

**Jomsky, Mark**

---

**From:** Una Lee Jost <una@jostlegal.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 13, 2017 4:54 PM  
**To:** Sinclair, David  
**Cc:** Varma, Arthi; Jomsky, Mark; Jill Shook  
**Subject:** [CORRECTED] Policy for ADUs-Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear Pasadena Senior Planner David Sinclair,

My sincere apologies; please disregard my previous email sent to you earlier today as there was a typo in the previous email.

Please find below the corrected email in lieu of my previous email to you containing my comments regarding the current discussion for forming a policy for Accessory Dwelling Units.

My apologies for any confusion or inconvenience.

Sincerely yours,  
~ Una Lee Jost

=====

Dear Pasadena Senior Planner David Sinclair,

I am Una Lee Jost, a California small business and nonprofit organizations attorney based in Pasadena. I am writing on behalf of my husband Geoffrey Jost and I in our capacities as long-time residents and tenants of Pasadena since 2006, a supporter of the Greater Pasadena Affordable Housing Group, and interim steering committee member of the Progressive Asian Network for Action

I understand the Pasadena Planning Staff is currently crafting their proposal to present to the City Council in December on their policy for ADUs—Accessory Dwelling Units (Granny Flats, Secondary Dwelling Units).

My husband and I both provided our written comments during the October 17 city-sponsored workshop held at Jackie Robinson Center requesting public comment regarding ADUs.

We are writing again to urge the Pasadena Planning Staff to craft a proposal to help retain a healthy mix of opportunities to adequately house our city and help prevent displacement. In particular, we urge your Staff to craft a proposal with no minimum lot size requirement to build a detached ADU.

In addition, we urge your Staff to craft a proposal that accounts for the needs of middle-class, low-income, and working class families, so that Pasadena does not become a city where housing for such families are concentrated in one spot, but rather that the housing in Pasadena is planned in such a way that it invites economic diversity.

Economic diversity in Pasadena is also in keeping with Pasadena's historic heritage. I understand Hunt who designed our library, Bachelder and one of the Green and Green brother's lived in ADUs. I also understand that Pasadena's broad streets with the large stately craftsman homes adjacent to more narrow streets with smaller homes, allowed lower-income workers to live close to wealthier residents. This heritage of a mixed income community sets a precedent for ADUs.

In addition to increasing availability of ADUs, I concur with Peter Drier, Professor of Sociology and Urban Studies at Occidental College, that we need changes in government policy to prevent widescale evictions and displacement, including:

- Working with nonprofit housing developers to purchase existing apartment buildings and preserving them as permanently affordable rental housing;
- Adopting rent control to keep landlords from rent-gouging. (I understand that under the state's Costa-Hawkins law, cities can't adopt full rent control but only "vacancy decontrol," but even that is better than the current lack of any rent regulations in Pasadena).
- Strengthening the city's Inclusionary Zoning law to require that developers set aside 20% of units for low- and moderate-income housing, and eliminate the "in-lieu" fee so developers have to actually build the affordable units rather than buy their way out of the obligation

As Professor Drier states:

"The city keeps approving more and more luxury apartments and condos.

Rents are skyrocketing. Working families are being pushed out of the city. The do-gooder approach -- helping one family at a time to find new housing after they've been evicted -- is no solution to this systemic problems. We need changes in government policy to prevent widescale evictions and displacement."

Professor Drier's concern is consistent with the concerns my husband and I have, which is shared by many of our neighbors and friends residing in the City of Pasadena. Many families are finding it harder and harder to afford living in Pasadena. With more families moving out of Pasadena, the resulting decreased enrollment of students decreases much-needed funding for public schools which is of much concern to my husband and I as parents of a elementary-age

child. We need to be investing in our next generations, not catering to the interests of real estate developers and their wealthy allies at the expense of our families in the City.

We urge the City of Pasadena to have courage to seek the welfare of the City and engage in all efforts possible to help alleviate the housing crisis, cultivating a City that is friendly to all families living in Pasadena.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,  
Una Lee Jost

--  
Una Lee Jost, Esq.  
Jost Legal ~ Pasadena, CA  
Small Business and Nonprofit Attorney  
phone:626.344.8021 | email:una@jostlegal.com | skype:unaleejost www.jostlegal.com

Jost Legal, 530 S. Lake Ave. #274, Pasadena, CA 91101 \*Helping you navigate today's complex legal environment.\*

---  
  
\*Supporter of the Healthy California campaign, working to win SB562, the Healthy California Act. SB 562 would guarantee healthcare for ALL California residents regardless of age, income, or immigrant status AND save CA \$37.5 billion annually in healthcare spending. Join the movement!

"Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health is the most shocking and inhuman." - Martin Luther King Jr.  
<https://www.healthyca.org>  
<https://www.ba4hcal.org/fix-it-the-movie>

---  
  
I consider it the highest compliment for clients to refer their family and friends to me. Thank you for your trust!



Please be advised that any advice concerning one or more U.S. Federal tax issues contained in this communication (including any attachments), is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

~~~~~  
This message may contain information that is ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT or otherwise PRIVILEGED or CONFIDENTIAL. If you received this communication in error, kindly erase all copies of this message and its attachments, if any, and notify us immediately. Thanks.  
~~~~~

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Felicia Williams <feliciaw@stanfordalumni.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 4:39 PM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** ADU Comments for 12/11 Public Hearing

Please distribute to Councilmembers in preparation for the 12/11/17 public hearing on Accessory Dwelling Units, thanks!

Felicia

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I would like to submit the following comment supporting a minimum lot size for ADUs of 7,500 sf or more. The highest density single family zoning designation in the Zoning Code is RS-6 (Low Density Residential) which allows for 6 dwelling units per acre, or 7,260 sf per dwelling unit. Reducing the ADU minimum lot size below 7,500 sf would effectively “re-zone” individual properties to multi-family (RM).

Single-family properties are priced at a premium based on current zoning, and owners expect to exercise a certain amount of their right to quiet enjoyment based on the lower density. I am concerned that reducing the minimum lot size below 7,500 sf could expose the City to litigation from single-family property owners who feel that their home value and right to quiet enjoyment have been negatively impacted.

Thanks,

Felicia Williams

Council District 2

## Reese, Latasha

---

**From:** Kathy Gregg <kaaath74@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 03, 2017 9:49 AM  
**To:** cityclerk  
**Cc:** Masuda, Gene; Sullivan, Noreen; UHRA Board  
**Subject:** ADU issue on Monday, 7pm

Allowing accessory dwelling units in town will be the beginning of over populating and seriously over crowding our roads, etc, even more than it is already. It will be junky looking with far too many people living in one address. I never thought we'd come to this extent. It's common sense that this allowance would over load the already crowded city.

Please be careful with this issue. It could very easily be taken advantage of...I'm sure, if you live here in Pasadena, you can understand and realize what could and would happen.

Thank you for rethinking this problem, this mess!

Kathy Gregg  
Upper Hastings Ranch



# M A D I S O N H E I G H T S

October 24, 2017

## **Mayor Tornek and City Council**

Pasadena City Hall  
100 N. Garfield Ave  
Pasadena, CA 91101

Dear Mayor and City Council,

We are writing to ask that you not support several of the recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission and staff in regards to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and for you to consider how these suggestions may harm and commercialize single-family residential neighborhoods. Many of the commission's suggestions do not support HE 1.1 of the General Plan. In fact, as Pasadena Heritage so eloquently said, "the state requirement runs intuitively counter to Pasadena's very carefully crafted plans to protect and preserve neighborhood character "

We ask you to carefully consider the following points as opportunities to mitigate the negative impact of increased ADUs on our single-family neighborhoods:

- A. The Zoning Code Amendment does not include "pending" landmark overlay districts such as Magnolia Avenue. The city has multiple districts that have applied for landmark status and they must be recognized;
- B. The Zoning Code Amendment does not maintain neighborhood character because street width is not addressed. Street width is only considered in the Hillside overlay district, but the council should consider a standard width applied to the entire city. Street width should also determine the number of ADUs and occupants allowed;
- C. By lowering the minimum lot size to 5,000 sq ft, Policy HE1.1 of the General Plan is ignored. Smaller lots will not preserve the character, scale, or quality of life in residential neighborhoods. By comparison, South Pasadena's minimum lot limit is 12,500 sq ft, which more strongly supports the General Plan. Similar limits should be considered by the council here,
- D. We agree with the staff suggestion that units be kept to a maximum of 800 sq ft. Unit size must be limited in order to protect existing green space and keep the character of neighborhoods intact. There is also a concern that if these units are allowed to be any larger they will contribute to the potential loss of trees;
- E. Council must consider privacy concerns and not allow second-story ADUs in single-family neighborhoods. The suggested idea that these second units, if

---

allowed, can be built without windows on neighboring sides does not support Policy HE1.1;

- F. The proposal to reduce building separation to 6 feet leaves no open space for children to play, and will reduce sunlight on properties. Buildings should maintain a separation of 10 feet for exterior units in order to be in compliance with Policy HE1.1;
- G. During the permitting process, a one-time fee should be charged to the homeowner in order to pay for the enforcement of these new regulations,
- H. With the potential for increased residents on our streets, street cleaning days should be increased;
- I. We request special engineering studies to be conducted to analyze the effect of increased sewage outflow, including any possible costs involved with the creation of additional dwelling units and the potential for surcharges in the sewer lines in denser areas;
- J. Separate addresses or utility connections for the units should not be allowed,
- K. The proposed changes by the Planning Commission and staff increases the number of potential ADU properties to from 1,275 to 13,320 units. We wonder if this will be considered in regards to the residential caps in the General Plan; and
- L. Residential Impact Fees (RIF) cannot be reduced as proposed by the Planning Commission. As you are well aware, we are severely lacking parks and open green spaces, especially in the Central District where most new ADUs will be built. The city should consider using RIF revenue to provide more public green space in areas affected by increased density. The council must remember that it is beneficial to keep families attracted to Pasadena and that we must not inadvertently allow it to become a "child free zone" through a reduction in RIF and consequent lack of new green space.

We deeply appreciate the consideration of these issues by the Council

Sincerely,



John Latta, President

Madison Heights Neighborhood Association