

Reese, Latasha

Subject: FW: Mickinley gym

From: Thyret, Pam
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 4:24 PM
To: 'Hugh Su'
Subject: RE: Mickinley gym

Dear Hugh,

Thank you for your comments. This matter will be taken up by the City Council on Monday evening. I am forwarding you comments to the City Clerk and to Councilmember Wilson as part of the record.

Pam Thyret
City Council District Liaison for Councilmember Andy Wilson
(626) 441-4802

From: Hugh Su [<mailto:hughksu@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 2:44 PM
To: Thyret, Pam
Subject: Mickinley gym

Dear Pam,

I am a homeowner in the immediate neighborhood of the McKinley School Gymnasium. My property is located at 625 E Del Mar Blvd #102, Pasadena CA 91101, which is across the street of the gymnasium. I have concerns regarding the proposed conditional use permit.

I have particular worries concerning:

- (i) the number of persons who may be participating or in attendance at the gymnasium - I have been made aware that the parks department interprets the limit of participants in events of 100 persons to not count visitors or spectators, and that the actual limit is 500 persons in the gymnasium at any time. The parks department takes the position that the building can already be used by 500 persons for school uses, but (1) the students are all known to and under the control of school administration and are therefore unlikely to cause any neighborhood security problems; and (2) being K through 8 students do not require any parking.
- (ii) the potential security problems which may result from large numbers of unknown people in attendance at events to be held in the gymnasium. The area is residential and not commercial and therefore is not patrolled by any private security at all, nor would it be economic nor reasonable for me to be required by the resulting security vacuum to supply private security to protect me and my family for the benefit of a public purpose. The limited amount of security proposed by the applicants would in no way make the area safe from a large number of unknown strangers roaming the neighborhood. I would not feel it appropriate for me to be forced to remain in my home during evening hours to avoid confrontation with groups of potentially dangerous strangers.
- (iii) the inability of the Parks department to enforce any parking limitations (they can encourage gymnasium guests to park in the assigned parking lots but have no way of enforcing to prevent any violators using the limited number of street parking spaces) coupled with the inconvenience to

be caused to my family and my guests by the proposed solution of creating a permit only zone - how do I have a dinner party with a dozen guests?

(iv) the late hours of use on weekdays (until 9pm) coupled with the early hours of use on weekends (8am).

(v) all of these potential problems and inconveniences result from the spurious objective of the parks department to maximize use of the facility while running roughshod over me and the other residents of the neighborhood.

(vi) (any other concerns not listed above)

Since these and possibly other concerns of the neighbors have been disregarded in previous attempts to resolve them, and the requirement of an Environmental Impact Report has apparently been sidestepped by an at best questionable interpretation of state regulations, the matter should be returned to the planning department with instructions to prepare an environmental impact report and follow all relevant procedures before any proposed CUP should be approved or any of the proposed uses be effected.

Sent from my iPhone

Reese, Latasha

From: Thyret, Pam
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 4:31 PM
To: 'Adelaide Lau'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; Wilson, Andy
Subject: RE: McKinley School Gymnasium

Hi Adelaide,

Thank you for your comments. This matter will be taken up by the City Council on Monday evening. I am copying your email to our City Clerk and Councilmember Wilson to be part of the official comments on Monday.

Pam Thyret
City Council District Liaison for Councilmember Andy Wilson
(626) 441-4802

From: Adelaide Lau [<mailto:adelaide.m.lau@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 2:17 PM
To: Thyret, Pam
Subject: McKinley School Gymnasium

Dear Pam,

I am a homeowner in the immediate neighborhood of the McKinley School Gymnasium. My property is located at 625 E Del Mar Blvd #102, Pasadena CA 91101, which is across the street of the gymnasium. I have concerns regarding the proposed conditional use permit.

I have particular worries concerning:

- (i) the number of persons who may be participating or in attendance at the gymnasium - I have been made aware that the parks department interprets the limit of participants in events of 100 persons to not count visitors or spectators, and that the actual limit is 500 persons in the gymnasium at any time. The parks department takes the position that the building can already be used by 500 persons for school uses, but (1) the students are all known to and under the control of school administration and are therefore unlikely to cause any neighborhood security problems; and (2) being K through 8 students do not require any parking.
- (ii) the potential security problems which may result from large numbers of unknown people in attendance at events to be held in the gymnasium. The area is residential and not commercial and therefore is not patrolled by any private security at all, nor would it be economic nor reasonable for me to be required by the resulting security vacuum to supply private security to protect me and my family for the benefit of a public purpose. The limited amount of security proposed by the applicants would in no way make the area safe from a large number of unknown strangers roaming the neighborhood. I would not feel it appropriate for me to be forced to remain in my home during evening hours to avoid confrontation with groups of potentially dangerous strangers.
- (iii) the inability of the Parks department to enforce any parking limitations (they can encourage gymnasium guests to park in the assigned parking lots but have no way of enforcing to prevent any violators using

the limited number of street parking spaces) coupled with the inconvenience to be caused to my family and my guests by the proposed solution of creating a permit only zone - how do I have a dinner party with a dozen guests?

(iv) the late hours of use on weekdays (until 9pm) coupled with the early hours of use on weekends (8am).

(v) all of these potential problems and inconveniences result from the spurious objective of the parks department to maximize use of the facility while running roughshod over me and the other residents of the neighborhood.

(vi) (any other concerns not listed above)

Since these and possibly other concerns of the neighbors have been disregarded in previous attempts to resolve them, and the requirement of an Environmental Impact Report has apparently been sidestepped by an at best questionable interpretation of state regulations, the matter should be returned to the planning department with instructions to prepare an environmental impact report and follow all relevant procedures before any proposed CUP should be approved or any of the proposed uses be effected.

--

Sincerely,

Adelaide Lau
626.823.0692
Adelaide.M.Lau@gmail.com



Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: CUP) #6116 McKinley school gym parking

From: nancy chen [mailto:nancy3n@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 6:29 PM

To: Thyret, Pam

Cc: Simon Lu

Subject: CUP) #6116 McKinley school gym parking

I am a homeowner in the immediate neighborhood of the McKinley School Gymnasium. My property is located at ___355 south Madison ave___ which is within a quarter mile distance of the gymnasium. I have concerns regarding the proposed conditional use permit.

I have particular worries concerning:

(i) the number of persons who may be participating or in attendance at the gymnasium - I have been made aware that the parks department interprets the limit of participants in events of 100 persons to not count visitors or spectators, and that the actual limit is 500 persons in the gymnasium at any time. The parks department takes the position that the building can already be used by 500 persons for school uses, but (1) the students are all known to and under the control of school administration and are therefore unlikely to cause any neighborhood security problems; and (2) being K through 8 students do not require any parking.

(ii) the potential security problems which may result from large numbers of unknown people in attendance at events to be held in the gymnasium. The area is residential and not commercial and therefore is not patrolled by any private security at all, nor would it be economic nor reasonable for me to be required by the resulting security vacuum to supply private security to protect me and my family for the benefit of a public purpose. The limited amount of security proposed by the applicants would in no way make the area safe from a large number of unknown strangers roaming the neighborhood. I would not feel it appropriate for me to be forced to remain in my home during evening hours to avoid confrontation with groups of potentially dangerous strangers.

(iii) the inability of the Parks department to enforce any parking limitations (they can encourage gymnasium guests to park in the assigned parking lots but have no way of enforcing to prevent any violators using the limited number of street parking spaces) coupled with the inconvenience to be caused to my family and my guests by the proposed solution of creating a permit only zone - how do I have a dinner party with a dozen guests?

(iv) the late hours of use on weekdays (until 9pm) coupled with the early hours of use on weekends (8am).

(v) all of these potential problems and inconveniences result from the spurious objective of the parks department to maximize use of the facility while running roughshod over me and the other residents of the neighborhood.

(vi) (any other concerns not listed above)

Since these and possibly other concerns of the neighbors have been disregarded in previous attempts to resolve them, and the requirement of an Environmental Impact Report has apparently been sidestepped by an at best questionable interpretation of state regulations, the matter should be returned to the planning department with instructions to prepare an environmental impact report and follow all relevant procedures before any proposed CUP should be approved or any of the proposed uses be effected.

Yours respectfully,

Nancy Chen

02/29/2016
Item 9