

**PUBLIC COMMENT  
FROM THE  
FEBRUARY 22, 2021  
CITY COUNCIL  
MEETING**

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2021 12:44 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #21

## **Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #21**

**Name:** Julianna Delgado      **Email:**      **Phone:**      **Address:** ' Avenue, Pasadena, California 91104

---

### **Comments:**

The Historic Preservation Ordinance needs further revision to protect the integrity of historic districts when reviewing alterations to non-contributing properties and new structures, and prevent them from being out of scale and character. The Certificate of Appropriateness findings, and those made by the Historic Preservation Commission as the reviewing authority for ‘major’ projects—as proposed in Sections 17.62.090.E.4.b and 17.62.090.E.6.a.--needs strengthening beyond Mansionization Ordinance standards. These should consider compatibility with adjacent contributing structures and within the same street segment and tract, in terms of design, size, height, massing, scale, and use of materials viewed from the public right-of-way. In larger historic districts, like Bungalow Heaven, homes are not typical and uniform throughout. They can vary among different street segments and tracts depending on when developed and by whom, contributing to a unique character when viewed from the street. That context needs to be protected. To increase the City’s transparency for applicants and the public, the findings should be clear and explicit. This will reduce the burden on staff to address applicants’ expectations for altering non-contributors or new construction. The definition for 'neighborhood compatibility' should also be added to the “Definitions” section and reflect these recommended revisions.

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** City Web  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2021 12:46 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #21

## **Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item Item #21**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Address:</b>
David Delgado			Avenue, Pasadena, California 91104

---

### **Comments:**

The Certificate of Appropriateness findings in the proposed provisions of the Historic Preservation Ordinance need to be revised further to be clear and explicit to protect the character and integrity of historic districts with lesser emphasis on the Mansionization Ordinance compatibility analysis. Additionally, Section 17.62.130.B., which addresses preservation incentives, also needs further amendment. As proposed, incentives are available for restoration projects involving individually-listed and contributors to historic districts. Incentives should also be extended to owners of non-contributing properties for projects intended to restore them to contributing status. In Bungalow Heaven, where I live, to implement the Neighborhood Association's mission, a Home Restoration Grant Program was established, with the intent to provide financial support for owners of non-contributing properties who work on restoring their homes. The City's historic preservation regulations should likewise encourage increasing the number of contributors by providing incentives for all restoration projects.

---

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

---

**Entry Submitted:** February 22, 2021 at 12:45 pm

**02/22/2021  
Item 21**