

**Attachment C**  
**Scope of Work of the Project**

**TABLE VI-5  
Alternative 3  
Area Summary at Buildout  
Hotel Option**

<b>USE</b>	<b>UNITS (Rooms/Units)</b>	<b>AREA (Sq. Ft.)</b>	<b>PARKING (Spaces)</b>
<b>PHASE 1</b>			
EXISTING CONVERTED USES			
Hotel rooms	136	64,725	
Restaurant		2,564	
Retail		5,000	
OUTDOOR AREAS			
Outdoor Seating		2,530	
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>		<b>74,819</b>	<b>215</b>
EXISTING RETAINED USES			
Bank/Office		24,885	
Retail		3,649	
Restaurant		5,000	
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>		<b>33,534</b>	
<b><i>PHASE 1 SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>136</b>	<b>108,353</b>	
EXISTING USES TO BE DEMOLISHED			
Retail		(2,362)	
<b><i>PHASE 1 NET SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>136</b>	<b>105,991</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>PHASE 2</b>			
NEW USES			
Hotel Addition	20	22,380	
Residential	5	7,400	
Office		69,720	
Restaurants		13,000	
Retail		9,905	
Bank		8,010	
Internal Circulation		20,358	
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>156/5</b>	<b>150,773</b>	<b>295</b>
OUTDOOR AREAS			
Paseo, Roof Deck		7,972	
Outdoor Seating		2,726	
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>		<b>10,698</b>	
<b><i>PHASE 2 SUBTOTAL</i></b>		<b>161,471</b>	<b>295</b>
EXISTING USES TO BE DEMOLISHED			
Bank		(24,885)	
<b><i>PHASE 2 NET SUBTOTAL</i></b>		<b>136,586</b>	
<b><i>PROJECT TOTAL</i></b>	<b>156/5</b>	<b>242,577</b>	<b>510</b>

SOURCE: RTKL Architects.

NOTE: This table summarizes phasing programs, uses, parking and breakdowns provided in Tables VI-1 and VI-3. See associated footnotes not shown here.

**Attachment D**  
**Applicable General Plan Policies and Central District Specific Plan Objectives**

There are broad areas of compliance that are applicable to the Project, which are summarized immediately below. The project complies with specific Policies, Objectives, and Guidelines of the Central District Specific Plan and the General Plan, respectively, which are listed after the summary.

**Economic Development**

The Central District (CD) has been targeted for growth with development of projects with substantial floor area that are compatible with the downtown character of the area. The subject project is a comprehensive development with a combination of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, and residential uses multiple economic development benefits. The project will create substantial employment. The employees in the development will use the services (retail, restaurant, etc.) in the vicinity and strengthen the business activity in the vicinity. The retail uses will draw additional customers the site and enhance and enhance the commercial character of E. Colorado Boulevard and N. and S. Lake Avenue. The new building construction, new hotel use, historic preservation and associated uses will create commercial vitality on a prominent corner site that is currently underutilized. The new construction will provide a substantial tax increment to the City.

**Transit-Oriented Development**

The project is located in a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) area as defined in the Zoning Code in which employees and visitors to the new building can utilize mass transit modes (MTA Gold Line, ARTs bus service, MTA bus service) to access the site. City plans target the Central District for substantial new building floor area to take advantage of mass transit. In addition, the project provides on-site bicycle storage facilities for cyclists.

**Historic Preservation**

The project proposes to renovate, restore, and preserve the existing Landmark Constance Hotel and landmark-eligible one-story commercial storefronts on the property in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. These historic structures would be occupied with viable commercial (hotel, retail, restaurant, and residential uses, which is consistent with the development an re-use of older and historic buildings in Central District. The historic buildings would be sensitively integrated into the redevelopment of the property. The new construction, parking, paving, and landscaping would be compatible with and complement the historic structures and the project would enhance the prominent site at the intersection of E. Colorado Boulevard and S. Lake Avenue.

**Specific Policies, Goals, Objectives, Guidelines:**

**General Plan Policies:**

1.1 and 10.1 – Targeted Development Areas: Geographical areas have been identified where the bulk of future economic development is to occur.

1.2 – Specific Plans: For identified target development areas, a principal implementation tool, utilize Specific Plans containing development standards, distribution of land uses, infrastructure requirements and implementation measures.

1.3 and 10.2 - Transit-Oriented and Pedestrian-Oriented Development: Within targeted development areas, cluster development near light rail stations and along major transportation corridors thereby creating transit-oriented development “nodes” and encouraging pedestrian access.

5.7 – Enhanced Environment: Development should be shaped to improve the environment for the public; it should support the distinctiveness of the locality and region as well as the special characteristics of the existing fabric of the site’s immediate surroundings.

5.10 – Spatial Attributes: Promote development that creates and enhances positive spatial attributes of major public streets, open spaces, cityscape and mountain sight lines and important “gateways” into the City.

6.2 – Protection of Historic and Cultural Resources

10.3 - Business Expansion and Growth.

10.6 – New Businesses

10.9 – Healthy Business Community.

10.10 - Regional Center.

11.2 - Employment Diversity.

11.7 – Increase jobs.

12.1 - Encourage Retail Tax.

Central District Specific Plan Objectives:

1.2 – Expanded visitor and tourism activity

1.5 – Sites for expansion and attraction of new establishments and projects

4.1 – A wide range of diversified employment opportunities.

11 – Provide economic opportunity.

12 – Diversify downtown economy.

13 – Encourage business retention.

14 – Promote job growth.

15 – Maintain fiscal health

**Attachment E**  
**Department of Transportation Memorandum of December 7, 2010**

**MEMORANDUM - CITY OF PASADENA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**DATE:** December 7, 2010

**TO:** Denver Miller, Zoning Administrator  
Planning and Development Department

**FROM:** Mike Bagheri *MB*  
Transportation Planning and Development Manager

**RE:** Appeal of Conditional Use Permit #5209- 880-940 East Colorado Blvd -  
Response to OEG Traffic Consultant's comments

Below please find DOT's responses to Appellant's Traffic Consultant, OEG, Inc., comments, dated November 29, 2010, for the proposed mixed-use project at 880-940 East Colorado Boulevard with shared parking at 2 N. Lake Avenue.

**Response to Traffic-Related Comments, dated November 29, 2010**

**OEG Comment 1**

We feel that the document that the Board based their approval on is flawed and did not provide the necessary documentation to support their approval on. This letter summarizes these concerns more specifically.

In our review of the supporting documents found on the City's website for the project, we found that the project traffic and parking analysis for Alternative 3 does not represent that project description being considered by the decision makers and that there is not sufficient parking supply to meet the parking demands of the project.

**DOT Response to Comment 1**

The preferred project alternative considered by the decision makers has been fully analyzed. The appellant argues that the project description considered by the decision makers was not evaluated, and that the parking supply requirements to meet the parking demands are not sufficient.

The project being considered by the decision makers is accurately described in the "Alternative Option 1: Reduced Development – Hospitality" analysis in the final traffic impact and parking analysis found in Appendix I. "Alternative Option 1: Reduced Development – Hospitality" fully discussed the project's impact to the street network, which is identified as "Alternative 3 Hotel Option" in the Final EIR (pages VI-24-58).

**Denver Miller, Zoning Administrator**  
**880 East Colorado Blvd – CUP #5209**  
**December 7, 2010**  
**Page 2**

The appellant is referring to Alternative Option 3: Reverse Engineered Alternatives (3A and 3B) found in the traffic and parking analysis, which does not represent the project description being considered by the decision makers.

**OEG Comment 2**

The description of the project analyzed in the traffic study is significantly less than project that the Board of Appeals approved.

**DOT Response to Comment 2**

The "Final" Traffic Study found in Appendix I analyzed 5 project scopes and their associated impacts to the street network:

- Original project as proposed
- Alternative Option 1: Reduced Development – Hospitality
- Alternative Option 2: Reduced Development – Residential
- Alternative Option 3A: Reverse-Engineered Alternative
- Alternative Option 3B: Reverse-Engineered Alternative

The project alternative approved by the Board of Appeals, identified as "Alternative 3 Hotel Option" in the Final EIR, is identical to the project fully analyzed as Alternative Option 1: Reduced Development – Hospitality in the "Final" Traffic Study found in Appendix I.

**OEG Comment 3**

The project results in a shortage of 49 spaces that was not addressed in the FEIR. This is a significant project impact that was not identified in the FEIR.

**DOT Response to Comment 3**

The parking analysis for the project of which the Board of Appeals took action is provided in the final traffic impact and parking analysis found in Appendix I as Alternative Option 1: Reduced Development – Hospitality (page 149). As stated in the analysis, and reiterated in the Final EIR (page VI-48), the Phase 1 shared parking analysis determined that there would be a peak parking demand of 195 spaces. In order to have an efficient parking supply between 5-15% greater than the peak parking demand, it was determined that 215 spaces would be required during the peak parking period. For Phase 1, the additional 20 spaces would allow 10% more spaces during the peak parking period than what would be required. The peak parking demand of 195 spaces is 90% of the 215 spaces provided.

The Phase 2 shared parking analysis determined that there would be a peak parking demand of 458 spaces. In order to have an efficient parking supply between 5-15% greater than the peak parking demand, it was determined that the project shall provide 510 spaces (445 spaces on-site and 65 spaces off-site at the parking structure at 2 North Lake Avenue) during the peak parking period. For Phase 2, the additional 52

**Denver Miller, Zoning Administrator**  
**880 East Colorado Blvd – CUP #5209**  
**December 7, 2010**  
**Page 3**

spaces would allow 11% more spaces during the peak parking period than what would be required. The peak parking demand of 458 spaces is 90% of the 510 spaces provided.

With at least 10% more parking provided than the peak parking demand for each phase, the parking supply requirements would result in an efficient parking operation. Increasing the peak parking demand by 5-15%, described as “buffers”, is supported in the American Planning Association document Planning and Urban Design Standards, as stated by the appellant.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

C: Theresa Fuentes, City Attorney's Office  
Frederick C. Dock, Director of Transportation  
John Poindexter, Planning Manager, Planning Department  
John Steinmeyer, Senior Planner, Planning Department



**Attachment F**  
**Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. Memorandum of December 7, 2010**



KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES  
ADVISORS IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

ADVOCATES IN  
REAL ESTATE  
REDEVELOPMENT  
AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SAN FRANCISCO  
A. HARRY KEYSER  
TIMOTHY C. KELLY  
KATE EARLE FUNK  
DEBBIE M. KERN  
ROBERT J. WEIMORE  
REED T. KAWAHARA

LOS ANGELES  
KATHLEEN H. HEAD  
JAMES A. RABE  
PAUL C. ANDERSON  
GREGORY D. SOO-HOO  
KEVIN E. ENGSTROM  
JULIE L. ROMLY  
DENISE BICKERSTAFF

SAN DIEGO  
GERALD M. TRIMBLE  
PAUL C. MARRA

**To:** Dave Klug, Redevelopment Manager  
City of Pasadena

**From:** Kevin Engstrom

**Date:** December 7, 2010

**Subject:** Park Place Fiscal Analysis Review

Pursuant to your request, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) reviewed the "Response to Comments on CBRE Illustrative Fiscal Revenue Analysis for Park Place Development in Pasadena, California" memo prepared by CBRE Consulting dated October 19, 2010 (CBRE Report). The CBRE Report responds to comments received on their December 16, 2009 analysis (Original Analysis) evaluating the same project. To this end, the CBRE Report indicates the comments did not take issue with a number of assumptions and findings in the Original Analysis. However, there were four analytical assumptions that derived comments. These included:

1. Payroll Estimates
2. Net New Sales Tax Revenue Potential
3. Hotel Employees
4. Hotel Operating Parameters

For each of these comments, KMA reviewed the assumptions set forth in the CBRE Report.

**Payroll Estimates**

CBRE utilized data from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics to estimate the total payroll from the project. As KMA understands the situation, the specific tenancies and business that will occupy the project have not been identified. Given the uncertainty regarding the tenancies, the utilization of this data source as the basis for projecting payroll is not unreasonable.

**To:** Dave Klug, City of Pasadena  
**Subject:** Park Place Fiscal Analysis Review

December 7, 2010  
Page 2

### **Net New Sales Tax Revenue Potential**

The Original Analysis did not assume the transfer of sales from existing retail establishments in the City. Typically, when a new retail center is developed it is assumed that some of the sales generated by the project would have been captured by existing retailers in the City. The magnitude of this transfer depends on the type of tenants in the project and existing competition in the market area. Given that the tenants in the project are unknown, the magnitude of this impact is difficult to estimate. However, it is unlikely that there would be no transfer of sales. The revised CBRE Report indicates that a 50% transfer factor for the taxable sales would reduce the project's fiscal impact by 5%. This revised estimate is not unreasonable.

### **Hotel Employees**

The Original Analysis and the CBRE Report estimate the number of employees assuming an "industry standard" of one employee per room. The CBRE Report indicates the hotel will be a boutique property; however, the level of service and "star" quality are not specified. The level of service or "star" level of a hotel will determine the staffing needs. Typically, limited service, two and three-star hotels will have much lower employee ratios than full-service, three and four-star hotels. Based on industry standards, a reasonable range for this hotel would be between 0.5 and one employee per room. The CBRE projections are at the upper end of this range.

### **Hotel Operating Parameters**

According to the CBRE Report, PKF Consulting (PKF) prepared the operating projections for the hotel. Within the hotel industry, PKF is a respected consultant that has prepared numerous hotel market analyses and appraisals within Southern California. Based on the PKF estimates, the hotel's Average Daily Rate (ADR) is projected to be \$142 and the occupancy level is 72%, for a Revenue per Available Room (RevPAR) of \$106. According to PKF's "Trends in the Hotel Industry - September 2010", the year to date ADR for all Pasadena hotels is \$145 and the occupancy level is 72.4%. The average RevPAR in the City is \$105, which is 6% higher than 2009. Assuming PKF prepared the market projections and the hotel is a higher quality boutique property, then the CBRE Report's operating parameters do not appear unreasonable.

We hope this review is helpful and are available to discuss the above at your convenience.