

## ATTACHMENT C

### Zoning Consistency and Adherence to Design Guidelines Overview:

**General Plan Consistency:** The General Plan designation for the project site is the Central District Specific Plan (CDSP). The CDSP is further broken down into sub-districts, with the project site being located in particular within the RM-48 In-Town Housing sub-district. This sub-district is an established low to moderate density residential area. The objective of the sub-district is to protect the existing residential character from incompatible intrusions, including requirements for sensitive infill development based on Pasadena's "City of Gardens" standards.

**The General Plan provides the following policies that are relevant to the project:**

**Objective 5 - Character and Scale of Pasadena:** Preservation of Pasadena's character and scale, including its traditional urban design form and historic character, shall be given highest priority in the consideration of future development.

*The proposed project would be located in an area that is in the process of transitioning to predominantly multifamily housing. Adherence to the City of Gardens development standards would ensure that the proposed project would be consistent with the existing development in this area.*

**Policy 5.5 – Architectural and Design Excellence:** The City shall actively promote architectural and design excellence in buildings, open space and urban design and shall discourage poor quality development.

*The proposed project has been reviewed by the Deign Commission **four times (January, June, October, and November 2007) and was unanimously approved by the Deign Commission on November 26, 2007.***

**Policy 15.1 - Sizes and Types:** Provide a range of housing sizes and types for the many sizes and types of families in the community.

*The proposed project would provide apartments with two to three bedrooms. This type of residential product would increase the housing options for extended households or those with children.*

**Policy 15.2 – Increase Supply:** Increase the total number of market rate and affordable housing units within the City.

*On-site affordable units are encouraged to increase the total number of units available to moderate income residents of the city.*

**Policy 19.3 - Bicycles/Pedestrians:** Promote the use of non-motorized modes of transportation, such as bicycles and walking within the City.

*The proposed project is located south of the Central District/Old Pasadena. To encourage walking and the use of bicycles for short distance trips into Old Pasadena, storage and bicycle lockers or racks will be provided on the site for the convenience of the residents.*

**Specific Plan Consistency:** The Central District Specific Plan, approved by the City Council in February 2005, contains the recommended heights, setbacks, floor area ratios and residential densities of the Central District Specific Plan. Height of buildings in this area is limited to 36 ft at the highest ridgeline as specified in the "City of Gardens" development standards. As proposed, the project would be within the allowable height permitted under the specific plan.

**The maximum density allowed** on the project site is 48 units per net acre. The proposal to construct 21 dwelling units is within the allowable density of the Central District Specific Plan. In addition, the 1994 Land Use Element placed a development cap of 5,095 dwelling units in the Central District until the horizon year 2015. The cap was adopted as part of the 2004 Land Use Element update. As of March 31, 2006, there are 2,020 available dwelling units remaining. The PAC process does not reserve or entitle this project for any of the remaining units. Available units are allocated at the time a building permit is issued.

**Citywide Design Principles, Guiding Principle 3:** "Show Creativity and Imagination...while a new building should respect the surrounding character, it should avoid nostalgic misrepresentations that confuse the relationships among buildings over time. The city will benefit most from creative designs that show individual expression, richness and variety..."

**District-Wide Guidelines: Building Design, Guideline BD1: Respect Surrounding Character:**

"...New buildings are occasionally clothed in exteriors that mimic past architectural styles. This nostalgic misrepresentation confuses the relationship between buildings over time, devaluing and questioning the authenticity of true historic structures. Pasadena emphasizes the notion of historical continuity – the relationship of built structures over time. This relationship expresses diversity within a coherent whole, reinforcing the unique and evolving historical and cultural character of the city."

**Zoning Code Section: 17.22.020**

**Multi-Family Residential, City of Gardens (RM-16, RM-32, and RM-48) district.**

The purposes of the RM-16, RM-32, and RM-48 zoning districts are to:

- a. Provide appropriately located areas for medium and high density residential neighborhoods that are consistent with and implement the Medium Density, Medium-High Density, and High Density Residential, land use designations of the General Plan, and with the standards of public health and safety established by this Zoning Code;
- b. Promote multiple-family residential developments having maximum economic life and stability;
- c. Integrate the street and the site visually and functionally as a total environment;
- d. **Achieve an appropriate level of design quality consistent with or better than the surrounding neighborhood and the price range of the development;**
- e. **Relate new development to the existing environment in scale, material, and character so that Pasadena's inherent human scale, visual, and functional diversity may be maintained and enhanced;** and
- f. Restrict alterations to the existing grade, except for minor grading for landscaping purposes and for subterranean parking.



PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
PLANNING DIVISION

November 28, 2007

Hugo Suarez  
120 West Bellevue Drive, Suite #100  
Pasadena, CA 91105

**NOTICE OF DECISION - CONSOLIDATED DESIGN REVIEW**  
**229-247 South Marengo— New Construction of a 21-unit multi-family complex**  
Case #PLN2006-00348  
Council District 6

Dear Mr. Suarez:

On November 26, 2007 at a public hearing in the Pasadena Senior Center, the Design Commission, acting under the provisions of §17.61.030 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, reviewed your application for concept design for the above-referenced project, which encompasses approximately 30,129 square feet of new construction at 229-247 South Marengo Avenue.

The submittals used for this review are two sets of plans, elevations, renderings (dated October 2007) and material boards. The design guidelines applied to this review include the Citywide Design Principles in the Land-use Element of the General Plan.

In its decision, the Design Commission:

**Environmental Determination**

1. **Acknowledged** that the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation, with the General Plan goals and policies for the area, and with the applicable zoning designation and regulations; and that the project site has no value as habitat for endangered or threatened species, and can be served by utilities and public services;
2. **Found** that approval of the project will not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality;
3. **Acknowledged** that none of the buildings on the property meets the criteria for designation as landmarks, historic monuments, or for listing in the California or National Registers;
4. **Concluded**, therefore, that the project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under §15332, (Class 32) "in-fill development projects."

**Taxpayer Protection Amendment**

**Acknowledged** the parties of interest in this project listed on the attached Taxpayer Protection Amendment form (Attachment A).

## **Art Plan**

**Acknowledged** that an application to the Arts Commission was submitted for the concept art plan on June 18, 2006.

## **Findings for Removal of Specimen Trees and Replacement Trees**

1. **Acknowledged** that the new development will cause the removal of one protected tree, a Cinnamomum Camphora (camphor tree), with a 36-inch DBH (tree #6 on Sheet L-PD);
2. **Approved** the removal based on the finding that: the canopy of the replacement trees (43 new trees @ 24" box or larger—tree legend, Sheet L-PD) will result in tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed within a reasonable time after completion of the project (§8.52.075 A P.M.C.)

## **Findings of Consolidated Design Approval**

1. **Found** that the design of the project complies with the City-wide Design Principles in the Land-use Element of the General Plan and the Design Guidelines for Windows in Multi-unit Residential Projects:

Based on these findings **approved** the revised application for consolidated Design Review with **the following conditions**, subject to final review and approval by the staff:

### **Conditions of Approval**

1. The **paving material** shall relate to the base course cast-stone veneer represented on the elevations. The base course material shall be selected with special attention to the detailing of the corners and the interface with wood and stucco elements on the building.
2. The elevation drawings shall be revised to include **wood facias on all eyebrow elements** of the building.
3. The architect shall **revise and coordinate the floor plans** to reflect the final [approved] design.
4. The cast-stone **cap detail on the balcony rail/parapet** shall be included and shall reference the base material used on the building.
5. The **corner element detail where two windows come together** shall be reevaluated. (It may be wood or clear aluminum.)
6. The **scale of the [pedestrian] entry gates** shall be reinvestigated to consider making this element more substantial. The relocation of this element farther back from the street elevation shall be considered.
7. **The dimension of the horizontal railings on the balconies** shall be reexamined to insure that they are sturdy/strong enough instead of the half-inch dimension presented in the drawings.
8. **The door selection (size and material) shall be reexamined** on the front [street-facing] elevation.

This decision becomes effective on **Friday, December 7, 2007**. Before the effective date, the City Council may call for a review of this decision. If the Council calls for a review of this decision, it becomes void, and the application will be considered as a new item. In addition, you or any person affected by this decision may appeal it to the City Council before the effective date by filing an appeal in writing with the City Clerk (room S228, City Hall, 100 N. Garfield Avenue) along with an appeal fee of \$1,364.00. The last day to file an appeal is **Thursday, December 6, 2007**. Appeals must cite a reason for objecting to a decision. Please note that

appeals and calls for review are conducted as de novo hearings, meaning that the lower decision is vacated and the entire decision is reviewed anew.

This approval expires **two years** from the effective date. The approval may be renewed for a period not to exceed one year by filing a written request with the Planning Director prior to the expiration date (along with the fee for renewal of an approval). Any **changes in the approved design** for the project, whether prior to construction or during construction, must be submitted to City staff for review and approval. The municipal code authorizes the staff to approve minor changes. Major changes, however, must be reviewed as part of a separate application for changes to the approved project (for which the filing fee is equal to one-half of the original fee).

As many as two applications for changes to the approved project may be filed during a calendar year. Major changes may be approved only if there are findings of changed circumstances that justify revisions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Odell', written in a cursive style.

Mark Odell  
Senior Planner, Design and Historic Preservation Section  
ph: 626-744-710 e-mail: [modell@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:modell@cityofpasadena.net)

cc: Address file; chronological file; Tidemark; City Manager; City Council; City Clerk

**The Issues Addressed in the Final Reworking of the Design Prior to Design Commission Approval, between August and November, were:**

1. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has restudied the **canopies** over the vertically stacked fenestration units for a more logical architectural expression (i.e., those not over doorways and balconies).

*Comments from staff: The canopies (eyebrow) had been used inconsistently on the building. The more consistent use of the canopies is over doorways and balconies, while elsewhere this "eyebrow" detail appeared randomly throughout the project over singular window units. Limiting the canopies to doors and balconies has helped to simplify the structure and reference "a logic" to their usage.*

2. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has restudied the overall **coloration of the project** of the **project** to assist in the further modulation of the elevations and to enliven the original neutral, monotone quality of the color palette. [source: *City-wide Design Principles, Contextual Fit: compatible scale and massing; pleasing proportions. Visual Appeal: balanced composition*

3. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has introduced **alternative materials** on portions of the exterior elevations to add more visual interest and verticality to the building and to emphasize the projecting and recessing volumes of the structure.

*Comments from staff: The introduction of alternate materials on the projecting and recessing volumes of the structure has emphasized the modulating pattern established in the overall design. Additionally, the introduction of wood siding, applied in horizontal bands that further reference the horizontality of the design, has added greater warmth and texture to the building and given the structure added verticality. [source: *City-wide Design Principles, Visual Appeal: balanced composition; articulated and expressive facades*].*

4. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has restudied the design details of the **decorative metal fencing** at the main entrance, balcony railings and perimeter locations. The re-design refers more closely to the horizontality of the banding on the facades of the structure and reinforced the more streamlined design of the building [source: *City-wide Design Principles, Residential Scale: inviting entries; quality detailing*]

**ATTACHMENT E**

5. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has coordinated the detailing of the **parapet walls** to articulate in conjunction with the recessing and projecting volumes of the facades on all elevations.
6. Revised proposal from architect: The architect has modulated the **roof/eyebrow detail at the upper-most level of the building** to give greater interest at the sky level of the structure.

*Comments from staff: Associating the projecting and recessing volumes of the building with the top of the parapet has helped to further animate the building. [source: City-wide Design Principles, Contextual Fit: compatible scale and massing; pleasing proportions. Visual Appeal: balanced composition]*

7. Revised proposal from architect: *The architect has increased the quality and/or coloration of the **paving materials**.*

*Comments from staff: The paving material now relates more harmoniously to the base course stone veneer represented on the elevations. [source: City-wide Design Principles, Residential Scale: inviting entries; quality detailing].*