

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 8:39 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Protect Pasadena Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Protect Pasadena Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving the planned development project located at 465-577 Arroyo Parkway- 1) A massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, destroying all trees on the property; 2) Planting of no large trees between building lot lines to create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) Zero street setbacks which will destroy the potential integration of trees into the new development plans supporting our urban forest policy. 4) Planting of only two street trees as described in the conditions of approval. 5) On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." Does City Council agree with this statement? The City Council must further review why the EIR conditions for this project approves of only two additional street trees to suffice to match our urban forestry goals and policies for the General Plan. It is the city's and residents' interest to create an environment where strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy for the vitality and health of the neighborhood. It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ken Perry

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com



RECEIVED

2022 OCT 19 PM 4: 53

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

October 19, 2022

Mayor Victor Gordo
Pasadena City Council
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109
VIA EMAIL: mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net, city_council@cityofpasadena.net,
Miguelmarquez@cityofpasadena.net

Re: The Affinity Project – October 24 Public Hearing

Dear Mayor Gordo and City Council Members

The Board of Directors of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce is fully supportive of the Affinity Project at California Boulevard and Arroyo Parkway in Pasadena.

The project will include a medical office building and an assisted living facility along with the existing Whole Foods Market and establishments in the historic properties on site.

The Arroyo Parkway site is ideally suited for the uses proposed. Medical offices will complement the nearby Huntington Hospital and the already existing medical uses on Raymond Avenue and Fair Oaks Avenue. The assisted living facility will have easy access to the Gold Line Stations at Del Mar Boulevard and Fillmore Street. Medical offices in close proximity will also provide walkable access to necessary medical support for residents of the project.

We are all aware of the need for housing and services for our aging population.

The project will not have significant impacts on nearby streets and will provide an attractive use to the area that is currently very under-utilized. It is also compatible with the City of Pasadena's plans for the area and adheres to the General Plan.

The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce urges your support for the Affinity Project and asks that you approve the project.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Little". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Paul Little

Cc: City Council, M. Marquez

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 8:29 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Kamin

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:09 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Dr. Amy Kim

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:10 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Dr. Amy Kim

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:21 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Teri Shikasho

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:22 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: We Need Trees!

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: We Need Trees!

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. We must do everything possible to promote a stronger urban tree canopy.

Sincerely,
Teri Shikasho

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2022 11:54 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Mr. John Holmes

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 3:12 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Protect Our Urban Tree Canopy

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Protect Our Urban Tree Canopy

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving the planned development project located at 465-577 Arroyo Parkway- 1) A massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, destroying all trees on the property; 2) Planting of no large trees between building lot lines to create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) Zero street setbacks which will destroy the potential integration of trees into the new development plans supporting our urban forest policy. 4) Planting of only two street trees as described in the conditions of approval. 5) On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." Does City Council agree with this statement? The City Council must further review why the EIR conditions for this project approves of only two additional street trees to suffice to match our urban forestry goals and policies for the General Plan. It is the city's and residents' interest to create an environment where strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy for the vitality and health of the neighborhood. It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Kamin

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 1:25 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Dr. Heather and Mr Gabe Moreno

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 9:27 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Frances Morrison

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 9:28 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Protect Pasadena Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Protect Pasadena Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving the planned development project located at 465-577 Arroyo Parkway- 1) A massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, destroying all trees on the property; 2) Planting of no large trees between building lot lines to create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) Zero street setbacks which will destroy the potential integration of trees into the new development plans supporting our urban forest policy. 4) Planting of only two street trees as described in the conditions of approval. 5) On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." Does City Council agree with this statement? The City Council must further review why the EIR conditions for this project approves of only two additional street trees to suffice to match our urban forestry goals and policies for the General Plan. It is the city's and residents' interest to create an environment where strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy for the vitality and health of the neighborhood. It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments.

Sincerely,
Frances Morrison

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 7:49 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: More Trees Please

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: More Trees Please

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. Your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,
Ms. Melissa Eaves

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 7:59 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: More Trees Please

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: More Trees Please

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. Your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kristi Link

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 8:02 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project and Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Affinity Project and Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments. The planned development for 465-577 Arroyo Parkway is very concerning to me because of the lack of any meaningful setbacks along Arroyo Parkway, which translates to zero in-ground trees anywhere around the periphery of the development. Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." I strongly believe that it is in everyone's interest to create and foster strong urban forestry efforts, as dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy are vital for the health and beauty of our neighborhoods. It is concerning that the historic and tree-lined Madison Heights neighborhood would be directly abutting such drastic concrete canyons of development, and I appreciate your careful consideration of the shortcomings of this development plan.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Page Malloy

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:36 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Help our Tree Canopy!

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Help our Tree Canopy!

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments. Please help our community.

Sincerely,
Heather Drake

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:45 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Please Do Not Build a City Without Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Please Do Not Build a City Without Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments. The planned development for 465-577 Arroyo Parkway is very concerning to me because of the lack of any meaningful setbacks along Arroyo Parkway, which translates to zero in-ground trees anywhere around the periphery of the development. Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's City Council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." I strongly believe that it is in everyone's interest to create and foster strong urban forestry efforts, as dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy are vital for the health and beauty of our neighborhoods. It is concerning that the historic and tree-lined Madison Heights neighborhood would be directly abutting such drastic concrete canyons of development, and I appreciate your careful consideration of the shortcomings of this development plan.

Sincerely,
Mark Freeark

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:18 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: More Trees Please

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: More Trees Please

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. Your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Reed

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:54 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Lianne Kern

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 11:06 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Protect Pasadena Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Protect Pasadena Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving the planned development project located at 465-577 Arroyo Parkway- 1) A massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, destroying all trees on the property; 2) Planting of no large trees between building lot lines to create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) Zero street setbacks which will destroy the potential integration of trees into the new development plans supporting our urban forest policy. 4) Planting of only two street trees as described in the conditions of approval. 5) On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." Does City Council agree with this statement? The City Council must further review why the EIR conditions for this project approves of only two additional street trees to suffice to match our our urban forestry goals and policies for the General Plan. It is the city's and residents' interest to create an environment where strong urban forestry efforts with dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy for the vitality and health of the neighborhood. It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments.

Sincerely,
will Freeark

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 11:14 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Pasadena's Urban Tree Canopy

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Pamela halferty

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 11:20 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: We Need Trees!

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: We Need Trees!

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. We must do everything possible to promote a stronger urban tree canopy.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Anneke Greco

Prepared by OneClickPolitics (tm) at www.oneclickpolitics.com. OneClickPolitics provides online communications tools for supporters of a cause, issue, organization or association to contact their elected officials. For more information regarding our policies and services, please contact info@oneclickpolitics.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 1:18 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Leave Room for Trees

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Leave Room for Trees

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

It is imperative that we ensure the city we pass down to our children is made of more than just parking lots and concrete developments. The planned development for 465-577 Arroyo Parkway is very concerning to me because of the lack of any meaningful setbacks along Arroyo Parkway, which translates to zero in-ground trees anywhere around the periphery of the development. Pasadena's General Plan includes goals and policies with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating any negative environmental effects for the city, including protecting trees and open space. Policy 10.13 encourages the maintenance and planting of additional trees along the city's sidewalks and private developments to support the health and diversity of wildlife, reduce the urban heat index, and sequester GHG emissions. However, in the Affinity Draft EIR, the only planned condition for approval calls for planting of two new street trees along Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. All other trees will be above-grade planters. This project is proposed to remove 23 current in-ground trees—two are mature Canary Pines, which produce significant shade. The plan to replace 23 mature trees with only two street trees and 38 above-grade trees in planters, raises a number of valid questions: 1) How can Pasadena's city council find this project to be in alignment with the goals and policies related to the urban forest as outlined in our General Plan? 2) Are the two new sidewalk trees enough to support healthy and diverse wildlife? 3) How effective are potted trees at mitigating and sequestering the pollution caused by the estimated 6,952 additional vehicle trips (as proposed by building A) 4) Will the above-ground potted plants reduce the urban heat island that will be created from the construction of a 151,000 sf medical office and 184,376 senior living facility? The Pasadena City Council must address the following issues before approving this project: 1) The proposed massive subterranean garage going lot line to lot line, which will destroy all trees on the property; 2) The lack of any plans to place large trees between building lot lines, which would create an urban canopy within a dense urban area; 3) The complete lack of street setbacks, which destroys any potential integration of trees into the new development; and 4) The assertion that planting two in-ground trees will somehow meet Pasadena's goals regarding trees and green neighborhoods. On page 42 of the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR, the city explicitly acknowledges "that in-ground trees may convey a perception of greater permanence than trees in planters; however, from an arboriculture perspective, there is little difference." I strongly believe that it is in everyone's interest to create and foster strong urban forestry efforts, as dense vegetation and a beautiful urban canopy are vital for the health and beauty of our neighborhoods. It is concerning that the historic and tree-lined Madison Heights neighborhood would be directly abutting such drastic concrete canyons of development, and I appreciate your careful consideration of the shortcomings of this development plan. Sincerely, Anamaria Young

Sincerely,
Mrs. Anamaria Young

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: myvoice@oneclickpolitics.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 7:17 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Re: Magnolia Landmark District and the Affinity Project

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

The residents of Magnolia Landmark District are alarmed by the planned development proposal to build two, seven-story buildings just a block and a half from our boundaries. The Project as described with medical uses, has a traffic volume of 6,366 trips a day if the questionable and overzealous "trip credits" are not factored in. The City of Pasadena has not placed any conditions of approval in the CEQA study to protect our neighborhood from cut through traffic and they have not provided conditions to ensure we can readily exit our street when the train creates backup all the way to Euclid Avenue during peak hours. How will the lack of any limitations or conditions for approval prevent this adjacent historic neighborhood of quiet streets and historic homes turn into a very busy, noisy and unsafe living environment? Pasadena Land Use regulations were meant to help neighborhoods evolve without sacrificing their unique characteristics or charm. This proposed use will erode our surrounding historical neighborhood if it moves forward with the massive unmitigated number of vehicle trips adjacent to our historic neighborhood. In addition, this planned development is completely incompatible with our General Plan which promises to protect the character of our neighborhoods. Council must do more to understand the impacts of building 380,000 sf of new medical space a block and a half from our boundaries. How we can be assured our neighborhood will not be impacted when there are currently no mitigations being put in place to ensure our landmark district remains healthy, comfortable, and pedestrian safe while adjacent commercial districts massively expand? We must ensure this idea of a high-growth, high-density model for Arroyo Parkway has been thoroughly reviewed and impacts are appropriately mitigated before moving forward. Can the city consider doing a cumulative traffic impact report to ensure our street will remain accessible? The CEQA analysis is based on the 2013 Travel demand Forecasting Model which seems old considering we are closing in on 2023. In addition, the EIR Response to Comments (112.3) also states the City's inability to conduct traffic count surveys, why? It seems perfectly plausible and imperative to conduct in person traffic surveys to ensure the success of our roads and maintenance of our historic neighborhoods. This development is too massive, lacks enough green space for future residents, is not contextually relative to our suburban neighborhood, and will cause the intrusion of traffic impacts to our street. Southwest Pasadena does not have the proper infrastructure to support such growth, and we are concerned that all of this new traffic will make it nearly impossible for Pasadena residents to access adjacent roads for their transportation needs. When was the last time Pasadena approved a project of this size with only one condition of approval being two street trees?

Sincerely,
Mrs. Shannon Kramer Staat

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: carlos.
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:20 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Learn why this is

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Carlos and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 661 Carpenters Union Member,

Carlos Carbajal

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Emilio Gonzalez
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:25 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from
at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Emilio Gonzalez and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 661 Carpenters Union Member,

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Vic Rodriguez
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:26 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from " ". Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Victor Rodriguez and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 661 Carpenters Union Member,
Victor Rodriguez

Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: richard cardenas
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:26 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email fr
important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Learn why this is

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Richard Cardenas and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 661 Carpenters Union Member,

Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Elvis Corvera
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:26 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from 1
important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[Learn why this is](#)

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Elvis corvera and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 213 Carpenters Union Member,

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: kevin marcial
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:26 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from i... Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. Learn more...<https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263>.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

My name is Kevin Marcial and I'm a Local 661 Carpenters Union member. Carpenters Local 661 represents nearly 5,000 working men, women, and families in the area. I'm writing to you today regarding the hearing this afternoon for the Affinity Project. I wanted to voice my FULL SUPPORT for this project.

The Developer has made a solid commitment to hire responsible contractors that will be providing family supporting wages and benefits such as healthcare and pension.

Projects like this create hundreds of jobs for working families in the Pasadena area. The jobs that it creates are good paying jobs with benefits. Its projects like this that also create opportunity. Opportunity for union members in the Pasadena area to work and build in the area they live rather than commuting everyday to Los Angeles, Orange County, or further. This also creates opportunity for individuals to get on a career path with the trades and to get the proper skills training to be successful in the construction industry.

It is important that we do not let great opportunities like this pass. We need jobs and we need good paying jobs- mortgage paying jobs, we need healthcare, and we need retirement options for workers that call Pasadena their home. This project would create all that. With the amount of working union families that live in the area this project would benefit the community and the people that call this community home. Let's take advantage of every opportunity to create economic prosperity for our constituents and contribute to the health and wellbeing of our community.

We ask that you SUPPORT this project in full and approve this project at today's hearing.

Local 661 Carpenters Union Member,