

Jomsky, Mark

From: Tiffany Beljak <t.beljak@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:14 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Appeal of 127-141 N. Madison

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

I'm in support of this appeal
So are many of my friends and neighbors!
Tiffany Beljak
1525 Orlando Road
Pasadena, ca 91106

Sent from my iPhone

Jomsky, Mark

Subject: FW: Tonight

-----Original Message-----

From: Rosey Bell [mailto:roseybell@rocketmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 11:23 AM

To: Terry Tornek <ttornek@charter.net>; Thyret, Pam <pthyret@cityofpasadena.net>

Subject: Tonight

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Dear All,

I feel it is very important for the City of Pasadena to request an environmental review of the projects proposed for North Madison and Los Robles. They seem to be big projects that dwarf the neighborhood. If Pasadena keeps allowing these ginormous project to be approved, and built, Pasadena stands to lose our charm and character. I know the State of California does not care, its time for us as leaders, and citizens of Pasadena to stand up and show that we do.

Please forward my letter to the other Council Members. I have obligations tonight and cannot show up in person to state my position.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rosey Bell

726 S. El Molino Ave

Pasadena, California 91106

Jomsky, Mark

From: Judy Denenholz <jdenenholz@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:20 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Appeal of 127-141 N. Madison

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

We strenuously object to the proposed development at 127 -141 north Madison Avenue. I have lived in Pasadena for 40 years, and have sadly watched the over development of our beautiful City. We live on South Madison; by about 4:00 pm, it takes forever to go home. Every block is gridlocked. Council needs to figure out a way to fund the pensions without driving everyone out of PASADENA. Thank you.

Just Denenholz
717 South Madison Avenue, Pasadena.

Sent from my iPhone

Jomsky, Mark

From: Christine Fedukowski <cfedukowski@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:05 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: Wilson, Andy; Thyret, Pam
Subject: 127 - 141 N. Madison - Pasadena Heritage Appeal of BZA approval - City Council AR24

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Dear Mark,

I am a 13- year resident and property owner in the Playhouse District.

I support Pasadena Heritage's appeal and ask that City Council reverse BZA approval, deny Applicant's application, and require a full environmental impact review. Evidence has been presented to indicate the proposed project will potentially have significant adverse impacts. To identify and properly analyze such potential impacts, an EIR must be done. Without that analysis, how can the city assert there are no adverse impacts?

Our downtown neighborhoods are too important to permit potentially irreparable damage without proper analytic review and robust public process.

And, please record my thanks to Pasadena Heritage and the Madison Heights Neighborhood Association for their time and efforts on behalf of our community, and full support of Ken McCormick's Guest Opinion in Pasadena.

Please distribute this to City Council members,

Thank you,

Christine Fedukowski

CHRISTINE FEDUKOWSKI ||
601 E. Del Mar Blvd #408, Pasadena, CA 91101
PHONE: 626.792.6246 | MOBILE: 415.310.0385

Jomsky, Mark

From: Stacey Fortner <sfortner@me.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: City Council Trees July 22 (1)[1].docx PLEASE ADD FOR TONIGHTS MEETING!
Attachments: City Council Trees July 22 (1)[1].docx

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

City Council Members:

As a Pasadena resident for 51 years, the over development and increased density without regard to our precious tree canopy has become an immense and concerning problem. I am 100% supporting the attached letter. We are at a fork in the divide and we must choose wisely tonight, to honor and preserve our city's history and beautiful, mature tree canopy!

Thank you,
Stacey Fortner
40 Arroyo Drive No. 102
Pasadena, CA 91105

Sent from my iPhone



July 22, 2019

Mayor Tornek, City Council, Planning Department
City Clerk
100 North Garfield Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Appeal of Hearing Officer's Decision on Affordable Housing Concession Permit #11869 and #11879

Dear Mayor, City Council, and Planning Department,

The developers in both cases of 253 South Los Robles and 127 North Madison want to remove beautiful protected trees from their properties even though it seems as if they could easily be integrated into the proposed development. This 100ft canary pine at 253 South Los Robles is the only remaining protected tree left on the block. Its removal does not conform with the very first Guiding Principle of our General Plan which was developed through an extensive program of community outreach and input conducted over a six-year period. It says, "*Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life...New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks, and trees.*"

Our residents really want to understand the city process of our tree ordinance which allows this removal especially when we specifically asked our General Plan to include tree preservation? There are two other trees clustered next to the one tall protected tree at 253 South Los Robles to be removed and it doesn't make sense how they will be able to remain with the property line just a few feet from the remaining trees especially when design commission will not have a chance to scale back the building to make sure the trees stay healthy. How will they dig the subterranean garage and build massive walls just feet away from the trees that are to remain? Will we see another Kaiser wrongdoing? In fact, we have protections in place for this but it through the design commission.

If the design commission first had the opportunity to see how the development could be altered and minimized to save these trees as it says in our protection policy, we might see a completely different project. After these concessions are given though, you have put the design commission in a corner. They cannot save the tree by giving more incentives to the developer with height or reduced garden requirements because the project is already out of scope of the General Plan. The design commission has to choose between two evils to remove the last protected tree on the block or go even bigger which will not be consistent with our General Plan. What is happening with the city not following Goal 5, Policy 5.5 of our General Plan- "*Civic Open Space. Continue to protect the character of the Civic Center as defined by its landscaped open spaces and tree canopy. Locate and design new civic structures to respect this urban form, character, design and functionality.*"

The next big development coming to our city like these two must take our tree canopy into consideration just as our General Plan requires in Policy 5.5. It is the city's duty to protect its current residents from development that might hinder the livability of our city and protect us from a high urban heat index. In addition, our city is quickly losing what differentiates us from other cities: mature trees.

We must ensure that the city we pass down to our children isn't made of just parking lots and concrete developments. It is up to city staff and council to protect us from development that contradicts this fundamental imperative and follow

our General Plan. While our city does have tree protections in place, it is clear it is not enough and you are not following it. The city needs to take a stronger stance on maintaining mature trees in the urban center. We must create a city that has strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy. We need to band together and insist on stronger and more stringent views of our urban canopy.

Thank you,

Jomsky, Mark

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 11:50 AM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: Contact Form From Office of the City Clerk

Name : Richard A Grzesiak
Phone: 6266585650
Email: rich.grzesiak@yahoo.com

Message:

I oppose the furtherance of the projects sponsored by these 2 firms: no exceptions, exemptions, or waivers should be allowed.

In exchange for a grand total of NINE (9) "affordable" housing units to be constructed, these 2 developers are being granted exemptions to go ahead and build properties that exceed height and other restrictions that are essential to maintain a quality of life in those areas — and avoid more examples of extreme gentrification (and, frankly, monetary greed).

The rules need to be maintained. No concessions or exemptions should be allowed, and certainly not for a nine (9) units of 'affordable' housing.

User Information

IP Address: 174.85.47.32

User-Agent (Browser/OS): Mozilla Firefox 60.0 / OS X

Referrer:

<https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cityofpasadena.net%2Fcity-clerk%2Fcontact%2F&data=02%7C01%7Cmjomsky%40cityofpasadena.net%7C41a5a32b7c04636804108d70ed56734%7C82d9fc002c664402a28fc6bcd32e491%7C1%7C0%7C636994182029223839&sdata=b74%2BhWekzN9JwUfNxvMXs4Bh3Emm0NpF99mQvuLdbrU%3D&reserved=0>

Jomsky, Mark

From: Ron Johnson <rjohnson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:00 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Affordable Housing Concession Permit #11869 and #11879

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Re: Appeal of Hearing Officer's Decision on Affordable Housing Concession Permit #11869 and #11879

Dear Mayor, City Council, and Planning Department,

The developers in both cases of 253 South Los Robles and 127 North Madison want to remove beautiful protected trees from their properties even though it seems as if they could easily be integrated into the proposed development. This 100ft canary pine at 253 South Los Robles is the only remaining protected tree left on the block. Its removal does not conform with the very first Guiding Principle of our General Plan which was developed through an extensive program of community outreach and input conducted over a six-year period. It says, *"Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life...New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks, and trees."*

Our residents really want to understand the city process of our tree ordinance which allows this removal especially when we specifically asked our General Plan to include tree preservation? There are two other trees clustered next to the one tall protected tree at 253 South Los Robles to be removed and it doesn't make sense how they will be able to remain with the property line just a few feet from the remaining trees especially when design commission will not have a chance to scale back the building to make sure the trees stay healthy. How will they dig the subterranean garage and build massive walls just feet away from the trees that are to remain? Will we see another Kaiser wrongdoing? In fact, we have protections in place for this but it through the design commission.

If the design commission first had the opportunity to see how the development could be altered and minimized to save these trees as it says in our protection policy, we might see a completely different project. After these concessions are given though, you have put the design commission in a corner. They cannot save the tree by giving more incentives to the developer with height or reduced garden requirements because the project is already out of scope of the General Plan. The design commission has to choose between two evils to remove the last protected tree on the block or go even bigger which will not be consistent with our General Plan. What is happening with the city not following Goal 5, Policy 5.5 of our General Plan- *"Civic Open Space. Continue to protect the character of the Civic Center as defined by its landscaped open spaces and tree canopy. Locate and design new civic structures to respect this urban form, character, design and functionality."*

The next big development coming to our city like these two must take our tree canopy into consideration just as our General Plan requires in Policy 5.5. It is the city's duty to protect its current residents from development that might hinder the livability of our city and protect us from a high urban heat index. In addition, our city is quickly losing what differentiates us from other cities: mature trees.

We must ensure that the city we pass down to our children isn't made of just parking lots and concrete developments. It is up to city staff and council to protect us from development that contradicts this fundamental imperative and follow our General Plan. While our city does have tree protections in place, it is clear it is not enough and you are not following it. The city needs to take a stronger stance on maintaining mature trees in the urban center. We must create a city that has strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy. We need to band together and insist on stronger and more stringent views of our urban canopy.

Thank you,

Ron Johnson
333 Manford Way
Pasadena, CA 91105

Jomsky, Mark

From: Chuck Livingstone <realtor@chucklivingstone.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Tonight's City council meeting-July 22
Attachments: image001.jpg

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Hi Mark,

As a former resident of Madison Heights Neighborhood Association and past President as well as President of Pasadena Beautiful Foundation, I oppose the waiver of CEQA review.

The General Plan Land use guide states: Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life...New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks and trees.

These two new development projects do not represent Pasadena's General Plan nor stay within guidelines of pass developed projects.

The oversize buildings are not in good design of Pasadena's overall General Plan.

The big development coming to Pasadena takes away our tree canopy. The city needs to protect us from these large development projects and protect us from a high urban heat index. The proposed projects threatens our city history of protected tree canopy, our parks etc. Yes on the CEQA review

--
Best Regards,



**Charles "Chuck" Livingstone
Realtor**

O: (626) 584-0050

C: (626)-641-1264

Realtor@ChuckLivingstone.com

388 S. Lake Ave. Pasadena, Ca. 91101

www.ChuckLivingstone.com

CalRE# 01203399



Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage



CITY CLERK

19 JUL 22 12:04PM

July 22, 2019

Mayor Tornek, City Council, Planning Department
City Clerk
100 North Garfield Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Appeal of Hearing Officer's Decision on Affordable Housing Concession Permit #11869 and #11879

Dear Mayor, City Council, and Planning Department,

The developers in both cases of 253 South Los Robles and 127 North Madison want to remove beautiful protected trees from their properties even though it seems as if they could easily be integrated into the proposed development. This 100ft canary pine at 253 South Los Robles is the only remaining protected tree left on the block. Its removal does not conform with the very first Guiding Principle of our General Plan which was developed through an extensive program of community outreach and input conducted over a six-year period. It says, "*Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life...New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks, and trees.*"

Our residents really want to understand the city process of our tree ordinance which allows this removal especially when we specifically asked our General Plan to include tree preservation? There are two other trees clustered next to the one tall protected tree at 253 South Los Robles to be removed and it doesn't make sense how they will be able to remain with the property line just a few feet from the remaining trees especially when design commission will not have a chance to scale back the building to make sure the trees stay healthy. How will they dig the subterranean garage and build massive walls just feet away from the trees that are to remain? Will we see another Kaiser wrongdoing? In fact, we have protections in place for this but it through the design commission.

If the design commission first had the opportunity to see how the development could be altered and minimized to save these trees as it says in our protection policy, we might see a completely different project. After these concessions are given though, you have put the design commission in a corner. They cannot save the tree by giving more incentives to the developer with height or reduced garden requirements because the project is already out of scope of the General Plan. The design commission has to choose between two evils to remove the last protected tree on the block or go even bigger which will not be consistent with our General Plan. What is happening with the city not following Goal 5, Policy 5.5 of our General Plan- "*Civic Open Space. Continue to protect the character of the Civic Center as defined by its landscaped open spaces and tree canopy. Locate and design new civic structures to respect this urban form, character, design and functionality.*"

The next big development coming to our city like these two must take our tree canopy into consideration just as our General Plan requires in Policy 5.5. It is the city's duty to protect its current residents from development that might hinder the livability of our city and protect us from a high urban heat index. In addition, our city is quickly losing what differentiates us from other cities: mature trees.

We must ensure that the city we pass down to our children isn't made of just parking lots and concrete developments. It is up to city staff and council to protect us from development that contradicts this fundamental imperative and follow

07/22/2019
Item 23 & 24

our General Plan. While our city does have tree protections in place, it is clear it is not enough and you are not following it. The city needs to take a stronger stance on maintaining mature trees in the urban center. We must create a city that has strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy. We need to band together and insist on stronger and more stringent views of our urban canopy.

Thank you,



MARK A. MORILLO
1240 CATALAN ROAD
PASADENA, CA.
91105



CITY CLERK

19 JUL 22 12:04PM

July 22, 2019

Mayor Tornek, City Council, Planning Department
City Clerk
100 North Garfield Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Appeal of Hearing Officer's Decision on Affordable Housing Concession Permit #11869 and #11879

Dear Mayor, City Council, and Planning Department,

The developers in both cases of 253 South Los Robles and 127 North Madison want to remove beautiful protected trees from their properties even though it seems as if they could easily be integrated into the proposed development. This 100ft canary pine at 253 South Los Robles is the only remaining protected tree left on the block. Its removal does not conform with the very first Guiding Principle of our General Plan which was developed through an extensive program of community outreach and input conducted over a six-year period. It says, *"Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life...New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks, and trees."*

Our residents really want to understand the city process of our tree ordinance which allows this removal especially when we specifically asked our General Plan to include tree preservation? There are two other trees clustered next to the one tall protected tree at 253 South Los Robles to be removed and it doesn't make sense how they will be able to remain with the property line just a few feet from the remaining trees especially when design commission will not have a chance to scale back the building to make sure the trees stay healthy. How will they dig the subterranean garage and build massive walls just feet away from the trees that are to remain? Will we see another Kaiser wrongdoing? In fact, we have protections in place for this but it through the design commission.

If the design commission first had the opportunity to see how the development could be altered and minimized to save these trees as it says in our protection policy, we might see a completely different project. After these concessions are given though, you have put the design commission in a corner. They cannot save the tree by giving more incentives to the developer with height or reduced garden requirements because the project is already out of scope of the General Plan. The design commission has to choose between two evils to remove the last protected tree on the block or go even bigger which will not be consistent with our General Plan. What is happening with the city not following Goal 5, Policy 5.5 of our General Plan- *"Civic Open Space. Continue to protect the character of the Civic Center as defined by its landscaped open spaces and tree canopy. Locate and design new civic structures to respect this urban form, character, design and functionality."*

The next big development coming to our city like these two must take our tree canopy into consideration just as our General Plan requires in Policy 5.5. It is the city's duty to protect its current residents from development that might hinder the livability of our city and protect us from a high urban heat index. In addition, our city is quickly losing what differentiates us from other cities: mature trees.

We must ensure that the city we pass down to our children isn't made of just parking lots and concrete developments. It is up to city staff and council to protect us from development that contradicts this fundamental imperative and follow

07/22/2019
Items 23 & 24

our General Plan. While our city does have tree protections in place, it is clear it is not enough and you are not following it. The city needs to take a stronger stance on maintaining mature trees in the urban center. We must create a city that has strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy. We need to band together and insist on stronger and more stringent views of our urban canopy.

Thank you,

Kimberly Popovich Shepherd
1295 Lombardy Road
Pasadena, CA 91106

19 JUL 22 02:19PM

CITY CLERK

July 22, 2019

Re: 127-141 North Madison

Dear Mayor Tornek and Members of the City Council,

I agree with the environmental analysis presented in the document you've received from Pasadena Heritage. It is clear that this project cannot remain categorically exempt, because it is clear that the project will be adversely impacting many historic resources, particularly in the Playhouse District and the Fuller Seminary District. One of the City's most significant Historic Monuments, the Blinn House, is adjacent to the site, and another, the Scottish Rite Temple is across the street. This project must respond to the surrounding environment, not overwhelm and destroy it.

It is also clear that the excavation for the project, which extends to the property line, will impact the root zones of nearby trees. And what about construction scaffolding? Have we not learned from the Kaiser project on Green Street that these questions need to be asked before the project is approved? Every tree is an asset, and as we see these assets struggle to survive in the changing climate, we must respond by protecting each one of them and aiding their survival.

I urge you to require a full EIR completed by a consultant chosen by the City.

Sincerely,

Ann Scheid
500 S Arroyo Blvd
Pasadena, CA 91105

07/22/2019
Item 24