ATTACHMENT J CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FOR THE OCTOBER 30, 2019 BZA HEARING



Newmeyer & Dillion LLP 895 Dove Street Fifth Floor Newport Beach, CA 92660 949 854 7000

October 29, 2019

Michael W. Shonafelt Michael.Shonafelt@ndlf.com

VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Luis Rocha
Board of Zoning Appeals
City of Pasadena
175 N. Garfield Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91101
lrocha@cityofpasadena.net

Re: Revocation of Conditional Use Permit #5530

Dear Mr. Rocha,

This office represents Pasadena Lots-70, LLC ("Applicant") regarding the above-referenced conditional use permit (#5535; PLN 2010-00384) ("CUP"). This letter presents our legal grounds for the appeal of the Hearing Officer's July 17, 2019, revocation of the CUP. This matter is set as item 2.A. on the October 30, 2019, agenda.

1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR APPEAL.

The City of Pasadena ("City") approved the CUP on March 6, 2013. Since that time the Applicant has been availing itself of the rights granted by that entitlement, namely, allowing private group events at the former Ambassador College Campus. Its use of the CUP right has matured into a constitutionally protected, vested right. (See, e.g., *Goat Hill Tavern v. City of Costa Mesa* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1519, 1525-1526 [8 Cal.Rptr.2d 385]; see also *Tex-Cal Land Management v. Agric. Labor Relations Bd.* (1979) 24 Cal.3d 335, 343-344 [156 Cal.Rptr. 1].)

The Hearing Officer's July 17, 2019, revocation rests on only one of the six possible grounds for revoking a vested CUP right: the "changed circumstances" ground. (PMC, § 17.78.090(a).) That finding cannot properly be made, because the foreseeability of purportedly "changed" conditions was a matter of record at the time the City granted the CUP. Nor do any of the changed circumstances conflict with the terms of the CUP or the Applicant's ability to comply with the CUP conditions of approval. Specifically:

(a) The CUP Entitles the Applicant to Continue Its Events at Fowler Garden, Regardless of the Elimination of the Other Venues: The Hearing Officer's main basis for terminating the CUP is that three of the four original locations for events allowed by the CUP (Merritt Mansion, Terrace Villa, and Italian Garden) are no longer available for event use, thereby concentrating the uses into the Fowler Garden. This argument reads restrictions into the CUP that are not there. Nothing in the original CUP prohibited the allotment of events from occurring on only one site. If the City were concerned about concentrating event and guest maximums on one site, it could have fashioned an appropriate condition of approval prohibiting

that manner of use or placing venue-specific caps; it did not do so. This ground is insufficient to support a termination of the Applicant's vested CUP rights.

- (b) The Hearing Officer's Compatible Use Argument Is not Supported by the Record: The Hearing Officer concluded that allowance of event uses is inconsistent with new residential uses on the western boundary of the Fowler Garden. The City approved that residential project on April 12, 2007, some six years before it approved the CUP. The findings to approve the CUP required the City to determine compatibility, not just with existing uses, but also known *future* uses. (See, e.g. PMC, § 17.61.050.H.6.) When the City approved the CUP it was fully aware of the residential uses that would be located adjacent to the Fowler Garden. It cannot therefore invoke this ground as a basis for revoking the CUP right.
- (c) The Hearing Officer's Assertion about Use of On-Site and Off-Site Facilities Is Devoid of Legal Support: The third ground for the Hearing Officer's revocation was based on a finding that the lack of kitchen and/or restroom amenities from adjacent facilities qualifies as grounds to revoke the CUP. In fact, the CUP contains no restrictions on how the Applicant may avail itself of amenities for its events. There is no restriction on the use of ported kitchen or bathroom amenities, nor does the CUP prohibit use of such amenities on alternative adjacent facilities. The City is prohibited from revoking the CUP on the basis of uses and activities that the CUP allows. Nor does the Hearing Officer's references to changes in the Applicant's use of parking amenities sufficient to revoke the CUP. If the Applicant seeks to avail itself of only one of many alternative parking resources, it is free to do so without facing the penalty of a revocation of its CUP right, as long as it remains in compliance with the CUP conditions.
- (d) The Hearing Officer's Reference to Purported Failures to Provide Monthly Reports Is Improper in this Proceeding: As noted in the Applicant's July 16, 2019, letter to the Hearing Officer, the Applicant has been in strict compliance with the conditions of approval for the CUP since its issuance. Staff's passing attempt to undermine this showing by invoking a purported failure to comply with a condition of approval requiring monthly reporting to the Zoning Administrator is not proper. (See Board Staff Report at p. 7.) The proper procedure for enforcing a failure to comply with a condition of approval for a CUP is an enforcement action under section 17.78.090(c). This is a revocation action, proceeding on only one criterion for revocation -- section 17.78.090(a) for purportedly "changed" circumstances.

2. DISCUSSION.

In determining whether to revoke a CUP right, the City is bound, not only by the provisions of the City of Pasadena Municipal Code ("PMC"), but also state law. As the staff report notes, PMC section 17.78.090 governs the revocation of CUPs. That ordinance sets forth limited criteria for revocation of CUPs. The Hearing Officer invoked only one of those criteria, which allows the City to revoke a CUP if

[c]ircumstances under which the permit or entitlement was granted have been changed by the applicant to a degree that one or more of the findings contained in the original permit or entitlement can no longer be made in a positive manner and the public health, safety, and welfare require the revocation.

(PMC, § 17.78.090(a).) As demonstrated in this letter, the City cannot properly invoke section 17.78.090(a) and must allow the Applicant to continue to avail itself of the rights of the CUP.

Administrative decisions -- such as this -- must rest on findings supported by substantial evidence. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1094.5.) As the courts repeatedly have concluded, substantial evidence "means more than a mere scintilla; it means 'such relevant evidence as a reasonable man might accept as adequate to support a conclusion" The term "substantial evidence "cannot be deemed synonymous with 'any' evidence. It must be reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value; it must actually be 'substantial' proof of the essentials which the law requires in a particular case." (*Nakasone v. Randall* (1982) 129 Cal.App.3d 757, 762 [181 Cal.Rptr. 324] quoting *United Professional Planning, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1970) 9 Cal.App.3d 377, 392-393 [88 Cal.Rptr. 551].) To support a denial, the agency "must set forth findings to bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and ultimate decision or order." (*Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 506, 515 [113 Cal.Rptr. 836].)

Importantly, the standard of review for terminating CUP rights is a heightened one because it deals with vested rights. In such cases, *no deference is to be paid to the public agency's findings*. (*Nightlife Partners, Ltd. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2003) 108 Cal.App.4th 81, 89 [133 Cal.Rptr.2d 234].) As one court observed:

If [an administrative] decision does not substantially affect a fundamental vested right, the trial court considers only whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record." [Citation.] If, however, "an administrative decision substantially affects a fundamental vested right, the trial court must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence and find an abuse of discretion if the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence. [Citation.]

(Goat Hill Tavem v. City of Costa Mesa, supra, 6 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1525-1526; see also Tex-Cal Land Management v. Agric. Labor Relations Bd., supra, 24 Cal.3d at pp. 343-344.)

In this case, the Hearing Officer's decision to revoke the CUP under PMC section 17.78.090(a) is devoid of substantial evidence and cannot withstand the heightened scrutiny applicable to administrative decisions to terminate constitutionally vested CUP rights. The Hearing Officer's decision rests on three substantive grounds. Each ground is devoid of legal support, as demonstrated below.

A. The CUP Entitles the Applicant to Continue Its Events at Fowler Garden, Regardless of the Elimination of the Other Venues:

The Hearing Officer's primary contention for termination of the CUP is that three of the four original locations for events allowed by the CUP (Merritt Mansion, Terrace Villa, and Italian Garden) are no longer available for event use, leaving only the Fowler Garden open for the events contemplated by the CUP. The Hearing Officer asserts that the CUP's originally findings -- which supported up to 32 events a year, with a maximum of 300 guests on four locations -- are no longer tenable for only one event location.

The Hearing Officer's finding reads restrictions into the CUP that are not there. Nothing in the original CUP prohibited the maximum allotment of events from occurring on only one site. Nor did the City impose venue-specific caps on the number of maximum attendees. The Applicant always was -- and still is -- entitled by the CUP to hold its events wherever it deems appropriate as long as its use is consistent with its grant under the CUP. If the City were concerned about concentrating event and guest maximums on one site, it could have fashioned

an appropriate condition of approval prohibiting that manner of use or otherwise imposing venue-specific caps; it did not do so. Use of Fowler Garden as the situs of the CUP's annual allotment of events is not precluded by the CUP, and the City has no legal basis to read that prohibition into the CUP or to purport to base a termination of the CUP rights on that ground.

If concentration of the uses granted by the CUP remains a major concern for the City, other measures exist -- short of revoking the Applicant's constitutionally protected CUP rights -- that can adequately address that concern. Specifically, an amendment can be crafted to reduce the maximum events and/or attendee caps at the Fowler Garden. The Applicant is willing to work with staff to determine a mutually acceptable maximum event/quest cap.

B. The Hearing Officer's Compatible Use Ground Is Unsupported by Substantial Evidence.

The Hearing Officer's decision also rested on a finding that allowance of event uses is inconsistent with new residential uses on the western boundary of the Fowler Garden. On that basis, the Hearing Officers concluded that findings three, four and six no longer can be made. The "adjacent" residential uses to which the Hearing Officer refers are part of the City Ventures Grove project. Notably, the City approved that project on April 12, 2007, some six years before it approved the CUP.

The findings to approve the CUP required the City to determine compatibility, not just with existing uses, but also known *future* uses. (See, e.g. PMC, § 17.61.050.H.6.) When the City approved the CUP it was fully aware of the residential uses that would located adjacent to the Fowler Garden, and it made an express finding that

[t]he hours of operation, noise level, maximum number of attendees permitted, and parking have been conditioned to be compatible with the surrounding existing **and proposed** residential uses.

(See CUP Staff Report, Findings (Mar. 6, 2013), at p. 13, emphasis added.) Indeed, the CUP uses were disclosed to the purchasers of the residential units that ostensibly now oppose the CUP. The Second Amendment to the Ambassador West Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (Oct. 31, 2013) ("CC&Rs") amends section 2.4 of the original Master HOA CC&Rs to expressly prohibit the HOA from "limiting or abridging" the commercial uses allowed by the CUP for the Fowler Garden. (CC&Rs, § 8, p. 4.) That provision goes on to state that the HOA shall not "interfere with or challenge, whether by legal challenge or otherwise the operation and/or use by the respective owner of the Merritt Mansion, Terrance Villa or Fowler Garden" (*Ibid.*) \

The revocation findings also generally reference "148 multi-family residences that have been constructed on the Ambassador College Campus, in and around areas originally approved for events." (Board of Zoning Appeals Staff Report (Oct. 30, 2019) ("Board Staff Report"), p 6.) Aside from conceding that "a majority of these uses were contemplated when the CUP was approved," this finding also overlooks that the General Plan policy the Hearing Officer invokes addresses only "adjoining" incompatible uses. (See Board Staff Report, at p. 9, finding 3 [invoking Policy 25.7 of the Land Use Element of the City of Pasadena General Plan.) As noted above, the "adjoining" residential uses were approved well before the CUP was issued, and the City knew all about those adjoining uses at that time. That is why it crafted conditions of approval designed to mitigate potential impacts to those residential uses. (See, e.g., Board

Staff Report, Attachment E (Staff Report for Approval of CUP #5535] Conditions of Approval.) The City cannot now invoke impacts to residential uses as a ground for revoking the CUP.

C. The Hearing Officer's Conclusions about Use of On-Site and Off-Site Facilities Is Devoid of Legal Support.

The third substantive ground cited by the Hearing Officer for the termination of the CUP is that use of kitchen and/or restroom amenities brought on-site or from adjacent facilities qualifies as grounds to revoke the CUP. In fact, the CUP contains no restrictions on use of on-site kitchen or bathroom amenities, nor does it prohibit use of such amenities on adjacent facilities. Nor does the reference to the change in the Applicant's use of parking amenities support a finding of denial. The Applicant is entitled to draw from any one of its allowed parking resources to meets its parking demands, as long as the Applicant does not violate the conditions of approval and terms of the CUP. The City is prohibited from revoking the CUP on the basis of uses and activities that the CUP allows.

D. The Hearing Officer's Reference to Purported Failures to Provide Monthly Reports to the Zoning Administrator Is Misplaced in this Proceeding.

As noted in the Applicant's July 16, 2019, letter to the Hearing Officer, the Applicant has been in strict compliance with the conditions of approval for the CUP since its issuance. The staff's passing attempt to undermine this showing by invoking a purported failure to comply with a condition of approval requiring monthly reporting to the Zoning Administrator is not proper. (See Board Staff Report at p. 7.) The proper procedure for enforcing a failure to comply with a condition of approval for a CUP is an enforcement action under section 17.78.090(c). This is a revocation action, proceeding on only one criterion for revocation -- section 17.78.090(a) for purportedly "changed" circumstances.

3. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, among others, the Hearing Officer's decision to revoke the CUP is unsupported by law and/or evidence. Nor can the City meet the stringent standard for revocation of a vested CUP right. In fact, upholding the Hearing Officer's decision to revoke the CUP under the grounds presented in that decision could give rise to a viable action for regulatory taking. We respectfully request that the Board of Zoning Appeals overturn the Hearing Officer's decision to revoke the CUP.

Representatives of the Applicant will be on hand at the October 30, 2019, hearing to answer any questions.

Very truly yours,

Michael W. Shonafelt

MSUL

MWS

cc: David Reyes, Director, City of Pasadena Department of Planning and Community
Development (davidreyes@cityofpasadena.net)
Michele Beal Bagneris, Esq., City Attorney (mbagneris@ci.pasadena.ca.us)

Joe Oftelie, Vice President of Development, City Ventures, LLC. (joe@cityventures.com)

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Λ ,
0	Vincent A. Cou	elli 102 S. Orange Grove Blue #103	Pasaderia,
			. , ,
	,		
		,	
A			

WS group

Signature	Printed Name	Address	
	~	Address	
Cumbell	RICHARD		
10 1	MANIA	100 So ORANJE Grove Blue	1 #104
("index Deeplas	Cindy Duplass	102 11 11 11 11 11	#202
Javy Duplan	Larry Dyplass	102 11 11 11 11	7205
	, ,,		
promoder	manymada	100 S.O. Chart #104	
	/	0 /	
Sorothy Cloudwitz	DOROTHYLOUGHERTY	102 So. ORANGE GROVE # 107	
Josh Tolled	Exed Clouchents	1025 Danie Grove Blyd #107	
		102 5. CHANGE BRIVE 106	
560	Sterk News 120	102 S. army 6002 \$ 106	
		<i>b</i>	

		•	
Signature	Printed Name	Address	
Paul Mahen	PAUL MAHER	112 S. ORANGE GROVE, #308 Pasadem, CA	91105
	,		

Signature / Printed Name Address Michael Michael Welf 100 5. Ovange br. #303, Panadua, (A9 1105) Kim Vin 189, S. Orange Bone Ht 108 PA3 91105				
Michael Welf 100 S. Ovanse by #303, land dea (A) 1105 Kim Vin 1013, S. Ovanse by #303, land dea (A) 1105 Peter Poten Peterson 117 S. Ovange Done St 108 PA3 9/105	Signature /			
Kim VII 19 S. Deane Some # 309 Passace A The Peter Passace II 2 S. Deange Some # 108 Pass 9/105	Michael Migh	Michael Wolf	100 S. Ovange br. #303, Paradua, (A9 110	0.5
The Potent River 117 S. Drange Some St. 108 PA3 9/105	- The file	Kim Vin	112 S. 022NGE (2000) # 309 POSOGO	Л
	Tell John	POTON RATION	117 S Oremo Some It 108 PAS 9114	0
		6	4 3 (4)	

Signature /	Printed Name	Address
U	EMILLY Comper	168 Sovarac from 4712
ADU	KMAIN COOPY	11
Jun august	Joan Augus	Tiny 1725. Drange Grove # 221
Droy		in 180 S. Grange Grove Blud #24/
Dane Rybra	LynneThomas	
Sh.	Sara Ghayouri	1685. orange conc Blod. #212
Bries Den	Brian Goden	168 S Overno Grove Apr #212
Cos	Costic Color	169 5. orange now blue #201
	TAGGAR USI	180 50 O Plans Geore Tor
1500	TOOG GLEN	
Cillaco	C Drv.d Cole,	164 S ORANOU GLOVE PLID #17
Kalanmell	Kerin Cantuell	1645. Orange Grove Blvd. # 102 Pas 9110
J. MAZ440	Kirstin metatchio	1725. Gange Grove Blud #222 9/105
MA	JosH CHEVRI	116 S olayer Grove blid # 132 \$1105
N/KAKM W	Be Have Crarks	11
Number 11 hor.	THUMIS MANA	180 SOFANCE GRAVE BLYD
in the man	KITHEENMANN	1, 8 4 ,
MOOK!	dennify Took	164 S Orange Grove #164
6746-	Don Hickory	122 8 Orange \$122

Ja Mon Ga George partes Monice George poules 160 5.01 any Grave #111

We the undersigned support revocation of CUP #5535, which allows commercial and group events at various locations throughout the Ambassador College campus area. We live adjacent and in very close proximity to these locations, including in particular Fowler Gardens. When events were and are held, we experienced severe noise, litter, foot traffic, vehicle traffic and parking problems, amongst other unpleasant disturbances. The situation also has changed dramatically since the CUP was originally granted. These locations no longer have ready access to restrooms, kitchen facilities, or parking. Moreover, there are now, or soon will be, approximately 250 or more new residents living around the campus who would be directly impacted by any future group events, including all the problems experienced previously, but exacerbated by the absence of facilities previously available. We appreciate the City of Pasadena for recognizing these dramatic changes and therefore recommending the revocation of the CUP.

Signature Printed Name Address

July Morole July Morole JAS S. Orange Grove 1 102

July BASS JEE 24 5- ORANGE GROVE # ZOZ

Signature	Printed Name	Address	
tane BMack_	Jane Macking	n 110 S. Orang Grove Blyd \$107 Pa shipe 1/2 Science Come Blyd \$15 ove # 310 Pub. 91105	15
Mudy Make	Mary Linda Hand	stable 1/2 Scrave Com Bled 200	12
Mary Mudnotsky	1125. Orange G	EVE # 310 Pag. 91105	
	and the second of the second s		
and the state of t			
	and the second of the second o		
e na manimum - stagnig chine philosophica de parabacty parta i stephica dia massimum di manimum di m		The state of the s	
the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the second section is a second section of the second section of the second section is a second section of the sec			
a mangang na mangang na mga mga mga mga mga na			
the first the first the first the first term of the second second second second second second second second se	Balantin and the state of the s		
	The second of a single of the second of the		
	Politica etanologiamento a gui que que que a ser esta esta esta esta esta esta esta esta	The second secon	
	The state of the s		
A STATE OF THE STA			
	and the second s		

Signature.	Printed Name	Address	
JAK J		ET 196 5. ONA162 CACVE # 303	7
DAT WILL	FIEWELKE	700 S. OPIRGE (02 st 30)	
The Wille	WARLER KLEM	ETT 186 5 CKANGE GLAN HIR	3
Jan de la	1017	200 South Decorate Grandens Formation	a-
George Line Conf.	KANCY VAN 1046	192 S. Orango GROVE TENS 4302 91105	5
Milana		162 W. Del of or Band and 20/ 9/105	
8-D	ı	1/2 SCHANGE GROVE FLOW \$310 , PRISHOCATE, OIL	
	Tom Peitzman	2005. Orange Comme A (w/ \$107 Parade)	2011-5
J	Christa Patema	2005. Orange Grove Blod. # 107 Paraday 0	~ 4115
make a share in the second and the s			
The state of the s			
The state of the s			
V/4			

We the undersigned support revocation of CUP #5535, which allows commercial and group events at various locations throughout the Ambassador College campus area. We live adjacent and in very close proximity to these locations, including in particular Fowler Gardens. When events were and are held, we experienced severe noise, litter, foot traffic, vehicle traffic and parking problems, amongst other unpleasant disturbances. The situation also has changed dramatically since the CUP was originally granted. These locations no longer have ready access to restrooms, kitchen facilities, or parking. Moreover, there are now, or soon will be, approximately 250 or more new residents living around the eampus who would be directly impacted by any future group events, including all the problems experienced previously, but exacerbated by the absence of facilities previously available. We appreciate the City of Pasadena for recognizing these dramatic changes and therefore recommending the revocation of the CUP.

Signature Printed Name Address

Aaron W. Young

Helen L. Young

196 S Orange Crove Blvd, #304, Pasadena, CA 91105

We the undersigned support revocation of CUP #5535, which allows commercial and group events at various locations throughout the Ambassador College campus area. We live adjacent and in very close proximity to these locations, including in particular Fowler Gardens. When events were and are held, we experienced severe noise, litter, foot traffic, vehicle traffic and parking problems, amongst other unpleasant disturbances. The situation also has changed dramatically since the CUP was originally granted. These locations no longer have ready access to restrooms, kitchen facilities, or parking. Moreover, there are now, or soon will be, approximately 250 or more new residents living around the campus who would be directly impacted by any future group events, including all the problems experienced previously, but exacerbated by the absence of facilities previously available. We appreciate the City of Pasadena for recognizing these dramatic changes and therefore recommending the revocation of the CUP.

Signature Printed Name Address

Don Me Intyre Grove 196 S. Orange Grove #103 Pasadana 9,1105 Naney Mc In-14th Grow 1968. Orange Grow 7003 Posadena 91105

Signature	Printed Name	Address
and felt Warmell	DAVID SELTT WARAG	4 196 5 00 mg Cost # 207 Readon
		·
	en de companyo de discover di transporte de la discover de la disc	
10 P	* *************************************	
The State of the S	TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACT AND	
The second secon		то по в под

Signature .	Printed Name	Address
	+ 5 50 640	192 5.000 AMIN 103008 - 293"
Carpelin	C Duplass	102 S. Crange Evove #1.305
	S. PESTMAN	363 w Ed. O phan Blank +101
	WA WEFFE	363 0 Well 1280 34 \$100
	- Norther	367 Sur My whi Itles
	1200 ch 1/2 civi	1005 Orang Grow 10R
Marine Koller	But Follow	100 S Crange Grow-Bl 201
July Man	JOHN KLESBA	367 W. Da MA BUD 108
Morientec.	MUGRANTH	the 1925 OCANGE GROVE # 20
The state of the s	Moura Micarday	1105 Crame Clare Hold #103
A STATE OF THE STA		1965, OKANGELENOUT #104 PAGGLUM
of the	Andrew Yoka	196 S. Orange Grave #104 Paradon
	tendi Lim	176 S. drangl give #105 Pasadher
or and the second secon		
and the second section of the section of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of th	The second secon	
and the state of t		and the profession and the second an
man par did ni Namara in 18 Mary a nga 19 mga Namagana na na nama kamanana na manana na manana na manana na ma		and the state of t

Signature	Printed Name	Address	
27 7 3 7 Bilan	Jon Torner	Der a Orang being Blos Unit 2061	exchia 91105
ADments.	F -	n 1925 ORANGE EARL # 202	I .
1 1 co 46 1		on 1925. Crange Grove Ho	
michaly	FIFERELLIE	Bos COO XDUE Courusof PC	nulum
From Beneficen	Mearling	Lee In Come Color 1800 Papara	41105
Halatet 14	Vira Salmala	1786 5 Same Ca 500 1/23	1 to 1 to 2
	The way of the state of		
があるかんでき	Berthe Mantes	-2003 Olange Grow #106 Pos sty	175
andia Brown	Gecelibrace	2005. Oringe Grave # 207 1	9105
White Kith	Michael GRACE	200 S. Orneys Come Ried # 207 Freder	CA Glices
74-6-4)	DEREY SAM	200 S Gargeone Bina B3. L FARA	641 9100 C
AND SMI ()	LISTI SMITH	200 S Chane bave But 4BOU PREMA	m (a 91105
I continued as	DESE Sunder	367 6 Del Mas 4106 165 91105	
-CNZ.	JAH POTTARE	363 4. Not May Rhot & 10 1 Partitle + 1	
	and the state of t		

Signature	Printed Name	Address
	ONJelaus Ciano Joseph Heno	232 S. Orange Covere Blud, # 101 232 S. Orange Grove. Bl. + 101
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Annua .		
e e e e estadorio de cabal de caballación e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	3	

Signature	N/4	Printed Name	Address	000	CONO	C'Anus H	
Jacqua 1	116	HICK TILGINATI	(pend	476	JUKG	G RUUC A	1/2
an W	Youll.	(Aran 18/6 2016	sel 2:	32	S. ()2C	GROUS A	71
	1			consideration and more	anne Salaman (composition considerate e considerate e	of the character control of the character of the characte	1
	7		Theory and a some graph was provided the same page.	egrani a tenggap tan	Typege on a Tay to the special		
				······································			A CONTRACTOR
and delice for the Control of the Control of							
· man vid fan ver ter dersteldelse feldelsteldersteldenge vertreelt verbl				The state of the s		and the control of the state of	
Marketine of the second of the		The state of the s	engewood in hiji of mga maga tagay yan in tagabaya ya kuniya	There exists a second of	et an arror o pordinor visitor de la lace de la	- Harris of the Martin Control of the Control of th	
	•		TO THE STATE COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF THE ST	of Manager of Traffic person and common of	en e en	The second control of	
nere was the second of the sec	en Commentation and a second					manifector con a filtration of the contract of	
			a transport Maria to proportion to be a const		, a t a other district transactive control a		
Managarhania ayanda ayan ayan ayan ayan ayan ayan a			in the state of th	•.,	to the section of the plantages of the legal of		
				## 1 T	. Park a depart of the page from a segment stay on great stay on		
		***** ***	The state of the s				

Signature	Printed Name	Address
Madell.	16768	237 5. ORDICE CALL
	GASTAGAL	UNIT 263
and a state of the		13313 DELIA CA 91105
Da-1741-11		
Patrick Mittle	MASSINICA	212 & CANVOR CANA
and the second s	11111111-5	0141 200
	The state of the s	1105110610 CAGUES
Serve de Contrago	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	
Teen_	Dhostynu	232 5.01arye Grave Bl.#105 Pasadeny CA 9105
and the second section of the s	Puocel	Pasademy CA 9105
and the section of		
Pair 1844-sensor à sansacreace au s		
and the state of t		The Market of a superior of the superior of th
en del Alexandro de la Caracteria de la		
and the second		
	The state of the s	



MICHAEL W. SHONAFELT Michael Shonafelt@ndlf.com

File No.: 2470.105

July 16, 2019

VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Hearing Officer c/o Carrie Banks City of Pasadena 175 N. Garfield Ave. Pasadena, CA 91101 cbanks@cityofpasadena.net

Re: Revocation of Conditional Use Permit #5530

Dear Ms. Banks,

This office represents Pasadena Lots-70, LLC ("PL-70") regarding the above-referenced conditional use permit (#5535; PLN 2010-00384) ("CUP"). Revocation of the CUP is set for a hearing before the Hearing Officer on July 17, 2019, and is item D on the agenda.

The City of Pasadena ("City") approved the CUP on March 6, 2013. Since that time, PL-70, the CUP applicant, has been availing itself of the rights granted by that entitlement, namely, allowing private group events at various locations located at the former Ambassador College Campus. Since the date of the issuance of the CUP, PL-70 and has been in strict compliance with all CUP conditions of approval.

In determining whether to revoke a CUP right, the City is bound, not only by the provisions of the City of Pasadena Municipal Code ("PMC"), but also state law. As the staff report notes, PMC section 17.78.090 governs the revocation of CUPs. That ordinance sets forth limited criteria for revocation of CUPs. Staff invoke one of those criteria, which allows the City to revoke a CUP if

[c]ircumstances under which the permit or entitlement was granted have been changed by the applicant to a degree that one or more of the findings contained in the original permit or entitlement can no longer be made in a positive manner and the public health, safety, and welfare require the revocation.

(PMC, § 17.78.090(a).) As demonstrated in this letter, the City cannot properly invoke section 17.78.090(a) and must allow PL-70 to continue to avail itself of the rights of the CUP.

1333 N. CALIFORNIA BLVD SUITE 600 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596 T 925 986 3200 F 925 988 3290

895 DOVE STREET 5TH FLOOR NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660 T 949 854 7000 F 949 854 7099

3600 HOWARD HUGHES PKWY SUITE 700 LAS VEGAS, NV 89169 T 702 777 7500 F 702 777 7599 Administrative decisions -- such as this -- must rest on findings supported by substantial evidence. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1094.5.) As the courts repeatedly have concluded, substantial evidence "means more than a mere scintilla; it means 'such relevant evidence as a reasonable man might accept as adequate to support a conclusion" The term "substantial evidence "cannot be deemed synonymous with 'any' evidence. It must be reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value; it must actually be 'substantial' proof of the essentials which the law requires in a particular case." (Nakasone v. Randall (1982) 129 Cal.App.3d 757, 762 [181 Cal.Rptr. 324] quoting United Professional Planning, Inc. v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal.App.3d 377, 392-393 [88 Cal.Rptr. 551].) To support a denial, the agency "must set forth findings to bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and ultimate decision or order." (Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal.3d 506, 515 [113 Cal.Rptr. 836].)

Importantly, the standard of review for terminating CUP rights is a heightened one because it deals with vested rights. In such cases, no deference is to be paid to the public agency's findings. (Nightlife Partners, Ltd. v. City of Beverly Hills (2003) 108 Cal.App.4th 81, 89 [133 Cal.Rptr.2d 234].) As one court observed:

If [an administrative] decision does not substantially affect a fundamental vested right, the trial court considers only whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record." [Citation.] If, however, "an administrative decision substantially affects a fundamental vested right, the trial court must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence and find an abuse of discretion if the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence. [Citation.]

(Goat Hill Tavern v. City of Costa Mesa (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1519, 1525-1526 [8 Cal.Rptr.2d 385]; see also Tex-Cal Land Management v. Agric. Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 24 Cal.3d 335, 343-344 [156 Cal.Rptr. 1].)

In this case, staff's recommendation to revoke the CUP under PMC section 17.78.090(a) is devoid of substantial evidence and cannot withstand the heightened scrutiny applicable to administrative decisions to terminate CUP rights. Staff cite three reasons to revoke the CUP. Each reason is devoid of legal support, as demonstrated below.

(a) The CUP Entitles PL-70 to Continue Its Events at Fowler Garden, Regardless of the Elimination of the Other Venues: Staff's main contention for termination of the CUP is that three of the four original locations for events allowed by the CUP (Merritt Mansion, Terrance Villa, and Italian Garden) are no longer available for event use, leaving only the Fowler Garden open for the events contemplated by the CUP. Staff contend that the CUP's originally findings -- which supported up to 32 events a year, with a maximum of 300 guests on four locations -- are no longer tenable for only one event location. The problem with the staff's argument is that it reads restrictions into the CUP that are not there. Nothing in the original CUP

Hearing Officer July 16, 2019 Page 3

prohibited the maximum allotment of events from occurring on only one site. PL-70 always was -- and still is -- entitled by the CUP to hold its events wherever it deems appropriate as long as its use is consistent with its grant under the CUP. If the City were concerned about concentrating event and guest maximums on one site, it could have fashioned an appropriate condition of approval prohibiting that manner of use; it did not do so. Use of Fowler Garden as the situs of the CUP's annual allotment of events is not precluded by the CUP, and the City has no legal basis to read that prohibition into the CUP or to purport to base a termination of the CUP rights on that ground.

- Staff's Compatible Use Argument Is Baseless: Staff next concludes that allowance of event uses is inconsistent with new residential uses on the western boundary of the Fowler Garden. On that basis, staff conclude that findings three, four and six no longer can be made. The residential uses to which staff refers are part of the City Ventures Grove project. Notably, the City approved that project on April 12, 2007, some six years before it approved the CUP. The findings to approve the CUP required the City to determine compatibility, not just with existing uses, but also known future uses. (See, e.g. PMC, § 17.61.050.H.6.) When the City approved the CUP it was fully aware of the residential uses that would located adjacent to the Fowler Garden, and it made an express finding that "[t]he hours of operation, noise level, maximum number of attendees permitted, and parking have been conditioned to be compatible with the surrounding existing and proposed residential uses." (See CUP Staff Report, Findings (Mar. 6, 2013), at p. 13, emphasis added.) Indeed, the CUP uses were disclosed to the purchasers of the residential units. The Second Amendment to the Ambassador West Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (Oct. 31, 2013) ("CC&Rs") amends section 2.4 of the original Master HOA CC&Rs to expressly prohibit the HOA from "limiting or abridging" the commercial uses allowed by the CUP for the Fowler Garden. (CC&Rs, § 8, p. 4.) That provision goes on to state that the HOA shall not "interfere with or challenge, whether by legal challenge or otherwise the operation and/or use by the respective owner of the Merritt Mansion, Terrance Villa or Fowler Garden" (Ibid.)
- (c) Staff's Contention about Use of On-Site and Off-Site Facilities Is Devoid of Legal Support: The third ground cited by staff for recommending termination of the CUP is that use of kitchen and/or restroom amenities brought on-site or from adjacent facilities qualifies as grounds to revoke the CUP. In fact, the CUP contains no restrictions on use of on-site kitchen or bathroom amenities, nor does it prohibit use of such amenities on adjacent facilities. The City is prohibited from revoking the CUP on the basis of uses and activities that the CUP allows.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, staff's recommendation of revocation of the CUP is unsupported by law and/or evidence. Nor can the City meet the stringent standard for revocation of a vested CUP right. The City must refrain from following staff's recommendation and affirm PL-70's right to continue the uses granted by the CUP.

Hearing Officer July 16, 2019 Page 4

Representatives of PL-70 will be on hand at the July 17, 2019, hearing to answer any questions.

Very truly yours,

Michael W. Shonafelt

MWS

cc:

David Reyes, Director, City of Pasadena Department of Planning and Community Development (davidreyes@cityofpasadena.net)
Michele Beal Bagneris, Esq., City Attorney (mbagneris@ci.pasadena.ca.us)
Joe Oftelie, Vice President of Development, City Ventures, LLC.

MWS

2470.105 / 8288744.1