

Novelo, Lilia

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 3:33 PM
To: Novelo, Lilia
Subject: Fwd: SUPORTIVE HOUSING and the city owned YWMCA building and Robinson Park

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peter Hartgens <pch.knowledge@icloud.com>
Date: May 30, 2019 at 7:24:07 PM PDT
To: mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net
Subject: SUPORTIVE HOUSING and the city owned YWMCA building and Robinson Park

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

Dear Mayor and city Council Members,

The hope is that materialism and Mammonism has not taken dominance over Humanism, as to the city owned YWMCA Building and Robinson Park. These are not places for commercial use, at the cost to those who are the most needy and marginalized in this city. Compassion and sympathy are the virtues that are needed far above capital gains.

It seemed that the city council was in bracing humanism and compassion as to needs of the homeless and low income people as to housing. Have your heads been turned from this course by the beguiling luster of developers' shining silver and gold and seductive promises of creating prosperity for Pasadena? If so it will be another edifice whose foundation will be on the bodies of the suffering marginalized. Please go for the higher ground in this matter and put away the selfishness of material gain and reach your hand out and make a safe haven for your less fortunate brothers and sister human beings.

As Creator spoke through the man Jesus[or the Son of God if such is your belief] the words "WHAT THOU DO UNTO THE LEAST OF THEES THOU DOEST UNTO ME"! Verily, and such, what do we all want to be remembered for, historically, politically and ethically, a hand that oppresses and restricts, or for the hand that embraces and uplifts?

You desired leadership and it has been bestowed on you. Therefor, you have the weight of all the people of and in Pasadena on your shoulders. Do we want a city who's beauty is skin deep and vain or a city whose beauty radiates from its soul outward through its material exterior?

Thank you for reflecting on the above comments.

Sincerely
Rev. Peter C. Hartgens OFM,MSW
Sent from my iPad

Novelo, Lilia

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 3:33 PM
To: Novelo, Lilia
Subject: Fwd:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Randall Heyn-Lamb <rheynlamb@gmail.com>
Date: May 30, 2019 at 9:53:02 PM PDT
To: mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net

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

As a Pasadena voter and homeowner in Victor Gordo's district, I favor permanent supportive housing and public use, not private commercial development, at the city-owned YWCA. Some of the people I meet on the approaches to City Hall or in the courtyard of All Saints Church on Sunday and Monday mornings are now my acquaintances and I care what happens to them. I don't want developers to encroach on the Robinson park. I dont want our Sister City trees to fall under the Axe. This is an historic legacy."

**Randall Heyn-Lamb
821 E. Claremont St.
Pasadena, 91104**

May 31, 2019
David Klug
Redevelopment Manager
Economic Development Team
City of Pasadena

CITY CLERK

13 MAY 31 04:44PM

Re: Draft Civic Center Request for Proposal

Dear Mr. Klug:

I have some concerns about the Draft RFP issued on May 17 with comments due by May 31, 2019.

The comment period of 14 days extends over a major holiday which encompasses Memorial Day Monday and the week prior to and the week following the holiday, when many citizens are often away. In addition, there is no opportunity for citizens to comment in person at a scheduled meeting of any official body, except on Monday, May 20, barely 3 days after the issuance of the Draft RFP and when the item was not scheduled on the agenda.

Given the large number of citizens who have expressed concerns at previous hearings on the earlier proposal elicited by the 2012 RFP, this lack of opportunity to comment seems peculiar in the face of repeated citizen requests for an open process for any project proposed in this sensitive Civic Center location.

The new RFP publishes the 1925 plan from Bennett's office (amended) that shows the footprints of the Library, City Hall, and Auditorium, as selected by the jury of the design competition in 1924. This plan is presented as the governing document, because it shows footprints for possible buildings on Garfield across from City Hall, which is why it has been designated as the "final plan" by the City's Planning Department. It never received official approval by the City Council, it does not exist in any City records, and it was published only once, in 1927, in a small publication, *California Southland*. The nature of the cited amendments is unclear and could well be the introduction of the building footprints on Garfield and/or the labeling of alternative use of the spaces as parking lots. The parking lot idea was rejected in 1926. Furthermore, a proposal to sell the lots across Garfield facing City Hall was opposed in 1927-28 by the Woman's Civic League and others, and the lots were never sold.

Until the discovery of a photograph of 1925 building footprint plan (the plan itself has never been found) in Bennett's papers in Chicago, the recognized governing document for all planning efforts in the Civic Center has been the Bennett plan adopted by the City Council and approved by an overwhelming majority of Pasadena voters in 1923.

The RFP states that "new construction should be consistent with all Pasadena plans that relate to the historic Civic Center and the dynamic Central District." This is a tall order, because besides the two plans mentioned above and the several plans devoted to the Civic Center from the 1980s and 1990s, these include the Central District Plan of the early 1980s and more recently the Central District Specific Plan, which superimposes a height limit of 60 feet on the historic spaces across from City Hall. These plans conflict with each other. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine "new construction" that can match the quality of design and materials present in the existing historic buildings surrounding the site. And if the Central District is so dynamic, why do we need more development here?

The Civic Center Task Force recommended that the City commission a Cultural Landscape Report for the Civic Center. Why did the City not follow this recommendation? Instead the City commissioned a plan from the Olin landscape firm that has come up with yet another arbitrary setback line of 45 ft from the eastern edge of the existing sidewalk. This translates into an encroachment into the open space park grounds of 62 ft.

Using the developer's terminology of "setback" masks the important fact that over half of the open space will be lost, open space described in the National Register nomination (1980) as follows:

"To the east of the YMCA and YWCA are small park areas, attractively landscaped with paths, lawns, shrubs, flowers, and California redwood trees. These unbuilt areas allow the facades of the Post Office to the south and the Gas Company building to the north to play their parts in the composition."

The writer, the eminent architectural historian Alson Clark, emphasized these richly landscaped green areas as appropriate settings for the surrounding buildings and as playing a key role in the overall design of the Civic Center. They have been doing so for almost a century, reinforcing their significance as key components of the Civic Center District.

At the presentation of the Olin plan to the Council this year, a councilmember mentioned the importance of the open spaces as indicated in the National Register nomination, and the consultant admitted that she would need "to do more investigation of those issues," in other words, she seemed unaware of the National Register document.

One of the biggest questions is, why is the City once again pursuing an almost identical plan to develop these last two significant parcels of open space in the Central District? Why can the City think only in redevelopment mode, when "redevelopment/urban renewal" is clearly "over." After all, what is "blighted" here? The original and stated current goal of the project is to preserve and establish a new use for the historic Julia Morgan YWCA building. Has the City explored any possibilities other than monetizing this precious open space to fund the restoration and reuse of the Julia Morgan building? Has the City fully comprehended the impact on the Civic Center of introducing commercial uses at the historic center of the district? What happens if these projects fail, as has happened so often with the other example of redevelopment in the Civic Center, the Plaza Pasadena/Paseo project. Will the City "revitalize" the project by selling the air rights, allowing even taller buildings, as with the Paseo? Or maybe demolish significant portions to build something even more intrusive (see Paseo again)?

Pasadena prides itself on its historic preservation program. It has been designated by the State of California as a Certified Local Government, giving it the independence to run its historic preservation program with little State oversight. What has this brought us? The Holly Street Apartments redevelopment project, which buried the Hall of Justice, a contributor to the Civic Center National Register District, ostensibly preserving it but hiding it from public access and public view. The City's historic preservation planner didn't even know of its existence until it was brought to his attention. The acquiescence to Fuller Seminary's wish to get rid of the only Greene & Greene apartment building by moving it to a residential neighborhood, before Fuller obtained a building permit for the site, was a clear violation of City code. The site remains vacant, and we have lost a major contributor to Pasadena's downtown. Now the City is once again preparing to develop the property across Garfield from City Hall. Will this be a star in Pasadena's crown or another regrettable mistake?

Sincerely,



Ann Scheid

Cc: Mayor Terry Tornek
Members of the City Council
Kevin Johnson

Jomsky, Mark

From: Fred or Rosalie Niemann <niemann007@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 02, 2019 5:05 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: City Council Meeting June 3, 2019

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

Dear City Council members,

I want permanent supportive housing and public use, not private commercial development, at the city-owned YWCA.

I don't want developers to encroach on the Robinson park. This is a historic legacy.

**Sincerely,
Rosalie Niemann
737 Earlham St, Pasadena CA 91101**

CITY CLERK

19 JUN 03 08:48AM

Abundant Housing LA

June 2, 2019

To the Pasadena City Council,

Abundant Housing LA is asking the Pasadena City Council to re-write the Request for Proposals regarding the site at 78 N. Marengo Avenue to prioritize supportive and affordable housing.

Banning residential or mixed-use at this site would be severely harmful to Pasadena and the region when our housing needs are so urgent.. The lack of affordability and the number of unhoused people sleeping in the streets every night (60,000 people across Los Angeles County) are a direct result of the fact that there are simply not enough homes. Rising rents bankrupt families, forcing them out of their homes. Housing is scarce near major job centers, pushing people into their cars, creating unbearable traffic and worsening climate change.

The Request for Proposals for the site at 78 N. Marengo Avenue should, therefore, allow and prioritize housing, especially affordable low-income housing, in the redevelopment. Non-residential commercial redevelopment would be severely harmful to Pasadena and the region when our housing needs are so urgent.

78 N. Marengo Avenue is an ideal location for housing. Near walkable Old Pasadena and Memorial Park Station, it would help reduce car dependence and address traffic in the City.

For these reasons, we again ask that you e-write the Request for Proposals regarding the site at 78 N. Marengo Avenue to prioritize housing, especially affordable low-income housing.

Sincerely,

Leonora Camner
Managing Director
Abundant Housing LA

06/03/2019
Item 9

Jomsky, Mark

From: Kimberly Douglas <kdouglas50@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 02, 2019 4:04 PM
To: Wilson, Andy
Cc: Thyret, Pam; Tornek, Terry; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: YWCA development CUPs proposed by City Staff (#9 on 6/3 Council Agenda)

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

Dear Councilmember Wilson,

I have reviewed the documents for item #9 on June 3rd 2019 Council Meeting. With considerable dismay, especially since the release of the 2019 Homeless Count Report, I detect a myopic strong bias toward a hotel development. This, despite the failure of the 2016 Kimpton Hotel venture.

I bring up the Homeless Count Report because, while the overall number went down, the number of chronically homeless increased. Also, there was a high percentage of Pasadena residents, 58%, that were homeless. In addition, the report notes the increasing vulnerability of longtime senior residents, a population that will surely grow as the baby boomers age.

Shawn Morrissey, Union Station Homeless Service's director of Advocacy and Community Engagement, states that it is \$15,000-\$20,000 cheaper to help someone get housing rather than leave them on the street. Is this really a cost to Pasadena that the city is deciding to do nothing about given the opportunity of this city owned property?

The Council has the obligation to see the bigger picture and be able to see the relevance of data from one sphere and its pertinence to decisions in another. Thankfully the mayor did as much last year when he declared that the YWCA could be a rehabbed and used to address homelessness. At the Council meeting in April the charge to the Planning Staff was to develop an RFP to encourage a range of development options. Adaptive reuse was the turn of phrase. All public speakers spoke to the need for homeless housing. Even some of the Council brought up this crying need.

Yet, tomorrow's agenda item appears to deliberately narrow possible adaptive reuses to only hotels.

The evidence is:

1. The 2016 EIR was done for a hotel, a non-residential use. Is it or is it not applicable to supportive housing? Would a supportive housing option have to conduct a separate EIR? It is not clearly stated in the staff report how this provision will help certain kinds of projects and restrict other possible ideas.

2. Setbacks etc. CUPs are all based on the Kimpton Hotel application. Therefore the extension of these CUPs position the hotel developers for a leg up over other 'reuses.'

3. And what about the 23 trees? The staff report seems to exclude the CUP (#10 in 2016) to remove them from extension. However, given the setback allowances wouldn't applicants have an argument to gain a new CUP to do exactly that. And the trees will be gone along with the concept of an environmentally pleasing Civic Center. This is not explained in the staff report.

4. In addition there is the timeline. The finalized RFP is to be issued on June 4th. Clearly, this extension request by city staff on June 3rd is intended to be added to the RFP the next day. The RFP response deadline is set for July 14th, 44 days after issuance. This is incredibly short time period, especially since all (city staff, city council etc.) know that putting together a supportive housing project using a mix of state, federal, private and non-profit funding is extremely complex and takes time. This short timeframe looks like an explicit effort to compromise non-profits efforts to workup a possible housing project for the homeless.

The community sees an opportunity to address homelessness on this city owned property. The Centennial House across the street is successful in that location. The City has an urgent need for more support housing. The council needs to ensure that such opportunities can be properly explored.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Douglas
315 Fillmore St.
Pasadena, CA 91106