

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 4:36 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item Item #27

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item Item #27**

<b>Name: Dr.</b>	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Address:</b>
Julianna Delgado			Pasadena, CA 91104

---

### **Comments:**

Pasadena's overlay districts—including our landmark and National Register historic districts—are exempt from the provisions of the newly-enacted Mansionization Ordinance. In exempting our historic districts, City Staff argued that adequate protections would be included in amendments to the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Yet tonight's Agenda Report is silent on that issue and the amendments discussed show no evidence of promised protections. Last year, despite the protest of the neighborhood association and concerned residents, Staff recommended and the Historic Preservation Commission narrowly-approved, the de facto demolition and replacement of a modest single-family, non-contributing home in Bungalow Heaven with a 4,000 square foot, two-story, pseudo-Craftsman 'mansion.' How will the amended Historic Preservation Ordinance protect our historic districts from this sort of mansionization? What provisions are proposed to prevent the out-of-scale, inappropriate redevelopment of non-contributing structures in historic districts from reoccurring?

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

**User IP Address:** [REDACTED]

---

**Entry Submitted:** December 14, 2020 at 4:36 am

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 12:42 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27**

**Name:** Paul Yamashita    **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91104

---

### **Comments:**

I respectfully ask that the council consider eliminating the criterion for amending existing conservation plans that requires that all amendments be in absolute agreement with the HPO. It seems to me that making local decisions is the best way to ensure alignment with the city's intent, as opposed to a one size fits all mandate. Thank you.

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

---

**User IP Address:** [REDACTED]

---

**Entry Submitted:** December 14, 2020 at 12:42 pm

12/14/2020  
Item 27

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 1:49 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27. Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments

## Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27. Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments

**Name:** Nina Chomsky      **Email:**      **Phone:**      **Address:**  
Pasadena, CA 91103

---

### Comments:

I write personally to support the Staff Recommendation, particularly proposed amendments 1. and 2. These amendments address major issues with undesignated eligible properties, specifically strengthening review procedures to allow disapproval of demolition or major alterations and strengthening evaluation procedures for potential historic significance.

I note one ongoing issue for amendment 2.: inclusion of public notification of the historic status evaluation and instructions to the public on the appeal procedure.

I also support the strengthening of the definition of “Major Project” as discussed and explained in Pasadena Heritage’s letter.


The Staff Report includes an important statement on page 5: “. . . the City does not have a comprehensive survey of historic resources”. These proposed amendments strengthen the ability to identify and protect historic resources, particularly eligible undesignated properties. But, without such a survey which would establish a comprehensive, reliable database, identification and protection will continue to rely on staff procedures and the diligence and observations of the public. While these amendments will reduce destruction and loss of eligible resources that are continuing,

full protection will not be possible until the City has such a database. The Council should commit to authorizing and funding such a survey, including obtaining available grants.

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

---

**User IP Address:** 

---

**Entry Submitted:** December 14, 2020 at 1:49 pm

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 2:51 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27

## Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27

**Name:** John Ripley      **Email:**      **Address:**      , Pasadena,  
California 91104

---

### Comments:

(please read aloud)

I would like to express my general support of the proposed amendments to the HPO, with a small but important exception. I urge the Council to eliminate the second criterion for amendments to a Landmark District Conservation Plan, as shown on Staff Report page 10.

The second criterion would leave no path for tailoring of a Conservation Plan to the specific conditions and needs of a district. By forcing absolute conformity to the HPO, the criterion will block any experimentation that could lead to improved ways of doing things, thus cutting off a potential source of growth and innovation. The opportunities for tailoring and innovation will be valuable to our city.

While staff may argue that some non-uniformity makes their jobs a bit harder, the benefits of allowing some flexibility outweigh the staff concerns, in my analysis. The remaining three criteria will be more than sufficient to assure that any Conservation Plan amendments are acceptable.

Thank you for considering this issue.

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

12/14/2020  
Item 27

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 2:54 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27. PUBLIC HEARING: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27. PUBLIC HEARING: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**

**Name:** Tina Miller      **Email:**      **Phone:**      **Address:**  
Pasadena, CA 91104-3017

---

### **Comments:**

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

As a member of the Historic Preservation Commission and resident of Bungalow Heaven Landmark District, I am thankful that the HPO has been reviewed by the City Staff and Commissions and that much needed recommendations are being presented to you today. However, I would like to encourage you to look at two items.

First is regarding a stronger definition of a Major Project [Item G] to read: Substantial removal or replacement (between 25% to 50%) of exterior cladding on a primary or street-facing elevation. The 25% to 50% would replace the recommendation of "generally more than 50%" which is too vague.

Secondly, I suggest that the three existing Landmark Districts be allowed to amend their Conversation Plan to be more protective and suite the individual character of their district. This suggests a change to Staff's recommendations listed under "Criteria For Amending Conversation

Plans ( 17.62.070 H.1 )". I feel that providing the Landmark Districts the freedom to alter their individual Conversation Plan would encourage forward thinking and preservation growth.

Thank you for your consideration and to City Staff for their diligent work to make the HPO a model for historic preservation.

Tina Miller

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

---

**User IP Address:** [REDACTED]

---

**Entry Submitted:** December 14, 2020 at 2:53 pm

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 4:28 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27**

**Name:** Mic Hansen    **Email:**    **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91105

---

### **Comments:**

Honorable Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Thank you to the Planning Staff for some significant improvement to the ordinance, though I agree with Pasadena Heritage that their more stringent definition for major projects needs to be put into place.

How will permits be reviewed, tracked, and their stated outcomes thoroughly and uniformly ENFORCED?

We have seen some remodels being given multiple permits over weeks, months, or even sometimes years--resulting in the nearly total destruction of a resource. What measures are being put into place to prevent this "destruction by serial permit" that we continue to observe in some historic or established neighborhoods.

Additionally, landmark areas can also benefit from the newly enacted mansionization provisions, and not be excluded. Non-contributing structures in designated districts may be potentially be subject to this practice; compromising the whole of the district.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

---

**Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes**

12/14/2020  
Item 27



**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 6:35 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item #27 Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item #27 Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments**

**Name:** Carol A Polanskey      **Email:**      **Phone:**      **Address:**      -----  
Ave., Pasadena, CA 91104

---

### **Comments:**

I am writing to endorse the request of the Bungalow Heaven neighborhood association to strike the bullet from the HPO update requiring amendments to Landmark District Conservation Plans to always be consistent with the HPO. The three other criteria listed in the staff report would serve to sufficiently constrain any proposed amendments. The reason older Conservation Plans have not evolved and are considered outdated by Staff is because we have been prohibited by the onerous logistics of the previous requirement to canvas all properties in the neighborhood. Now that the amendment process has been changed, this new requirement will again create an undue burden on neighborhoods from modernizing their Conservation Plans.

I also endorse the recommendation by Julianna Delgado to add provisions to the HPO to protect landmark districts from mansionization of non-contributing homes. The demolition of a home on Catalina Ave in Bungalow Heaven that she mentions, deemed to be non-contributing simply because of an altered front facade, is a perfect example of how historic neighborhoods are left unprotected by the current ordinances.

Finally, I support the change request by Pasadena Heritage with respect to removal or replacement of exterior cladding.

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2020 5:47 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27

## **Public Comment for Meeting on December 14, 2020 about Agenda Item 27**

<b>Name:</b> Rebecca & Brian Taft	<b>Email:</b> --	<b>Phone:</b> --	<b>Address:</b> Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91104
--------------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--

---

### **Comments:**

We oppose the proposed changes to the preservation ordinance which would allow the Bungalow Heaven Neighborhood Association (and other similar groups) to revise the conservation plan to their liking, including much more restrictive regulations for non-contributors, inconsistent with universally accepted best practices. While we recognize the importance of preserving the historical nature of Pasadena's neighborhoods, to allow the changes proposed for non-contributing properties would force such homeowners to abide by aesthetic feelings of voluntary neighborhood organizations without regard for the needs of the individual families/homeowners. Our home, offered by BHNA in their statement, is such a non-contributing house. It was remodeled by previous owners to the point that there were no real vestiges of the original craftsman design. BHNA opposed our project and is using it as an example of mansionization. We would note the pictures used of our house are taken from two different vantage points. Additionally, their claimed SQFT doesn't reflect the project and includes the SQFT of our detached garage. The proposed change would essentially force non-contributing homes to become contributing in order to have any remodeling plans approved. The City should follow universally accepted best practices with regard to non-contributing homes in historic districts.