/11/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:45 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Name: John S. Miller **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91103

Comments:

Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments: Item 15 subsection 8; Suggest including Historic Preservation approvals be included on all Construction Site Notices for public knowledge. Subsection 9: mandate maximum time allowed for staff to review and process submittals by property owners. Currently a good faith submittal can take months to process. This is not fair to the community and the applicant. I would suggest 3 weeks for approval of submittals that do not require being placed on Historic Preservation, Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage, Design Commission agendas, etc.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 11, 2021 at 2:45 pm

01/11/2021
Item 15

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:29 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Public Comment for Meeting on January 11, 2021 about Agenda Item 15

Name: Bryan Reese **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91104

Comments:

I strenuously object to the bullet point number two in the staff report under "Criteria for amending a Conservation Plan." Bungalow Heaven has proven a great success and has been of immense value to the City as a whole. It exists entirely because the residents of Bungalow Heaven wanted to have greater control of zoning and other issues of vital importance that are unique to their neighborhood. THIS HAS NOT CHANGED. Eliminating the ability of the residents of Bungalow Heaven to amend our conservation plan to continue to address these unique issues would be a giant step backward.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: January 11, 2021 at 2:28 pm

01/11/2021
Item 15