

**DESIGN ANALYSIS OF
HERITAGE SQUARE
DEVELOPER PROPOSALS**

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>will be activated or used. For example, the elevations do not show windows or doors onto this space, only blank walls. Similarly, none of the plans show how the retail spaces will be entered, or even whether the developer has an idea about what the uses should be to support the local market and to activate the public space.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The passage-way between the corner and parking lot is diagrammatic; it does not provide any sense of its three-dimensional quality or its architectural characteristics, or of its activities. The way it is shown as an enclosed passage implies that it is nothing more than an outdoor hallway. This space should include the elevator lobby for offices above, and maybe even a two story space that visually connects with the office lobby on the second floor. 3. The location where the parking lot meets the passage-way is an opportunity to create a space for activities... outdoor eating, for example. However, this space is nothing more than a narrow sidewalk. Revising the parking layout and visually connecting this location by means of landscape and paving materials with the nearby Oak Tree space is an example of a simple improvement that would add tremendously to the overall project design. |
| <p>4.7 Massing and height</p> | <p>36 foot height limit; massing and higher elements location/ neighborhood protection; commercial built to property line; residential built to property line</p> | <p>While the building is three stories, the sections do not provide height dimensions so we cannot verify if the residential buildings are within the 36 foot height limit. However, the narrative does claim that the "overall height is less than 36 feet to the plate line."</p> <p>The narrative stresses, and elevations confirm, that the project includes one, two and three story masses, and that additional features such as recesses, terraces, balconies, and roof projections vary the building facades to add visual interest and scale. In this regard the massing and elevations are very well articulated and scaled, and achieve significant visual interest.</p> <p>The RFP called for both cross sections (east/west – Fair Oaks/Wheeler Lane) and longitudinal sections (north/south – Painter/Orange Grove). One cross section is provided; no longitudinal section is provided.</p> <p>The cross section is shown at a very small size; it is very hard to understand the spatial relationships within the project yet alone read the text on the drawing. Because the adjoining houses east of Wheeler Lane are not shown there is no way to judge community impacts.</p> <p>Without the longitudinal section it is impossible to understand the impacts of the at-grade parking on the internal building courtyards. This is a major deficiency of this submittal.</p> <p>Both the residential and commercial uses are built to the property line; see above for additional discussion.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Fair Oaks (except for the elevator room in one wing facing Fair Oaks); 2) locating the community room and multi-purpose room fronting Fair Oaks; 3) providing generous openings of the two internal courtyards to Fair Oaks; and 4) providing human scale entry trellises to the two internal courtyards from Fair Oaks.</p> <p>No sidewalk/intersection improvements are shown on the plans.</p> <p>It appears that the Wheeler dedication is shown on the plans but it is difficult to tell because there are no notes.</p> |
| <p>4.6 Open space</p> | <p>Building courtyards, seams and connections between functions and courtyards, and corner and building entrances.</p> | <p>Three courtyards are provided and the following comments are offered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condominium Building courtyard/Seam between Condominium Building/Rental Apartment Building <p>This area involves two integrated courtyards. One north-south oriented courtyard sits within the Condominium Building proper; the other links perpendicularly to Fair Oaks in an east-west orientation. The combination of these two courtyards is wonderful: it is visually sophisticated and organizes movement throughout this part of the project including access to the community and multi-purpose rooms. The wide opening of the east-west space to Fair Oaks is inviting; however, the fences should be removed as discussed in 4.5 above. The other concern about the east-west space is the blank walls that define its edges: these walls, from the adjoining ground floor parking structure ultimately means that this space is not "owned" by adjoining residents and therefore becomes merely a passage-way, not actively engaged.</p> 2. Rental Apartment Building courtyard <p>This east-west oriented space organizes movements and activities for the Rental Apartment Building. As with the discussion above, the wide opening of this space to Fair Oaks is well proportioned and inviting.</p> 3. Shared Rental Apartment/Commercial Site B courtyard <p>This partial courtyard would be a wonderful link between the residential and commercial components of the project, if it is not fenced. This space humanizes the commercial parking lot. Providing access to the Oak Tree area for both residents and commercial users will be a wonderful public space in the city's overall urban fabric. As shown on the plan, the space around the adjoining commercial building to the south is not well designed, especially the walk way that connects south to Fair Oaks. This walkway, as well as all the space around this building needs to be better integrated with the Oak Tree courtyard.</p> <p>We have the following concerns about the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner public space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The space at the corner has both a landscape element and an architectural feature. However, both of these features beg the problem that neither the plans nor elevations show how this space |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>inactive. Therefore, this building does not present a "human scale" or character to the either street as set forth by the RFP. The project does not meet these essential criteria. See 4.5 below for further discussion.</p> <p>Second, the drawings are not clear if a drive-thru is provided for Church's Chicken. If it is provided, the present layout has stacking problems; that is, cars will back up into Wheeler Lane and Orange Grove. In the present configuration only nine parking spaces are provided for this use. It is unlikely that customers will self-regulate by not parking in the main retail/commercial lot. This use has an Orange Grove driveway with ingress and egress to only five parking spaces. However, the circulation from Wheeler Lane is one-way south. If a driver entering from Orange Grove cannot find parking in one of the five spaces, the driver will have to make a three-point turn to reverse direction and exit back onto Orange Grove because they cannot go north into the one-way driveway. This part of the plan needs revision.</p> <p>Third, also with regard to Site B, a portion of the second floor along Fair Oaks includes apartments. Parking for these units is described in the narrative (subterranean with access from Painter and the commercial parking lot) but is not shown on the drawings. The lack of drawings to depict these key conditions is a significant shortcoming of this proposal....</p> <p>Finally, the driveway connecting the commercial parking lot and Fair Oaks should have improved paving materials, at least at the crosswalk on the east side of the retail buildings.</p> |
| <p>4.5 Street edge and human scale</p> | <p>Sidewalk/ intersection improvements; Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner features; Fair Oaks/Painter corner features; senior rental building features; landscape setback/unit entrances; mixed-use commercial building edges; Wheeler dedication</p> | <p>The most significant problem of this project is the lack of ground floor residential units facing the street. This is a major deficiency of the project, and is cause not to select it.</p> <p>This project utilizes a "podium" model: the parking provides a podium upon which the housing is placed. This means that the street edges are not lined with active uses such as living spaces and front doors, but rather with blank walls mitigated by landscape.</p> <p>In the professional real estate and architectural world this model is recognized as being anti-urban and is largely outdated for this reason. Most real estate developers who want to create a successful urban environment do not use the podium model.</p> <p>As if the podium model were not sufficiently harmful to the urban environment, the project is surrounded by a five foot six inch high fence along the property line. While one would certainly expect a fence and gate at project entrances, to ring the property with a fence is in clear contradiction of the RFP guidelines which called for creating a secure and defensible project through "eyes on the street" that empower residents to take "ownership" of the sidewalk. Providing a fence clearly sends a defensive message to the community and does not add to the quality of the urban environment envisioned by the Pasadena city-wide design principles and Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan.</p> <p>To the architect's credit, however, mitigating features have been employed: 1) locating three building lobbies along and accessible from</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>southeast corner of the project. Placement at this location treats the use and its customers diminutively and bifurcates site activities including parking and access.</p> <p>3. Second and third floor office uses are provided above the ground floor retail along Orange Grove. Not showing a lobby on the plans to access these uses is a deficiency.</p> |
| | Provide senior rental building entrance and public space on Fair Oaks | Provided. See 4.6 for a discussion about the open space. |
| | Provide unit entrances along Fair Oaks. | Ground floor unit entrances are not provided. This is a major project deficiency that is cause not to select it. See 4.5 for discussion. |
| | Provides minor feature at Fair Oaks/Painter intersection | A feature is not provided however the building design does acceptably acknowledge and respect this corner. |
| | Maintain and protect the Oak Tree | The Oak Tree is an excellent feature of the public space linking the Rental Apartment Building and the commercial site. See the discussion in 4.6 below. |
| <p>4.4 Vehicular circulation</p> | <p>Orange Grove: commercial garage access; Fair Oaks: commercial access; Fair Oaks: provide senior drop-off/pick up; Painter: provide residential garage access; Wheeler Lane: provide residential and commercial garage access and service (e.g., trash)</p> | <p>A curb turnout is provided on Fair Oaks for curbside loading and unloading.</p> <p>The residential parking garage is at grade. The northern end of the garage at Painter is recessed one-half level below grade with a speed ramp (a short ramp with maximum angle) from Painter. Due to the slope of the site (down to the south) the garage "daylights" (fully above grade) not far south of Painter. The garage driveway to Wheeler Lane is at-grade.</p> <p>Internal garage circulation is well laid out with a major drive aisle running the length of the site in the north/south direction adjacent to Wheeler Lane. Two parking "wings" oriented east/west are connected to this north/south "spine." Guest spaces are provided.</p> <p>Trash and service are oriented toward Wheeler Lane as set forth in the RFP.</p> <p>Elevators and stairs connecting the at-grade parking to the project above are centrally located and provide good accessibility.</p> <p>Commercial retail and office parking surface lot is well laid out. It is located to the east of Site B behind the ground floor commercial uses which front Fair Oaks and Orange Grove. Access is from Fair Oaks and Wheeler Lane. The Church's Chicken use and surface parking lot is located on the south side of Site B along Orange Grove and is separated from the retail/office parking lot.</p> <p>We have the following concerns:</p> <p>First, with respect to the residential buildings, because parking is at-grade the non-lobby building edges on Painter and Fair Oaks are fundamentally</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

4.0 Diagrams

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|---|
| 4.1 Site organizational principles | Provide three zones north to south | <p>The site plan provides three zones north to south as defined in the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condominium building to the north 2. Rental apartment building in the middle 3. Commercial uses to the south (Site B). <p>In addition, two stories of rental units are provided above a portion of the ground floor commercial uses on Site B oriented to Fair Oaks.</p> <p>An important and excellent feature of the project is the central location, along Fair Oaks, of the community room and multipurpose room. These public rooms are located in the middle of the project between condominium building and rental apartment building.</p> |
| 4.2 Site modulation | Major modulation: massing between building types and basic scale features | Provided. |
| | Minor modulation: respect original 50 foot plat; oriented to Fair Oaks and Orange Grove; organizes building massing and features; do not create literal pattern | Provided. |
| 4.3 Site design features and views to the site | Focus on edges of Fair Oaks, Orange Grove, and Painter | <p>The residential portion of the project does not engage the Fair Oaks and Painter street edges due to the provision of a podium-designed parking structure as described in 4.5 below. This condition is mitigated, to a minimum degree by the location of the building lobbies at-grade adjacent to Fair Oaks.</p> <p>The commercial portion of the project engages the Fair Oaks and Orange Grove edges. However, the Orange Grove edge is weak due to the fact that a substantial portion of the frontage is occupied by parking and a driveway.</p> |
| | Mixed-use commercial features: provide architectural and landscape corner feature and building entrance at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove intersection. Mass commercial edges to property line at street. | <p>Commercial uses are provided on Site B. These uses are well organized in a traditional manner with retail spaces primarily fronting Fair Oaks. A corner open space feature at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove connects through a passage-way to the parking lot behind; a discussion of the open spaces is provided in 4.6 below. A discussion of circulation and parking is provided in 4.5 below.</p> <p>The following concerns are offered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The elevational design of the commercial uses look like an extension of the residential building. The commercial uses should have a commercial look and feel in order to provide the proper scale and identity at this important commercial intersection. 2. Church's Chicken is not well sited as an independent element at the |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

3.0 Other Design Issues

| Principle | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|---|
| 3.1 City-Wide Design Principles and Fair Oaks/ Orange Grove Specific Plan | Paraphrasing citywide principles: 1) enhance the unique character of Pasadena; 2) contribute to an identifiable and coherent city form; 3) achieve creative architectural solutions without direct mimicry of historical styles | <p>The plans for the proposed design strongly emphasize the residential character of the project; these plans are worked out in extraordinary detail. By contrast the commercial portion of the project is no where near as resolved or detailed. Furthermore, the project's commercial element incorrectly applies the architectural character of the residential element.</p> <p>But, the main problem with the residential element is that it utilizes a podium model of parking with units above. This means that, in contradiction to the RFP, there are no units to activate the street edges or internal project courtyards. The podium is an outdated development model that is fundamentally an anti-urban design. For this reason the design does not support the citywide design principles or the specific plan.</p> <p>The project's proposal documentation, as <i>required</i> by the RFP, does NOT contain a longitudinal section or a perspective sketch.</p> |
| 3.2 Site Specific Guidelines | Site Planning | The narrative does a good job responding to some of the key site planning concerns set forth in the RFP. |
| | Building Design | The narrative does a good job responding to some of the key site planning concerns set forth in the RFP. |
| | Landscape | The narrative does a good job responding to some of the key site planning concerns set forth in the RFP. |
| 3.3 Neighborhood Compatibility | The proposed architectural design is compatible with the existing neighborhood character, appearance, and scale. | While the varied massing, height, and roof treatments provide strong visual interest, the project is ultimately not compatible with the neighborhood character due to the fact that no residential units face or activate the street edges. |
| 3.4 Favorable Neighborhood Contributions | Project incorporates other features which provide favorable contributions to the neighborhood | The narrative does not specifically identify or reference such contributions. |
| 3.5 Green Building Ordinance | Green building ordinance elements are incorporated into the project | The narrative does not specifically reference Green Building Guidelines. |
| 3.6 Meets Ordinances and Requirements | The project meets other City of Pasadena ordinances and requirements | The narrative addresses city requirements such as the zoning height limitation: "The over all (sic) height is less than 36 feet to plate line." |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

2.0 Program

| | OWNERSHIP | RENTAL | COMMERCIAL | TOTAL | NOTES |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------|------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Land Area | | | | 2.06 89,734 | Acres Square feet |
| Project Description | | | | | |
| A. Unit Mix | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | 42 | 77 | | 119 | |
| Two-Bedroom | 6 | 12 | | 18 | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Total Residential Units | 48 | 89 | | 137 | |
| B. Unit Size | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Two-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Average Unit Size | | | | | |
| C. Residential | | | | | |
| Gross Living Area | 33,444 | 61,543 | | 93,987 | |
| Gross Building Area | 46,100 | 87,324 | | 133,424 | See Note 1 |
| D. Commercial/Retail | | | | | |
| Gross Leaseable Area | | | | | |
| E. Community Space | 2,000 | | | 2,000 | |
| F. Total Project GBA | 48,100 | 87,324 | | 135,424 | |
| G. Parking Spaces | | | | | |
| Parking Type | | | | | |
| Parking Square Feet | | | | | |
| Residential Parking Ratio | | | | | |
| Total Parking Spaces | 59 | 47 | | 112 | |

Note 1: no commercial s.f. shown on drawings

Condo: 48 units, 45,100 s.f.

Rental: 89 units, 87,324 s.f.

Community: 2,000 s.f. with 6 spaces

Parking Condo: 59 spaces

 1 space/unit for 1 bedroom units

 2 spaces/unit for 2 bedroom units

Parking Rental: 47 spaces

 0.5 spaces/unit for 1 bedroom units

 1 space/unit for 2 bedroom units

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: The Bakewell Company + Century Housing

Architect: Charles T. Bryant, AIA + Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc.

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.21.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

1.0 Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1 Organization | |
| Development Team | The Bakewell Company Century Housing |
| Architect | Charles T. Bryant, AIA Jones & Martinez Architects, Inc. |
| 1.2 Design Basic Elements/Threshold Requirements | |
| A/B Site Strategy | Provided |
| Narrative | Provided |
| Conceptual Drawings | |
| Site Plan | Conceptual Site/Landscape Plan |
| Sections | Cross (Fair Oaks/Wheeler); longitudinal section NOT provided |
| Elevations | West elevation for Site A; Orange Grove; Fair Oaks for Site A/B |
| Floor Plans | Conceptual Floor Plans (first, second, third) |
| Parking Plan | Conceptual Garage Plan |
| Typical Unit Plans | Type A, Type B, Type C, Type D |
| Illustratives | NOT Provided |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

1.0 Project Information

| 1.1 Organization | |
|--|---|
| Development Team | Heritage Housing Partners Los Angeles Community Design Center |
| Architect | J. Lou Architects |
| 1.2 Design Basic Elements/Threshold Requirements | |
| A/B Site Strategy | Provided |
| Narrative | Provided |
| Conceptual Drawings | |
| Site Plan | Site Plan Option One |
| Sections | 1 cross section; 1 longitudinal section |
| Elevations | Provided in section |
| Floor Plans | Option One: First Level, Second Level, Third Level, Fourth Level |
| Parking Plan | Subterranean Level Garage Plan Option One |
| Typical Unit Plans | 2 bedroom flat, 3 bedroom flat, 2 bedroom townhouse apartment, 3 bedroom townhouse apartment, 2 bedroom townhouse, 3 bedroom townhouse, Herkimer Arms Annex Floor Plans |
| Illustratives | View from Fair Oaks Ave., 2 Courtyard View, Retail Courtyard View |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

2.0 Program

| | OWNERSHIP | HISTORIC RENTAL | RENTAL | COMMERCIAL | TOTAL | NOTES |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Land Area | | | | | 2.06 | Acres |
| | | | | | 89,734 | Square Feet |
| Project Description | | | | | | |
| A. Unit Mix | | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | 11 | 27 | | | 38 | |
| Two-Bedroom | 11 | | 28 | | 39 | |
| Three-Bedroom | 10 | | 13 | | 23 | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Total Residential Units | 32 | 27 | 41 | | 100 | |
| B. Unit Size | | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Two-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Average Unit Size | | | | | | |
| C. Residential | | | | | | |
| Gross Living Area | 33,400 | 16,200 | 36,800 | | 86,400 | |
| Gross Building Area | 33,400 | 16,200 | 41,500 | | 86,400 | See Note 1 |
| D. Commercial/Retail | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area | | | | | | |
| E. Community Space | 0 | 700 | 4,550 | | 5,250 | |
| F. Total Project GBA | 33,400 | 16,900 | 46,050 | 16,000 | 112,350 | |
| G. Parking Spaces | | | | | | |
| Parking Type | | | | | | |
| Parking Square Feet | | | | | | |
| Residential Parking Ratio | | | | | | |
| Total Parking Spaces | | | | | 290 | |

Court A Commercial: 16,000 s.f.

Court B Affordable Rental + non-residential: 41 units, 41,500 s.f.

Court C For Sale Building: 32 units, 33,400 s.f.

Court D Historic Senior Rental: 27 units (27 @ 600 s.f. = 16,200 s.f. + 700 sf community room)

Summary of non-commercial: Child Development Center = 3,250 s.f.; Community Room = 1,200 s.f.; Community Room 700 s.f.

Parking Residential: 181 spaces

Parking Commercial Subterranean: 85 spaces

Parking Commercial At-Grade: 24 spaces

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

3.0 Other Design Issues

| Principle | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|--|
| 3.1 City-Wide Design Principles and Fair Oaks/ Orange Grove Specific Plan | Paraphrasing citywide principles: 1) enhance the unique character of Pasadena; 2) contribute to an identifiable and coherent city form; 3) achieve creative architectural solutions without direct mimicry of historical styles | <p>The proposed design shows a strong level of sophistication in the overall character of the building siting and open spaces. Some of the design drawings – for example, the site plan and three-dimensional massing diagram – clearly communicate, at a gross level, the idea of the project. However, most of the other drawings do not communicate well and do not provide sufficient additional information to understand the design at a level of detail needed to make a proper evaluation. These include the building level plans, sections, and perspective sketches. The perspective sketches are particularly irksome because while they seem to have some visual "energy", but upon closer inspection they do not contain sufficient information about the massing, architecture, or spatial relationships. The plans are also annoying; they do not clearly show, for example where units are entered...from the streets or courtyards; or, how upper level circulation works in the Affordable Rental building.</p> <p>The project's proposal documentation, as <i>required</i> by the RFP, does NOT contain a Fair Oaks elevation.</p> <p>As noted above and throughout this evaluation, while there are several specific problems with the proposed design and a discernable lack of information to properly demonstrate its intentions, it conditionally meets the citywide design principles and specific plan guidelines.</p> |
| 3.2 Site Specific Guidelines | Site Planning | The narrative does not specifically address the site planning guidelines set forth in the RFP. |
| | Building Design | The narrative does not specifically address the building design guidelines set forth in the RFP. |
| | Landscape | The narrative does not specifically address the landscape guidelines set forth in the RFP. |
| 3.3 Neighborhood Compatibility | The proposed architectural design is compatible with the existing neighborhood character, appearance, and scale. | <p>This project has great potential to integrate with the varied nature of its context (two and three story flat roofed commercial buildings; one and two story pitched roof residential buildings, etc.). However the design narrative does not demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the context. It therefore does not demonstrate how the proposed design intentionally relates to the community.</p> <p>While the narrative claims that the provision of the historic houses helps integrate the project with the community, this approach escapes a key design challenge: to develop the entire block at higher densities. Because the project does not meet this key challenge its neighborhood compatibility remains unfulfilled.</p> |
| 3.4 Favorable Neighborhood Contributions | Project incorporates other features which provide favorable contributions to the neighborhood | See discussion in 3.3 above. |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Principle | Guideline | Comments |
|--|--|--|
| 3.5 Green Building Ordinance | Green building ordinance elements are incorporated into the project | The narrative does not specifically reference Green Building Guidelines. |
| 3.6 Meets Ordinances and Requirements | The project meets other City of Pasadena ordinances and requirements | The narrative does not specifically address other city requirements as set forth in the RFP. |

4.0 Diagrams

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| 4.1 Site organizational principles | Provide three zones north to south | <p>The site plan deftly provides four zones south to north as defined in the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Court Senior Rental (Court D) to the north along Painter 2. For-Sale Housing in the middle north (Court C) 2. Affordable Rental in the middle south (Court B) 3. Commercial uses to the south (Court A on Site B). <p>The narrative and drawings describe this organization of uses on the site as intentionally moving from the highest density at Orange Grove to the least density at Painter. The narrative and drawings also reference each use around a specific courtyard as demarcated above. The clarity with respect to the uses and activities on the site is welcomed.</p> <p>The project excellently provides two community rooms: one in the Historic Court Senior Rental and the other in Affordable Rental building. In addition the project includes a child development center with a dedicated outdoor playground in the Affordable Rental building.</p> <p>The project also provides the relocation onto the property along Painter of five historic structures: the Decker House (relocated from the same site but moved north); Professor Hamond House; Evelyn Broadway Apartments; 130 Los Robles; and Herkimer Arms Annex. While the consideration of providing a permanent home for historic structures is virtuous, locating them on this site is underutilizes the property's potential.</p> |
| 4.2 Site modulation | <p>Major modulation: massing between building types and basic scale features</p> <p>Minor modulation: respect original 50 foot plat; oriented to Fair Oaks and Orange Grove; organizes building massing and features; do not create literal pattern</p> | <p>The plans drawings and three-dimensional massing diagrams indicate that both major and minor site modulations are provided. However the actual design the building with respect to these issues cannot be properly evaluated due to the non-submittal of Fair Oaks elevations. In this regard the proposal is deficient.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4.3 Site design features and views to the site</p> | <p>Focus on edges of Fair Oaks, Orange Grove, and Painter</p> | <p>The plan drawings provided in the proposal suggest that the residential portion of the project engages the Fair Oaks and Painter street edges. However, the plan drawings are deficient in showing unit entrances and the spatial relationship of the units to the street edge (for example, are they raised slightly above the street to provide a defensible space for residents, or are they at street level?). Furthermore, the proposal does not provide essential elevational drawings along Fair Oaks as required by the RFP. Therefore, a proper evaluation of how well the For-Sale Housing or Affordable Rental building addresses Fair Oaks cannot be made. In this regard the proposal is deficient.</p> <p>See below for a discussion of the commercial uses.</p> |
| | <p>Mixed-use commercial features: provide architectural and landscape corner feature and building entrance at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove intersection. Mass commercial edges to property line at street.</p> | <p>The commercial portion of the project primarily engages Orange Grove with uses wrapping onto Fair Oaks. As described in 4.4 below, a driveway and parking separates the commercial and residential components and limits length along Fair Oaks. The ground floor retail uses include a location for Church's Chicken on the corner plus other food and retail space. The retail courtyard is a welcoming one for eating and other activities; it is well proportioned and scaled. Offices are located on the second floor. The elevator core is well placed to serve the project from parking below to office above.</p> <p>The following concerns are offered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No meaningful elevations of the commercial component along either Fair Oaks or Orange Grove are provided. A VERY rough, hand-drawn sketch of elevation is included on the longitudinal section, but this drawing fails to address key architectural imagery or spatial relationships. Without the proper drawings, as required by RFP, the project fails to enable a proper evaluation and is deficient. 2. No meaningful perspective sketches are provided. The retail court sketch that is included in the proposal is extremely rough and illegible. While it does show some basic massing features, the drawing uses "super graphics" and other (graphic) techniques to obscure the fact that it does not communicate the necessary architectural design and spatial relationships. In this regard, the proposal is also deficient in enabling a proper evaluation of the commercial architecture. 3. The Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner design is measured and well considered. What appears to be a two story portico links to an arcade that defines the southern edge of the retail courtyard. While we appreciate the subtlety of this layout, the retail court would significantly benefit from an increased visual connection to the corner. This would entail revisions to adjoining fast food and/or retail spaces. 4. One retail unit is poorly located and requires revision. This unit only faces the internal court with no street visibility. |
| | <p>Provide senior rental building entrance and public space on Fair</p> | <p>No public entrances to the residential portions of the project are provided as set forth in the RFP. The only public entrances to the project are the</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | Oaks | two "seams" between the major building components -- one between the Historic Court Senior Rental and For-Sale Housing and other between the For-Sale Housing and the Affordable Rental. These seams are not scaled or designed to be public entrances. |
| | Provide unit entrances along Fair Oaks. | See discussion above. |
| | Provides minor feature at Fair Oaks/Painter intersection | No feature is provided due to the placement of an historic structure at this corner. Even with the placement of an historic structure at this corner, the co-location with a landscape feature would have been welcomed. |
| | Maintain and protect the Oak Tree | The Oak Tree is an excellent feature of the outdoor playground for the child development center, and the Oak Tree provides a visual feature for the nearby retail court. |
| 4.4 Vehicular circulation | Orange Grove: commercial garage access; Fair Oaks: commercial access; Fair Oaks: provide senior drop-off/pick up; Painter: provide residential garage access; Wheeler Lane: provide residential and commercial garage access and service (e.g., trash) | <p>The residential parking garage is one level below grade. Access and egress is from Wheeler Alley. Internal garage circulation is well laid out with major drive aisles running the length of the site in the north/south direction. The subterranean parking structure is only located under the For Sale Housing and Affordable Housing buildings but does not extend north under the Historic Court Senior Rental buildings to Painter.</p> <p>Some retail and office parking is accessed from a driveway that runs east-west separating the commercial and residential uses. This driveway is accessed from both Fair Oaks and Wheeler Lane. The remainder of the commercial parking is provided in a one-level subterranean parking structure accessed from Wheeler Lane.</p> <p>Residential trash and service are not indicated on the plans. Commercial trash and service are oriented toward Wheeler Lane as set forth in the RFP.</p> <p>Elevators and stairs connecting the subterranean parking structures to the residential and commercial components above are centrally located and provide good accessibility.</p> <p>We have the following concerns:</p> <p>First, a Church's Chicken drive thru is not provided.</p> <p>Second, one residential garage entry/exit on Wheeler Lane is not does not disperse traffic. Instead this one access point problematically loads all traffic onto Wheeler Lane and will impact Orange Grove. Furthermore, Wheeler Lane access does not provide a quality address for guest arrivals.</p> <p>Third, the commercial subterranean parking structure does not provide a drive aisle on the south side of the parking rows. Since each of these four rows dead-ends to the south, cars that do not find parking will end up making three-point turns to reverse direction. This will create congestion and driver frustration. The layout needs to be revised.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Fourth, the east/west driveway separates the commercial and residential components. For the benefit of the residents, this driveway should provide a better connection between these the residential and commercial uses. This may include enhanced paving materials connecting the residential entry to the Affordable Rental Building and commercial courtyard and enhanced sidewalk paving at Fair Oaks.</p> <p>Finally, the entries to the residential and commercial subterranean parking structures are too closely spaced on Wheeler Lane. We have noted above the problem of all residential traffic focused on one Wheeler Lane entry. This is further complicated with the commercial driveway being so close; the two driveways are only 100 feet apart. These driveways need to be significantly further apart. Better yet would be to add a residential driveway to Painter, thereby reducing Wheeler Lane impacts.</p> |
| <p>4.5 Street edge and human scale</p> | <p>Sidewalk/ intersection improvements; Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner features; Fair Oaks/Painter corner features; senior rental building features; landscape setback/unit entrances; mixed-use commercial building edges; Wheeler dedication</p> | <p>As noted above, the proposal is deficient in providing sufficient information to judge the relationship of the units to the street. The single rendering of Fair Oaks is too sketchy to provide this information, there is no Fair Oaks elevation, and plans don't show unit entrances. If anything, the plans show that a hallway is provided on the interior courtyard side of the building implying that units do not enter from the street.</p> <p>No sidewalk/intersection improvements are shown on the plans.</p> <p>See above for a discussion of the corner features.</p> <p>The Wheeler Lane dedication is not indicated on the plans.</p> |
| <p>4.6 Open space</p> | <p>Building courtyards, seams and connections between functions and courtyards, and corner and building entrances.</p> | <p>Four courtyards are provided. In totality, the proposed design offers a rich set of internal open spaces. They provide a wonderful range of spatial qualities and scale relationships with the defining building elevations. They also provide a rich set of visual and pedestrian experiences. They would likely add a significant value to urban fabric of Pasadena.</p> <p>However, there are two major deficiencies, one minor deficiency, and several concerns which follow below. The major design deficiency is that there is no intentional open space connection to Fair Oaks, as set forth in the RFP (see 4.3 above for a discussion of the inadequate "seams" between buildings which do connect to Fair Oaks). The second major deficiency is the proposal itself: the two residential courtyard sketches are VERY rough and do not communicate key information such as the architectural design, massing, spatial qualities, activities, and relationships of units to the public space. The minor deficiency is the lack of information about how the courts are programmed with activities and/or landscaped. While the importance of activities and landscape is described in the narrative, it is specifically defined or illustrated on the drawings. Instead, generic green lawns, trees, and a fountain are shown.</p> <p>1. Court A: Commercial Building</p> <p>See 4.3 above for a discussion about this court.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>2. Court B: Affordable Rental Building</p> <p>See 4.3 above for a discussion of the Oak Tree and associated playground space. The main courtyard is well proportioned. It is defined on the south side by an arcade that is a very interesting feature even though its purpose is not adequately described. Unfortunately it appears that most all of the ground floor units are entered from a hallway and do not have direct access to this space. This court, through the arcade is linked to the an entry facing the commercial Site B. This entry is well positioned but ultimately an enhanced connection with commercial site is needed, as described elsewhere in this evaluation.</p> <p>3. Court C: For-Sale Housing</p> <p>This court is extremely well designed. (There appears to be certain internal inconsistencies between level plans but these look to be only graphic problems.) The important design qualities of this space include a major internal space to the south with sub-spaces that have their own identity and strong connections to the adjoining courts north and south. The building footprints are shaped to create this visual interest: they enable spaces large and small to have their own shapes yet overlap in a way to create serendipity and extended visual connections. The concern about this court, like with others is how the units interact with open space; it is not clear from the plans or sketches.</p> <p>4. Court D: Historic Senior Rental</p> <p>The layouts of the historic buildings create a traditional street pattern with traditional side yards between the structures. What would be the backyards of these buildings is a shared courtyard. As cited above, additional information is required to understand the activities for this shared "backyard."</p> |
| <p>4.7 Massing and height</p> | <p>36 foot height limit; massing and higher elements location/ neighborhood protection; commercial built to property line; residential built to property line</p> | <p>The proposal has a range of heights and roof types. The historic structures are two stories. The For-Sale Housing is comprised of two-story units with internal stairs and flat roofs. The Affordable Rental building is three stories with pitched roofs. The commercial is two stories with flat roofs. The roof plans and three-dimensional massing diagrams are consistent with the narrative which stresses the variety of massing types, visual interest, and neighborhood compatibility. The massing concept provides a rich framework for subsequent architectural design development.</p> <p>While the sections are beautifully rendered drawings, they do not contain key information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sections do not provide height dimensions so we cannot verify if it is within the 36 foot height limit. 2. The sections do not include adjoining neighborhood buildings so it is not possible to properly evaluate these scale or height relationships. |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Heritage Housing Partners & Los Angeles Community Design Center

Architect: J Lou Architect

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.24.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---------|-----------|---|
| | | <p>3. The longitudinal section shows in a VERY sketchy manner the elevations of the units in the background. But it does not show any necessary cuts through proposed residential buildings in order to evaluate the scale relationships between the buildings and courtyards.</p> <p>Both the residential and commercial uses are built to the property line; see above for additional discussion.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

1.0 Project Information

| 1.1 Organization | |
|--|---|
| Development Team | Renaissance Oak, LLC Lambert Development, LLC Meta Housing Corporation The Holmes Firm Reliance Development Group |
| Architect | WRT/Solomon ETC Urban Studio |
| 1.2 Design Basic Elements/Threshold Requirements | |
| A/B Site Strategy | Provided |
| Narrative | Provided |
| Conceptual Drawings | |
| Site Plan | Site Plan |
| Sections | Two cross sections (rental and ownership); 1 longitudinal |
| Elevations | Fair Oaks Ave Elevation; Painter St. Elevation; Orange Grove Bl. Elevation |
| Floor Plans | Ground Floor Plan, 2nd Floor Plan (3rd Fl Housing Similar) |
| Parking Plan | Parking Level Plan |
| Typical Unit Plans | One Bedroom, Two Bedroom, Three Bedroom |
| Illustratives | 1 provided at Fair Oaks main entrance |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

2.0 Program

| | OWNERSHIP | RENTAL | COMMERCIAL | TOTAL | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------------|--|
| 2.1 Land Area | | | | 2.06 89,734 | Acres s.f. |
| 2.2 Project Description | | | | | |
| A. Unit Mix | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | 27 | 40 | | 67 | |
| Two-Bedroom | 9 | 27 | | 36 | |
| Three-Bedroom | 18 | 30 | | 48 | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Total Residential Units | 54 | 97 | | 151 | |
| B. Unit Size | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Two-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | |
| Average Unit Size | | | | | |
| C. Residential | | | | | |
| Gross Living Area | | | | | |
| Gross Building Area | 59,400 | 112,650 | | 172,050 | s.f. |
| D. Commercial/Retail | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area | | | 28,850 | 28,850 | s.f. |
| E. Community Space | | | | | |
| F. Total Project GBA | 59,400 | 112,650 | 28,850 | 200,900 | s.f. Does not include parking; see note 1 |
| G. Parking Spaces | | | | | |
| Parking Type | | | | | |
| Parking Square Feet | Note 1 | Note 1 | Note 1 | Note 1 | |
| Residential Parking Ratio | | | | | |
| Total Parking Spaces | | | | | |

Note 1: no parking s.f. provided on drawings.

Note 2: ownership units on plans are mislabeled. We've assumed them to be one bedroom units due to size.

Note 3: one unit on floors 2 and 3 is not labeled but looks like 3 bedroom unit.

26 family ownership units.

21 senior ownership units.

49 senior rental units.

49 family rental units.

1,800 s.f. retail.

1,950 s.f. retail.

3,100 s.f. restaurant.

2,100 s.f. Church's Chicken.

9,500 s.f. office.

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

3.0 Other Design Issues

| Principle | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| 3.1 City-Wide Design Principles and Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan | Paraphrasing citywide principles: 1) enhance the unique character of Pasadena; 2) contribute to an identifiable and coherent city form; 3) achieve creative architectural solutions without direct mimicry of historical styles | <p>We believe that the architectural and urban design talent on this team is not realized in the proposal's conceptual plans. The residential portion of the design meets the city wide design principles and the Fair Oaks/Orange Gove Specific Plan objectives; however, the commercial component does not.</p> <p>The entire conceptual design (that is, the both residential and commercial components) hints at the promise offered by the design talent, but the proposal falls short of the level of excellence that would be reasonably expected in trying to win the project.</p> <p>This raises a concern as to the importance of this project to the design firms. If this proposal is selected, the city should insist that the design principles of both firms be intimately involved in the project, and that the work not be handed off to the "B" teams in their respective offices.</p> |
| 3.2 Site Specific Guidelines | Site Planning | Does not specifically reference RFP Site Planning Guidelines in proposal narrative or on plans. |
| | Building Design | Does not specifically reference RFP Building Design Guidelines in proposal narrative or on plans. |
| | Landscape | Does not specifically reference RFP Landscape Guidelines in proposal narrative or on plans. |
| 3.3 Neighborhood Compatibility | The proposed architectural design is compatible with the existing neighborhood character, appearance, and scale. | The narrative addresses this issue and we believe the design is consistent with the stated intentions, for example: "Porches, walk-up residential entries, and planting animate the building base along all of the major frontages...The senior lobby and common rooms flank the double-height courtyard portal and are shaded by trellised colonnades along the street. |
| 3.4 Favorable Neighborhood Contributions | Project incorporates other features which provide favorable contributions to the neighborhood | Does not reference other features that contribute to the neighborhood. |
| 3.5 Green Building Ordinance | Green building ordinance elements are incorporated into the project | The project narrative describes the approach to Green Building in significant detail and is well done. It includes a discussion of such issues as site planning, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources, and indoor environmental quality. |
| 3.6 Meets Ordinances and Requirements | The project meets other City of Pasadena ordinances and requirements | Does not specifically describe how the proposed design will meet or exceed Pasadena ordinances or requirements. |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

4.0 Diagrams

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1 Site organizational principles | Provide three zones north to south | <p>The site plan adheres to the principles set forth in the RFP guidelines but deftly incorporates four use zones instead of three.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides family and senior ownership housing to the north 2. Provides senior rental housing in the north middle 3. Provides family rental housing in the south middle (but separate from the seniors) 4. Provides commercial uses to the south |
| 4.2 Site modulation | Major modulation: massing between building types and basic scale features | <p>The Site Plan shows major modulation in the massing of the functional four zones, but the Fair Oaks elevation and rendering do not readily distinguish this approach. Instead the architect has opted to create one "look" for the entire residential project along Fair Oaks; and another "look" for the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove commercial corner. While this may be an acceptable approach, we remain concerned and continue to believe, as we set forth in the RFP guidelines, that the Fair Oaks residential elevation would be enriched (better scale, hierarchy of patterns) with differentiation between functional zones.</p> <p>The Fair Oaks elevations do a reasonably good job at scaling down large masses by using porches and balconies to create local symmetry and visual relief through projections and shadows. The oversize and colonnade porches and building entrances are a wonderful idea that creates a human scale at the street level and a civic dimension to the entire project.</p> <p>Particularly attractive are the double height openings to the interior courtyards creating a connection between those courtyards and Fair Oaks.</p> |
| | Minor modulation: respect original 50 foot plat; oriented to Fair Oaks and Orange Grove; organizes building massing and features; do not create literal pattern | <p>Provided, including the organization of units and treatment of unit entrances and windows.</p> <p>The design does not create literal pattern.</p> |
| 4.3 Site design features and views to the site | Focus on edges of Fair Oaks, Orange Grove, and Painter | <p>The project focuses on and activates all the street edges including common rooms and elevator cores located along Fair Oaks.</p> |
| | Mixed-use commercial features: provide architectural and landscape corner feature and building entrance at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove intersection. Mass commercial edges to property line at street. | <p>Retail uses are massed to the street edge.</p> <p>While the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner architectural and open space feature is provided we have strong concerns about its design. While the idea of an outdoor eating area is a good one that activates the public space, the shed roof design is oversimplified and not symbolically appropriate for the importance of intersection in this district.</p> <p>Second, the "side" masses that frame the shed roof are also</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>oversimplified; basically a diagram in elevation. The architectural resolution of both these side masses and the shed roof need to be addressed beyond their diagrammatic appearance.</p> <p>Third, the 1,800 s.f. retail space east of Church's Chicken has no street visibility and is not viable.</p> <p>Fourth, the entrance to the office is not accessible from the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner but only from the parking behind.</p> <p>Finally, Church's Chicken cannot be accessed from the parking lot without crossing through the other restaurant.</p> |
| | Provide senior rental building entrance and public space on Fair Oaks | <p>The oversize loggia is a wonderful urban design feature.</p> <p>The organization of the building with the common rooms and elevator cores along Fair Oaks is also a good urban design feature and strengthens the relationship between the project and the street.</p> |
| | Provide unit entrances along Fair Oaks. | See the supportive comments in 3.1 above. |
| | Provides minor feature at Fair Oaks/Painter intersection | A lobby for family and senior ownership housing is provided and is appropriate for this location. Its understated nature is a good contrast with the emphasis that is provided at the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner. |
| | Maintain and protect the Oak Tree | <p>The project creates a welcomed recreational space around the Oak Tree; and this space connects well with the courtyard that organizes the family rental housing.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the benefit of the Oak Tree space is not extended to the commercial site B. Had some functional (albeit safe) or at least intentional visual connection been made between the Oak Tree space and the commercial site the overall project would have benefited.</p> |
| 4.4 Vehicular circulation | Orange Grove: commercial garage access; Fair Oaks: commercial access; Fair Oaks: provide senior drop-off/pick up; Painter: provide residential garage access; Wheeler Lane: provide residential and commercial garage access and service (e.g., trash) | <p>Parking is half-up/half-down from the street level. Units are shown in section and rendering as activating the street edge. However, the elevations look like the units are at a significantly higher elevation than the sidewalk. This issue must be clarified in favor of half-up/half-down with units slightly above the sidewalk.</p> <p>The residential parking ramps are well organized with respect to vehicle circulation in the garage; and connects in a well organized manner with reserved rental and ownership parking areas.</p> <p>It should be noted that because the elevators are located near Fair Oaks there is a bit of a walk (albeit not significant) for some of the rental parking spaces near Painter and Wheeler.</p> <p>Commercial parking presents certain problems: 1) there is only one access/egress point not including the drive-thru; 2) parking under the building dead-ends and will cause traffic jams and three-point u-turns for drivers that can't find a space; and 3) there is a cross-circulation problem between the garage entrance and cars stacking for the drive-thru.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Generally provides access in accord with the RFP guidelines.</p> <p>Wheeler Lane provides residential access but not commercial access.</p> <p>Service features are not indicated on plans.</p> |
| <p>4.5 Street edge and human scale</p> | <p>Sidewalk/ intersection improvements; Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner features; Fair Oaks/Painter corner features; senior rental building features; landscape setback/unit entrances; mixed-use commercial building edges; Wheeler dedication</p> | <p>No sidewalk/intersection improvements are shown on the plans.</p> <p>No indication of the Wheeler dedication is shown on the plans.</p> <p>All other aspects requested to be addressed in the RFP are provided and are discussed above.</p> |
| <p>4.6 Open space</p> | <p>Building courtyards, seams and connections between functions and courtyards, and corner and building entrances.</p> | <p>The design creates three courtyards, one each for the ownership housing, senior rental housing, and family rental housing. The courtyards are not internally connected, as suggested in the RFP.</p> <p>The courtyards are well sized and proportioned. However there is a distinct lack of ideas and information as to the nature and quality of these courtyards: their activities/uses, landscape character, and features.</p> <p>The design creatively employs the existing palm trees on Fair Oaks as a motif at the corners of Fair Oaks/Orange Grove and Fair Oaks/Painter.</p> <p>See above for a discussion of the quality space surrounding the Oak Tree.</p> |
| <p>4.7 Massing and height</p> | <p>36 foot height limit; massing and higher elements location/ neighborhood protection; commercial built to property line; residential built to property line</p> | <p>While the building is three stories, the sections do not provide height dimensions so we cannot verify if the building is within the 36 foot height limit.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sections do not address the height relationships of the proposed building with the residential neighborhood east of Wheeler Lane.</p> <p>Both the residential and commercial uses are built to the property line; see above for additional discussion.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Renaissance Oak, LLC

Architect: Soloman/Urban Studio

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Generally provides access in accord with the RFP guidelines.</p> <p>Wheeler Lane provides residential access but not commercial access.</p> <p>Service features are not indicated on plans.</p> |
| <p>4.5 Street edge and human scale</p> | <p>Sidewalk/ intersection improvements; Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner features; Fair Oaks/Painter corner features; senior rental building features; landscape setback/unit entrances; mixed-use commercial building edges; Wheeler dedication</p> | <p>No sidewalk/intersection improvements are shown on the plans.</p> <p>No indication of the Wheeler dedication is shown on the plans.</p> <p>All other aspects requested to be addressed in the RFP are provided and are discussed above.</p> |
| <p>4.6 Open space</p> | <p>Building courtyards, seams and connections between functions and courtyards, and corner and building entrances.</p> | <p>The design creates three courtyards, one each for the ownership housing, senior rental housing, and family rental housing. The courtyards are not internally connected, as suggested in the RFP.</p> <p>The courtyards are well sized and proportioned. However there is a distinct lack of ideas and information as to the nature and quality of these courtyards: their activities/uses, landscape character, and features.</p> <p>The design creatively employs the existing palm trees on Fair Oaks as a motif at the corners of Fair Oaks/Orange Grove and Fair Oaks/Painter.</p> <p>See above for a discussion of the quality space surrounding the Oak Tree.</p> |
| <p>4.7 Massing and height</p> | <p>36 foot height limit; massing and higher elements location/ neighborhood protection; commercial built to property line; residential built to property line</p> | <p>While the building is three stories, the sections do not provide height dimensions so we cannot verify if the building is within the 36 foot height limit.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sections do not address the height relationships of the proposed building with the residential neighborhood east of Wheeler Lane.</p> <p>Both the residential and commercial uses are built to the property line; see above for additional discussion.</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

1.0 Project Information

| 1.1 Organization | |
|--|--|
| Development Team | - Southern California Community Housing Development Corporation - Union Station Foundation - Triad Ventures |
| Architect | Irwin Pancake Dawson |
| 1.2 Design Basic Elements/Threshold Requirements | |
| A/B Site Strategy | Provided |
| Narrative | Provided |
| Conceptual Drawings | |
| Site Plan | Illustrative Site Plan provided |
| Sections | Longitudinal building section provided |
| Elevations | Senior for Sale; Fair Oaks Street Scene, Senior for Rent; Commercial; Orange Grove Street Scene; Painter Street Scene provided |
| Floor Plans | Conceptual Ground Level Plan, Conceptual Second & Third Level Plan provided |
| Parking Plan | Conceptual Garage Level Floor Plan provided |
| Typical Unit Plans | Plan 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 provided |
| Illustratives | 1 at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove; 1 at Fair Oaks/Painter |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

2.0 Program

| | SENIOR OWNERSHIP | SENIOR RENTAL | MULTI-FAMILY RENTAL | COMMERCIAL | TOTAL | NOTES |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------|---------|--|
| Land Area | | | | | 2.06 | Acres |
| | | | | | 89,734 | Square feet |
| Project Description | | | | | | |
| A. Unit Mix | Note 2 | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | 13 | 89 | | | | |
| Two-Bedroom | 42 | 8 | 12 | | | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | 6 | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Total Residential Units | 55 | 97 | 18 | | 170 | |
| B. Unit Size | | | | | | |
| One-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Two-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Three-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Four-Bedroom | | | | | | |
| Average Unit Size | | | | | | |
| C. Residential | | | | | | |
| Gross Living Area | | | | | | |
| Gross Building Area | 84,476 | 68,000 | 20,140 | | 172,616 | See Note 1 |
| D. Commercial/Retail | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area | 1,000 | 3,585 | | 17,361 | 21,946 | 17,361sf includes 6,631 s.f. artist loft |
| E. Community Space | | | | | | |
| F. Total Project GBA | 85,476 | 71,585 | 20,140 | 17,361 | 194,562 | |
| G. Parking Spaces | | | | | | |
| Parking Type | | | | | | |
| Parking Square Feet | | | | | | |
| Residential Parking Ratio | | | | | | |
| Total Parking Spaces | | | | | | |

Note 1: no breakouts are provided on drawings to justify building areas by units.

Note 2: ownership units on level floor plans are labeled differently than unit plans. Can't tell whether level floor plans are one, two, or three bedroom units; but assumed one or two bedroom units based upon size.

14,000 s.f. retail/office

6,631 s.f. office/artist lofts

1,000 s.f. residential unit sales office labeled commercial

3,585 s.f. residential unit rental office labeled commercial

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

3.0 Other Design Issues

| Principle | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|---|
| 3.1 City-Wide Design Principles and Fair Oaks/ Orange Grove Specific Plan | Paraphrasing citywide principles: 1) enhance the unique character of Pasadena; 2) contribute to an identifiable and coherent city form; 3) achieve creative architectural solutions without direct mimicry of historical styles | <p>The proposed design claims to apply an historical style that is fitting for Pasadena. The proposed design as depicted in renderings and elevations is generic and could be located anywhere. The proposed design does not reinterpret or apply historical Pasadena styles in a novel or meaningful way but leans instead toward the pastiche.</p> <p>Selecting this proposal will require significant re-design.</p> <p>The floor plans provided in the proposal are very hard to read. The line weights are not clear, the colors compete with the line weights, and it is very difficult to distinguish what is inside versus outside and what is a paving pattern versus a wall. The type sizes with respect to notes, dimensions, and room names are very small and extremely difficult (impossible, really) to read.</p> <p>The graphic problems lead to confusion in reading the plans and understanding how the building works.</p> |
| 3.2 Site Specific Guidelines | Site Planning | Does not specifically reference RFP Site Planning Guidelines in proposal narrative. |
| | Building Design | Does not specifically reference RFP Building Design Guidelines in proposal narrative. |
| | Landscape | Does not specifically reference RFP Landscape Guidelines in proposal narrative. |
| 3.3 Neighborhood Compatibility | The proposed architectural design is compatible with the existing neighborhood character, appearance, and scale. | Due to the generic nature of the renderings and elevations, the design is not compatible with the existing neighborhood character and appearance. |
| 3.4 Favorable Neighborhood Contributions | Project incorporates other features which provide favorable contributions to the neighborhood | Does not reference other features that contribute to the neighborhood. |
| 3.5 Green Building Ordinance | Green building ordinance elements are incorporated into the project | Does not specifically reference RFP Green Building Guidelines. |
| 3.6 Meets Ordinances and Requirements | The project meets other City of Pasadena ordinances and requirements | Does not specifically describe how the proposed design will meet or exceed Pasadena ordinances or requirements. |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

4.0 Diagrams

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| 4.1 Site organizational principles | Provide three zones north to south | The site plan provides three zones north to south as defined in the RFP: 1. For sale units to the north 2. Rental units in the middle 3. Commercial uses to the south |
| 4.2 Site modulation | Major modulation: massing between building types and basic scale features | Provided. |
| | Minor modulation: respect original 50 foot plat; oriented to Fair Oaks and Orange Grove; organizes building massing and features; do not create literal pattern | Provided. |
| 4.3 Site design features and views to the site | Focus on edges of Fair Oaks, Orange Grove, and Painter | The project engages the adjoining street edges for both commercial space and residential units. |
| | Mixed-use commercial features: provide architectural and landscape corner feature and building entrance at Fair Oaks/Orange Grove intersection. Mass commercial edges to property line at street. | <p>Four commercial locations are provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The major commercial center on Site B 2. A "commercial unit" (as defined on the plan) in the For Rent building immediately north of Site B as suggested in the RFP 3. A commercial unit at the Fair Oaks/Painter corner 4. A commercial unit at the residential entrance <p>All commercial uses are massed to the street edge property line.</p> <p>The commercial units cited in 3 and 4 above (at the residential entrance and at corner of Fair Oaks/Painter, respectively) raise concerns: a lack of critical mass of commercial square footage to function as stand alone retail, and a lack of accessible and adjacent parking.</p> <p>The public space at the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner is generously provided but the plan does not identify how that space will be activated (e.g., outdoor seating for a restaurant).</p> <p>A location for Church's Chicken is not identified.</p> <p>On a diagonal axis with the corner is an entrance to the commercial building. The plan and elevations/perspectives contradict one another. The plans indicate that there is no indoor lobby but rather an outdoor space. The elevations/perspectives clearly show this space as an indoor lobby. In any case it is not a leasable space. We believe that this important location – the heart of the diagonal axis linking the commercial</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | courtyard with the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner – should contain the elevator to the second floor office uses above. We understand that the architect has not located the elevator in this lobby because it would interfere with the parking plan for the level below. Nevertheless, we advise reconsideration of the parking layout to effect the proper placement of the elevator to this key urban location. We would also advise further activation of this space with landscape features and appropriate adjoining uses that would bring life to this space. |
| | Provide senior rental building entrance and public space on Fair Oaks | The entrance is at the seam between the For Sale building and the For Rent building. The entrance size and proportions, and the generous transit shelter represented in plan look promising; however, the entrance is represented on the Fair Oaks elevations and this leads to a concern that the space itself in not thought out. |
| | Provide unit entrances along Fair Oaks. | <p>The plans and elevations suggest that the For Sale building provide residential unit access from the street; however, the elevational design provides so much glass that the units look like a commercial space. Furthermore, it appears from the elevation that the units are entered at grade, rather than stepped up above the sidewalk, which is important for creating defensible space.</p> <p>Based upon the Fair Oaks elevation, the For Rent building units are not entered from the Fair Oaks sidewalk.</p> <p>Both the For Sale building and For Rent building have generous ten foot setbacks for patios.</p> |
| | Provides minor feature at Fair Oaks/Painter intersection | See discussion above. |
| | Maintain and protect the Oak Tree | The Oak Tree is a central feature of the commercial site layout and courtyard design. The Oak Tree also provides a visual link to the For Rent building, but does not provide a residential amenity. See above for a discussion about the commercial courtyard of which the Oak Tree is a part. |
| 4.4 Vehicular circulation | Orange Grove: commercial garage access; Fair Oaks: commercial access; Fair Oaks: provide senior drop-off/pick up; Painter: provide residential garage access; Wheeler Lane: provide residential and commercial garage access and service (e.g., trash) | <p>A curb turnout is provided on Fair Oaks for bus loading and un-loading.</p> <p>While the text on the plans is very small and in most cases too small to read, it does appear that services are provided on Wheeler Lane.</p> <p>Parking is provided in a below grade structure. Four ramps are provided as suggested in the RFP: two on Wheeler Lane, one on Painter, and one on Orange Grove. All ramps are speed ramps (meaning short and therefore at maximum angle).</p> <p>Elevators and stairs connecting the underground parking to the project above are centrally located and easy to access.</p> <p>We have the following concerns:</p> <p>First, almost all of the commercial parking is provided below grade save</p> |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>for a few spaces at grade adjacent to Wheeler Lane. Providing virtually all the commercial parking below grade is a disadvantage and creates the impression that the commercial uses are not easy to access.</p> <p>Second, there are problems with the speed ramps accessing the garage from Wheeler Lane. There are a few problematic drive aisles/ramp intersections including blind spots and turning conflicts.</p> <p>Third, the speed ramps accessing the garage from Orange Grove and Painter do not continue into drive aisles but rather are perpendicular to them. While this will not be too big of a problem for the residential side of the project off Painter (due to less traffic), this will cause congestion on the commercial side of the project at Orange Grove.</p> <p>Fourth, no drive-thru for Church's Chicken is provided.</p> |
| <p>4.5 Street edge and human scale</p> | <p>Sidewalk/ intersection improvements; Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner features; Fair Oaks/Painter corner features; senior rental building features; landscape setback/unit entrances; mixed-use commercial building edges; Wheeler dedication</p> | <p>No sidewalk/intersection improvements are shown on the plans.</p> <p>No indication of the Wheeler dedication is shown on the plans.</p> <p>All other aspects requested to be addressed in the RFP are provided and are discussed above.</p> |
| <p>4.6 Open space</p> | <p>Building courtyards, seams and connections between functions and courtyards, and corner and building entrances.</p> | <p>Three courtyards are provided for which we have the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Sale building courtyard The proportions of this courtyard are narrow and discomfiting. The activities, landscape, and features of this courtyard are neither defined nor described. Due to the narrow and discomfiting proportions, not having a clear idea about the nature of this space raises strong concerns. On the positive side, this courtyard has a connection to Fair Oaks through the building lobby. A linear space is provided connecting Wheeler Lane with the For Sale building elevator lobby. This space is also depicted in the Conceptual Building Section. This linear space is very narrow; it is not conducive to good light and air for adjoining units; and it size and shape may amplify noise. 2. For Rent building courtyard The proportions of this courtyard are more appealing than that of the For Sale building. However, the activities and features of this courtyard are not defined or described. Unfortunately, urban orientation is poor as the courtyard has no visual or functional connection to Fair Oaks. On the positive side, however, it does connect (albeit through a small passageway) to the commercial courtyard generally aligned with the Oak Tree. 3. Commercial building courtyard This courtyard has the best proportions of the three and features the existing Oak Tree cited above. The provision of an entirely commercial |

Heritage Square RFP Evaluation

Developer: Southern California Community Housing Development Corp. + Union Station Foundation+ Triad Ventures

Architect: Irwin Pancake Dawson

Date Prepared/Revised: 3.19.07

Prepared by: Marc Futterman, Futterman and Associates, Inc.

| Diagram | Guideline | Comments |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>courtyard is a wonderful idea, the potential for which has not been achieved by the proposed design. For example, while the offices/artists lofts and retail colonnade front to this courtyard, the actual uses and activities are neither defined nor described. The design does provide a strong spatial connection between the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove corner and this courtyard, as discussed above. In addition, a valuable pedestrian path aligned with the Oak Tree connects the courtyard and Fair Oaks.</p> <p>There is one seam that links the For Sale and For Rent buildings. This space is better proportioned than the internal courtyards cited above. This space provides an important pedestrian entrance to these two buildings and the recreation room. To effect a better urban design of the project and because this seam is such an important feature in organizing the entire project, the project would be better served if the elevator lobbies in both the For Sale and For Rent buildings connected directly to this space.</p> <p>There is another seam albeit partial between the For Rent building and the commercial site providing a pedestrian connection from Fair Oaks aligned with the Oak Tree into the commercial courtyard.</p> |
| <p>4.7 Massing and height</p> | <p>36 foot height limit; massing and higher elements location/ neighborhood protection; commercial built to property line; residential built to property line</p> | <p>While the building is three stories, the sections do not provide height dimensions so we cannot verify if the building is within the 36 foot height limit.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sections do not address the height relationships of the proposed building with the residential neighborhood east of Wheeler Lane.</p> <p>Both the residential and commercial uses are built to the property line; see above for additional discussion.</p> |