

From: Andy Wilson [mailto:andrew_r_wilson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 09, 2010 10:04 PM
To: Poindexter, John
Cc: Terry Tornek; Thyret, Pam; Bogaard, Bill; 'Richard McDonald'
Subject: Comments on IDS/680 E Colorado

Dear Mr. Poindexter, Mayor Bogaard & City Council Members (pls circulate & add to the record) –

Re: Consideration for Call for Review of Design Commission Decision for Concept Design Review for 680 E Colorado

I am unfortunately unable to tomorrow's hearing on the IDS project. In my absence I wanted to send you a few brief thoughts/comments that I would like you to take into consideration in your deliberations.

I would like to remind you of the following:

- Unanimous (8 – 0) recommendation from the Planning Commission in July 2009 that the City not certify the EIR and deny the requested entitlements
- Related recommendation that Council only approve a potential project on this parcel that complies with the current zoning code and the specific plan

Since the time that the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed project, the City has spent a tremendous amount of time, effort, financial resources, political energy etc to conduct extensive outreach in regard to the updating the General Plan. From my perspective this work has been outstanding and far reaching across the community. I believe we are all quite familiar with the recently issued Outreach Summary Report. In particular I would like to draw everyone's attention to the dominant themes #2 Growth & Density, #3 Design & Architecture and #4 Traffic. While the findings of the Outreach efforts were not 100% consistent (and given the diversity of our community would never be entirely homogeneous in their perspective), **I believe the general conclusions are amazingly clear: less density, better/more compatible architecture and an aggressive stance to reduce traffic.**

It is within this context that I believe the Council **must** revisit its flawed support of this project. While there may have been some ambiguity last year in regard to the scale/scope of this project, I believe such ambiguity has been erased as a result of the comprehensive General Plan outreach efforts. **This project should not have been approved last year and certainly with the recent revelations associated with General Plan process, I think it would be unconscionable to allow this project to move forward in its current incarnation.** I believe that the Community has spoken and it has determined that our current zoning (excluding any additional entitlements) is already too liberal with respect to density and the traffic generation. **I don't believe there is any basis for the Council to support a project that exceeds the current zoning code and would argue that any potential approval should be based on down sizing the project to below the current zoning code – the people have spoken and it is your duty to act accordingly.**

Best regards,

Andy Wilson
Planning Commissioner (2009 – 2010)
Design Commissioner (2003 – 2009)
andrew_r_wilson@yahoo.com
803 S Oakland Ave
Pasadena, CA 91106

05/10/2010
Item 22