

# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **DESIDERIO ARMY RESERVE CENTER HOMELESS ASSISTANCE SUBMISSION**

**Desiderio Army Reserve Center**  
**City of Pasadena (LRA)**  
Homeless Assistance Submission

**I. Summary of Homeless Population & Needs (from the City's Five Year Consolidated Plan)**

The City of Pasadena performs an annual homeless count and a homeless survey is completed every three years. Based on data from the 2006 count and the 2004 survey, Pasadena has a homeless population of 1165 homeless persons. Of these, 736 (63.2%) are adults and 429 (36.8%) are children. The majority (64.3%) of homeless adults are men, and 36.3% of the adult homeless population is white, 29.3% is African-American, 23% are Hispanic/Latino, 3.8% are Native American or Alaskan Native, and 1.5% are Asian, while 6.1% stated their race or ethnicity as "Other". Of the homeless adults, 39.3% meet the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) definition of chronically homeless.

The current inventory of homeless facilities in the City includes 52 year-round Emergency Shelter Beds for individuals and 70 for families; 185 seasonal or voucher Emergency Shelter Beds; 66 Transitional Housing beds for individuals and 52 for families; and 47 Permanent Supportive Housing beds for individuals and 41 for families. The Pasadena Continuum of Care also has an access center, Passageways, that provides intake, case management, and referrals, and provides street outreach to homeless residents.

The largest gap in service in the Pasadena Continuum of Care is Transitional Housing for families, with an identified unmet need of 250 beds. There is also an unmet need of 71 Emergency Shelter and 191 Permanent Supportive Housing beds for individuals.

See attachment A for the City's priority needs tables.

**II. Notices of Interest from Homeless Providers**

Description of Proposals Received

The City received one Notice of Interest (NOI) from a homeless assistance provider. The Union Station Foundation and Southern California Housing Development Corporation partnered to propose 75 affordable rental units serving the needs of formerly homeless families. The proposal is included as Attachment B.

Proposals Supported and Not Supported

The Union Station/SCHDC proposal was not selected in part because the site is not readily accessible to services or transit, and in part because the proposed density would have created negative impacts on adjacent historic and natural resources.

### Description of Accessibility and Impacts

The 5.1 acre Desiderio site was formerly the grounds and recreation area of the historic Vista del Arroyo Hotel and Resort complex built in 1903. The entire site was acquired by the U.S. War Department in 1943 to serve as hospital facilities for servicemen during WWII. In 1956 the Desiderio Army Reserve Center was built on the western half of the property below grade from the hotel buildings.

The hotel buildings east of the Desiderio site include the main hotel and several smaller bungalows. All have been restored and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Federal government still owns the main building and several bungalows that now house the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and provide offices for non-profit agencies. The remaining bungalows were sold to a private developer who is developing the site as condominiums.

Along the northern portion of the site is the Colorado Street Bridge built in 1913 and also restored and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The property includes an easement under the bridge to allow access for repairs.

Immediately south of the Desiderio site is a low-density historic single-family neighborhood built largely between 1890 and 1930. A portion of this neighborhood is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and with the balance of the neighborhood being eligible for listing. This quiet neighborhood and the Desiderio site are bordered on the west by the Arroyo Seco, a natural watershed and major tributary of the Los Angeles River. This deep canyon is the City's largest natural open space, stretching eight miles through the City and 22 miles in total linking the San Gabriel Mountains to downtown Los Angeles. Pasadena and other communities along the Arroyo have worked diligently to protect and restore this important natural environment for future generations.

The site is not readily accessible to employment opportunities or local services. It is not served by local or regional transit and is located at the bottom of a steep grade. Walking to commercial areas would be difficult and dangerous due to the grade, curvature of the road, and lack of sidewalks.

The West Gateway Specific Plan is the current long-range planning document for the site. Adopted in 1998, the plan is the product of several years of community participation and includes specific recommendations recognizing the environmental sensitivity of the Desiderio site. It requires that residential development on the site be not more than 6 units per acre and that any new development be in character with the surrounding residential areas, respect the peaceful quality of the area, and minimize traffic and impacts on the Arroyo Seco.

The proposal from Union Station/SCHDC was the highest density of all eleven proposals received and created the most significant impacts on the adjacent National Register structures, the historic single-family neighborhood and the sensitive natural environment of the Arroyo Seco.

The proposed height and density dramatically exceeded the land use regulations for the site. In addition, the massing would have created significant aesthetic impacts on the adjacent historic resources. Further concerns included noise, traffic and other environmental impacts on the neighborhood and protected natural environment.

The eleven proposals were reviewed by four advisory commissions before being presented to City Council. Three of the four commissions did not recommend the Union Station/SCHDC proposal because it was incompatible with the surrounding development and created too many negative impacts. In addition, the community expressed significant concerns regarding the proposal during the outreach process.

### III. Balance

**(1) State how the reuse plan balances the need for economic redevelopment, other types of development, and homeless assistance in the community.**

In considering appropriate uses for the site Pasadena had to balance several critical priorities including services to the homeless, the need for affordable housing and the need to create additional public parkland. In addition, the City had to consider the specific development qualities of the site including geographic location, accessibility, and adjacent sensitive land uses.

As described above, it was determined that the proposal for homeless services was not appropriate for the site. City Council ultimately selected a proposal that seeks to satisfy other critical City priorities including affordable housing and public parkland. The recommended plan includes nine affordable units to be built by Habitat for Humanity and leaves the remainder of the site as natural open space.

**(2) State how the plan is consistent with the Consolidated Plan and other existing housing and community development plans adopted by the jurisdictions.**

The City believes that all Pasadena residents have an equal right to live in decent, safe and affordable housing in a suitable living environment for the long-term well-being and stability of themselves, their families, their neighborhoods and their community. The Consolidated Plan 2005-2010 states that the housing vision for Pasadena is to maintain a socially and economically diverse community of homeowners and renters who are afforded this right. The recommended plan includes nine single family bungalows to be constructed by Habitat for Humanity and is consistent with the Consolidated Plan/Goal: Housing Production /Objective 2 to develop ownership units that will be affordable for very low-, low-, and moderate income households.

The plan is also consistent with the Housing Element of the General Plan which seeks to ensure the affordability of its housing stock, address individuals and families with special housing needs, and balance growth with preservation of the unique aspect of Pasadena.

Finally the recommended plan is consistent with the West Gateway Specific Plan which allows for low-density residential that maintains the character of the surrounding neighborhood and minimizes impacts on the natural environment.

#### **IV. Outreach to Homeless Assistance Providers**

Jurisdiction:

City of Pasadena

Newspaper Ad:

Notices were published in three local papers on June 8, 2006, including the *Pasadena Star News*, the *Pasadena Weekly*, and the *Pasadena Journal*. (Attachment C)

Outreach to Homeless Service Providers:

Letters were sent to a list of local homeless assistance providers as shown in Attachment D AND E.

Description of workshop:

On June 30, 2006, a workshop was held to provide an opportunity for interested parties to learn about the reuse process and to tour the buildings. A printed booklet was distributed providing background information and photographs of the site and an overview of the process. Following tours of the facilities, representatives of the City and the Army provided an overview and responded to questions. Representatives of more than 75 organizations attended (Attachment F) including numerous representatives of homeless services agencies.

#### **V. Public Comment**

Overview of Citizen Participation Process

A web page dedicated to information regarding the Desiderio site was posted in June, 2006, including the request for Notices of Interest, background information and photographs of the site, information on the process, and regular updates regarding meeting schedules, commission recommendations and plans. In September, 2006 all eleven proposals (excluding financial information.) were posted on the site. Information was also shared with the community through the City's semi-monthly community newsletter and regular coverage by local newspapers.

On October 12, 2006, a general information meeting was held to allow the community to become familiar with the proposals prior to the start of the planning process. Each of the eleven proposal teams presented their plan, answered questions and distributed materials to a group of approximately 80 attendees. The meeting was promoted through press releases, notices to all neighborhood associations, postcards mailed to addresses within 1,000 ft radius of the site, postcards placed at public counters, notice posted on the local cable channel, and information posted on the City's web page. These same tools were used to notify the community of additional commission and City Council meetings.

In October 2006, the Pasadena City Council designated the Planning Commission to act as the official advisory review panel to evaluate the proposals and recommend a conceptual land use plan. The Planning Commission was deemed to meet several important criteria which qualified it to act in an advisory role on this issue. By nature of their appointment to the Commission, Planning Commissioners possess technical expertise and experience in evaluating master plans and balancing land use-related concerns. In this case, several diverse proposals needed to be evaluated for compliance with existing City plans and codes, as well as for compatibility with the unique character of the site. The Planning Commission is experienced not only with the current plans and development standards for the community, but also with the community concerns and priorities regarding new development. In addition, the membership of the Commission is representative of a cross-section of the community, thereby providing a diverse range of perspectives.

The City Council also directed that the eleven proposals be reviewed by three additional advisory commissions including the Community Development Committee, the Recreation and Parks Commission and the Transportation Advisory Commission. These groups assessed the open space, housing, and traffic impacts of the 11 submitted proposals respectively. Each of these commissions reviewed the proposals, heard public testimony and forwarded a list of recommended projects to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

The Planning Commission reviewed the eleven proposals over the course of three public meetings. On November 1, 2006, presentations were heard and public testimony taken. On December 6, 2006, the Commission again heard public comment and selected four finalists from among the eleven proposals. Each of the four was asked to consider partnering with each other, or other agencies, to create a more balanced project. On January 24, 2007 revised proposals were submitted by three of the finalists, however no new partnerships were presented. Public testimony was heard and a final proposal was selected for recommendation to the City Council.

The City Council considered all eleven proposals, recommendations from all four advisory bodies, and public comment on February 5, 2007. A concept plan was selected that would combine two proposals and staff was directed to return with final documents for approval. On March 19, City Council considered, at the request of the participants of the plan, possible modifications to the approved concept plan and public comment was heard. Staff was directed to prepare additional plan variations and return to Council for further action. On April 23, staff returned with a revised plan as directed; after reviewing the alternative and hearing public testimony, City Council affirmed their original decision of February 5, 2007.

#### Public Hearing on Draft Plan

A fully noticed public hearing was held on February 5, 2007 when the City Council reviewed the proposals and selected a draft concept plan. A second noticed public hearing was held on May 21, 2007, when City Council approved the final Reuse Plan.

Summary of Citizen Comments

Citizen comments were heard at 11 public meetings as listed below:

October 12, 2006	Information Meeting
November 1, 2006	Planning Commission
November 20, 2006	Community Development Committee
November 29, 2006	Recreation and Parks Commission
December 6, 2006	Planning Commission
January 12, 2007	Transportation Advisory Commission
January 24, 2007	Planning Commission
February 5, 2007	City Council
March 19, 2007	City Council
April 9, 2007	City Council
May 21, 2007	City Council

Minutes for each of the meetings, with the exception of October 12, 2006, are attached as Attachment G. Minutes were not kept for the October 12 meeting.

ATTACHMENT A: Homeless Needs Charts

ATTACHMENT B: Union Station/SCHDC Proposal  
(Previously submitted to City Council on February 5, 2007)

ATTACHMENT C: Newspaper Ads

ATTACHMENT D: Letter to Homeless Services Providers

ATTACHMENT E: List of Homeless Services Providers

ATTACHMENT F: List of Attendees at June 30, 2006 Info Meeting

ATTACHMENT G: Minutes of Public Meetings  
(Available with City Clerk)

**TABLE 2A**  
**Priority Needs Summary Table**

<b>PRIORITY HOUSING NEEDS (households)</b>		<b>Priority Need Level High, Medium, Low</b>		<b>Unmet Need</b>	<b>Goals</b>
<b>Renter</b>	<b>Small Related</b>	0-30%	H	2,474	1,766
		31-50%	H	1,256	225
		51-80%	H	1,663	197
	<b>Large Related</b>	0-30%	M	642	4
		31-50%	M	1,376	9
		51-80%	M	942	2
	<b>Elderly</b>	0-30%	M	1,152	0
		31-50%	H	1,942	50
		51-80%	M	528	0
	<b>All Other</b>	0-30%	M	1,888	200
		31-50%	M	3,132	600
		51-80%	M	1,683	1,200
<b>Owner</b>	0-30%	M	1,082	130	
	31-50%	M	2,078	330	
	51-80%	M	2,041	335	
<b>Special Needs</b>		0-80%	H	7,672	2,500
<b>Total Goals</b>					7,548
<b>Total 215 Goals</b>					7,548
<b>Total 215 Renter Goals</b>					4,253
<b>Total 215 Owner Goals</b>					3,295



**TABLE 2B  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS**

<b>PRIORITY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS</b>	<b>Priority Need Level High, Medium, Low, No Such Need (optional)</b>	<b>Unmet Priority Need (optional)</b>	<b>Dollars to Address Unmet Priority Need</b>	<b>Goals (optional)</b>
<b>PUBLIC FACILITY NEEDS (projects)</b>				
Senior Centers	M		0	
Handicapped Centers	M		0	
Homeless Facilities	M		0	
Youth Centers	M		0	
Child Care Centers	H		23,949	1 unit of service
Health Facilities	M		0	
Neighborhood Facilities	M		0	
Parks and/or Recreation Facilities	M		0	
Parking Facilities	L		0	
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	L		0	
Other Public Facility Needs				
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE (projects)</b>				
Water/Sewer Improvements	M		0	
Street Improvements	M		0	
Sidewalks	M		0	
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	M		0	
Flood Drain Improvements	M		0	
Other Infrastructure Needs			0	
<b>PUBLIC SERVICE NEEDS (people)</b>				
Senior Services	H		\$85,500	1,530 units of service
Handicapped Services	M		0	
Youth Services	H		\$282,000	2,256 units of service
Child Care Services	H		\$20,000	15 units of service
Transportation Services	M		0	
Substance Abuse Services	M		0	
Employment Training	H		\$30,000	24 units of service
Health Services	H		\$55,000	1,375 units of service
Lead Hazard Screening	H		0	
Crime Awareness	M		0	

**TABLE 2B  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS**

Other Public Service Needs: Homelessness	H		\$183,000	2,407 units of service
Other Public Service Needs: Mental Health	H		\$40,000	250 units of service
Other Public Service Needs: Immigration	H		\$25,728	50 units of service
Other Public Service Needs: Home Maintenance	H		\$620,000	80 units of service
Other Public Service Needs: Fair Housing	H		\$58,000	1,500 units of service
Other Public Service Needs: Code Enforcement	H		\$244,048	2,000 units of service
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>				
ED Assistance to For-Profits(businesses)	H		\$203,000	525 units of service
ED Technical Assistance(businesses)	H		\$231,000	20 units of service
Micro-Enterprise Assistance(businesses)	H		\$68,000	40 units of service
Rehab; Publicly- or Privately-Owned Commercial/Industrial (projects)	H		\$313,449	12 units of service
C/I* Infrastructure Development (projects)	M			
Other C/I* Improvements(projects)				
<b>PLANNING</b>				
Planning	H		\$466,854	55 units of service
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED DOLLARS NEEDED:</b>			<b>\$2,453,079.00</b>	

\* Commercial or Industrial Improvements by Grantee or Non-profit

**Table 2C**  
**Summary of Specific Housing/Community Development Objectives**  
**(Table 2A/2B Continuation Sheet)**

<b>Obj #</b>	<b>Specific Objectives</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Expected Units</b>	<b>Actual Units</b>
	<b>Rental Housing Objectives</b>			
	provide rental assistance to very low- and low-income households	decent, safe and sanitary housing opportunities will be provided	5,410	
	construct rental units that are affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households.	Affordable housing opportunities will be provided	550	
	<b>Owner Housing Objectives</b>			
	provide homeowner assistance to very low- and low-income households	decent, safe and sanitary housing opportunities will be provided	145	
	construct ownership units that are affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. Assistance will be provided to 600 households.	Affordable housing opportunities will be provided	50	
	<b>Community Development Objectives</b>			
	(see Table 2B)			
	<b>Infrastructure Objectives</b>			
	(see Table 2B)			
	<b>Public Facilities Objectives</b>			
	(see Table 2B)			
	<b>Public Services Objectives</b>			
	(see Table 2B)			
	<b>Economic Development Objectives</b>			
	(see Table 2B)			
	<b>Other Objectives</b>			