

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sally Howell
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 6:58 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

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

Learn why this is important at

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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.

Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Nancy Chulay
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 7:47 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

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

arn 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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.
Nancy Chulay

Pasadena 91106

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kelly Duke <dm>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 7:51 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Cc: pasadenamhna@gmail.com
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. **TREES:** The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city. Please consider the following:
 - a. Typical sidewalk installation requires the underlying soil to be compacted to 95% density to support the sidewalk loads. That level of density inhibits deep root growth and can contribute, over time to shallow roots that lead to the uplift of pavement.
 - b. Modern, enlightened, urban planting practices advocate the creation of larger tree planting pits and / or the creation of continuous root zone corridors between trees using "structural cells". Structural cells are modular pedestals that transfer the weight of the sidewalk down through a 30"~36" deep root zone to a compacted soil layer that is below the tree pit.
 - c. The structural cells support the pavement and create a larger area for horticulturally suitable soil that is installed at a lower percentage of compaction (typically 85%). This larger area of accessible soil provides a greater mass for root growth which improves tree health and longevity. This is especially important as we see increases in ambient air and pavement temperatures harming and killing our street trees.
 - d. Structural cells, use in conjunction with root diversion barriers and an appropriately designed irrigation system can channel the roots deeper, thus reducing the potential for pavement up-lift.
 - e. Street trees are critical to reducing pavement surface temperatures and the resulting "urban heat island" effect.
 - f. Healthy street trees must be a critical component of Pasadena's long-term strategy to offset CO2 emissions in the broader efforts to hold global warming at bay. I am confident that the Pasadena's Urban Forestry team in the Department of Public Works are aware of and would support the requirement for structural cells for all trees to be planted in pavement within the landscape design of the proposed Development #39).

2. **HEIGHT:** The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).

3. **SIDEWALKS:** For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we ad

Thank you in advance for your consideration and action on these important matters.

Kelly F. Duke

B.S. Ornamental Horticulture, Cal Poly Pomona, 1982

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Rosey Bell
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 8:51 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

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

i. 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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.

Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sally Bunkall
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 3:55 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project: 1. **TREES:** The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city. 2. **HEIGHT:** The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District). 3. **SIDEWALKS:** For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation. 4. **NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE:** This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project. 5. **CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS:** Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made. Thank you very much.

Ray and Sally Turner

Pasadena, CA 91106

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Barbara Lamb
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 4:13 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

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

rn why this is important at

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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

I have lived in Madison Heights for thirty-three years and have been a property owner since 1963. I'm appalled by the enormity of this planned development.

As Madison Heights is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.
Barbara Lamb

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: ALTON CULLEN
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 8:12 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Megan Foker
Subject: Livable Pasadena & Affinity Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [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...](#)

City Council,

We strongly support the correspondence from Livable Pasadena and add that This City has got to Stop Being directed and run by developers and our Planning department needs a revamp so that they work for us, the citizens and not for outside interests such as developers.

Please change your thinking and become more of a body that centers their focus on the community, Not outsiders who are only interested in the Dollar.

Thank you for giving thought to these comments.

Al Cullen President
Greenwood/AllenNeighborhood Association

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Barbara Davis
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 7:29 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

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

arn why this is important at

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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much,
Barbara

Barbara Davis
District 7

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Gerrian W
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 9:01 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. **TREES:** The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. **HEIGHT:** The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. **SIDEWALKS:** For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. **NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE:** This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. **CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS:** Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.

G Wuts

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jane Levy
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 9:50 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

[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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As residents of Madison Heights for over 50 years, which is next to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), we hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.
Jane and Daniel Levy,

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Charlotte K. Reith
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 10:45 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

[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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. BRIDGE OVER THE TRAIN TRACKS OR PUT TRAIN TRACKS UNDERGROUND: This has always been such a bottleneck since the trains started running and with no relief as Glenarm, California or Del Mar, now is the perfect time to fix this HUGE mistake and give relief to neighbors trying to move around their city easily!
2. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
3. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
4. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
5. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
6. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jeff C
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 12:30 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: 10/24/22 City Council Agenda Item #16: Affinity Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [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...](#)

Dear Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

My name is Jeff Cyrulewski, and I'm a Pasadena resident. I'd like to echo the concerns from Protect Pasadena Trees and Livable Pasadena on the Affinity Project, and also hope that staff will go into detail on how traffic metrics were applied to the project, especially with the new Local Mobility Analysis metrics in place. Madison Heights' letter to the Planning Commission back in February does a really good job of laying out a lot of traffic concerns, and my hope is that staff can address those (along with the concerns from Livable Pasadena and PPT) on Monday night.

Thank you,
Jeff Cyrulewski

RECEIVED

Dear Councilmembers,

The intersection of Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd. are already THE MOST CONGESTED INTERSECTION IN OUR CITY. Are we going to add even more traffic to this almost impassible area?

At the very least, the smaller proposed project should be approved for that reason alone.

Also please be sure that the **developer follows** the following elements:

TREES

The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.

HEIGHT

The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to **residential neighborhoods** and several Landmark Districts.

SIDEWALKS

For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated **Specific Plan** that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.

NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE

This project should not be granted an **additional height Variance for Historic Resources**. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.

CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS

Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has **WIDE LEEWAY to impose conditions of approval** as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Sincerely,

Molly Kennington, Secretary, Los Robles Plaza HOA: 355 South Los Robles Avenue

10/24/2022
Item 16

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jonathan Paek
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 1:56 PM
To: Wilson, Andy; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from _____ [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I support the project. Please consider the following.

SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Paek

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cynthia dale
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 12:51 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

[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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.
Cynthia Dale

Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Ching-Yao (Tony) Tang
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:53 AM
To: Wilson, Andy; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Concerns regarding the Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council,

As a resident of Meridian Court (SW corner of California Blvd. and Marengo Avenue), which is near the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39) and could be heavily negatively impacted. I hope that you will consider the following five (5) important points while reviewing this project:

1. **TREES:** The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. **HEIGHT:** The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon, particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts.
3. **SIDEWALKS:** For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15', plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. **NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE:** This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. **CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS:** Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can, and should, be enforced.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Dr. Ching-Yao (Tony) Tang

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jonathan Knight
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 9:33 AM
To: Wilson, Andy; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

Below are a list of items that my wife and I have concerns about in regards to the new project planned for Arroyo parkway. My wife works in engineering and construction, so she understands, better than I, the complexities involved in such a huge project, so we're empathetic to the challenging decision making that needs to occur. However, we hope that you'll take our concerns into consideration while making a choice that will impact our community for decades to come. Thank you.

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project: 1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city. 2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District). 3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation. 4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project. 5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Knight and Heather Todak

--

Jonathan Knight

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Janice Ohta
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:16 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Cc: janiceohta@yahoo.com
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] 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...](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. **TREES:** The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. **HEIGHT:** The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. **SIDEWALKS:** For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. **NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE:** This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. **CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS:** Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

I urge you to consider what is best for our beautiful city and our local residents over the long term, and not what is in the interests of a particular project or developer. Your decisions are your legacy. Choose wisely.

Janice Ohta

RECEIVED

Linda Vista-Annandale Association
Pasadena, CA

2022 OCT 24 AM 10: 26

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

October 23, 2022

Re: Planned Development (PD) 39 – Affinity Project; City Council Meeting
10-24-2022; Agenda Item 16 .

Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers:

The Linda Vista-Annandale Association (LVAA) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Affinity Planned Development (PD) 39.

Our comments reflect several interrelated issues: first, whether the Project EIR is legally adequate and should be Certified, second, whether the recommendations of the Planning Commission should be accepted in addition to or in place of the Staff Recommendations; and third, whether any additional requirements should be imposed on the Project in connection with any approvals. Our comments on the proposed Certification of the EIR are made for the purposes of the Administrative Record in addition to being provided for your consideration.

1. Planning Commission Recommendations. LVAA strongly supports all of the still relevant Planning Commission recommendations, particularly recommendation no. 1: limiting the height of Building A to a maximum of 75 feet under all use circumstances, that is, whether the Building is a medical research/office building OR a housing project. The proposed Building is a massive Building at a key corner: California Blvd. and Arroyo Parkway, proposed at over 90 feet, and much more if housing is the selected use and the State Density Bonus Law is sought and applied. Such a result, no matter which use is selected, is out of scale, out of character, will be destructive to adjacent neighborhoods, loom over this area and change it in clear violation of all applicable City ordinances and policies, including adopted Planning documents.

2. Project On-Site Mature Tree Canopy. City policies and procedure have evolved to meet current thinking: the changing climate requires on-site real canopy shade trees **in the ground**, NOT in pots and planters. All of our new Specific Plans recognize this, as did the Huntington Hospital in connection with its recent medical project on South Fair Oaks. Staff and other developers KNOW how to put canopy shade trees in Tree Wells and otherwise in the ground. This project should be required to follow suit and stop avoiding this requirement which is so important to the community. In fact, this community benefit should be required not only because it is the “right” thing to do, but

because “giving” the developer all the benefits of a Planned Development should require community benefits such as this one: Canopy Shade Trees as a significant Landscape feature planted in the ground through Tree Wells and other methods, and not in pots and planters.

3 EIR Certification: The Project Description is Inadequate.

The EIR Project Description includes two alternative development scenarios for Building A. This “choice” of different development scenarios is explained in the Draft EIR as providing flexibility to exchange uses in Building A to enable the Project to respond to economic needs and demands at the time of Project implementation.

Applicable CEQA law requires an unambiguous, accurate, stable and “finite” Project Description. The EIR is legally inadequate because it includes a Project Description that is neither stable nor finite, and, in fact, is ambiguous. The Project Description enables a choice of different development “scenarios” for a major portion of the Project, Building A. The choice is referred to in the EIR as the “flexibility” to exchange the uses in Building A from medical office and ground floor commercial to 197 Dwelling Units, a small amount of commercial, and up to 650 new subterranean parking spaces.

The EIR indicates that this flexibility: “would enable the Project to respond to the economic needs and demands of the City at the time of Project implementation.” See page 2-6 of the Draft EIR. This is a classic “slippery slope” approach to a “finite” Project Description, and clearly violates CEQA. It is not even clear who or what is determining such economic needs and demands of the City as opposed to the economic needs and demands of the Project applicant in order to maximize profits. Further, the argument that the on-site Project is the same whether one Project scenario or another is selected fails because the housing flexible use will result (1) in a very large increase in underground parking for the Project, and, (2) the housing use is more likely than not to trigger the State Density Bonus Law thus significantly increasing height and mass, thereby leading to an entirely different Project which the EIR does not fully disclose to the public.

A leading CEQA case law opinion in this area is Stopthemillenniumhollywood.com v. City of Los Angeles (2019) 39 Cal.App.5th 1, 16–20 [251 Cal.Rptr.3d 296, 307–310, 39 Cal.App.5th 1, 16–20], As stated by the court in its opinion:

The requirement of an accurate, stable, and finite project description as the sine qua non of an informative and legally sufficient EIR has been reiterated in a number of cases since County of Inyo. (See, e.g., Treasure Island, supra, 227 Cal.App.4th at p. 1052, 174 Cal.Rptr.3d 363 [“This court is among the many which have recognized that

a project description that gives conflicting signals to decision makers and the public about the nature and scope of the project is fundamentally inadequate and misleading”]; Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 85–89, 108 Cal.Rptr.3d 478 [EIR failed as an informal document because the project description was inconsistent and obscure as to the true purpose and scope of the project]; San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 653, 57 Cal.Rptr.3d 663 [an EIR must include detail sufficient to enable those who did not participate in its preparation to understand and to consider issues raised by the proposed project].)

The Project EIR cannot be Certified so long as the Project Description is legally inadequate because it is not accurate, stable, and finite. The developer should be required to choose the Building A use NOW, prior to entitlement approval and EIR Certification.

4. Variance For Historic Resources.

The Project proposes construction of two new buildings with maximum building heights that range from 93 feet 6 inches (Building A) to 90 feet 6 inches (Building B), when measured to the top of the parapet. These building heights are proposed in excess of applicable maximums (50' and 65' with height averaging) for the purpose of accommodating onsite “historic resources”. The Staff Report indicates that the additional height would allow the Project to reestablish developable floor area, from one area of the site to another, while preserving the existing historic resources.

Planning Commission/City Council Jurisdiction. A basic question: did the Planning Commission have jurisdiction to recommend granting of an Historic Resources Variance, and does the Council now have jurisdiction to grant the Variance? The controlling Zoning Code provision, which is Zoning Code Section 17.61.080.H.3 (Variances – Variances for Historic Resources – Findings and decision), provides that the Hearing Officer shall be the applicable review authority for Variances for Historic Resources. How can the Council decide on the Variance without prior action by the Hearing Officer?

Proposed Condition of Approval No. 12. The applicable Zoning Code Section providing for a Variance for Historic Resources referred to above provides: The Variance . . . only applies if the property has a historic designation or is required, as a condition of approval of the Variance, to submit an application for historic designation prior to completion of the proposed project or establishment of the proposed use.

Project proposed Condition of Approval No. 12 provides: The applicant or successor in interest shall submit an application to designate 501 and 523 South Arroyo Parkway as Landmarks. Landmark Designation shall be required prior to issuance of any building or grading permits (emphasis added).

It should be obvious: the two “historic resources” on the Project site, 501 and 523 South Arroyo Parkway, are considered currently as “Eligible” resources, but actual designation is significantly deferred until well after Project approvals are, possibly, obtained – a major policy and arguably CEQA issue. Further, apparently, and as stated in the Staff Report, both of these buildings are Eligible for local listing as opposed to listing on the California or National Register. Eligibility is only one step, a beginning step, on the road to actual listing such that the Variance is available, and, in fact, at this point, neither of these buildings currently is a qualifying designated resource.

It is **not** obvious that both buildings easily will achieve local listing as Landmarks or otherwise. Probably, the building at 523 South Arroyo Parkway, the former Lewis Iron Building designed by Marston and Van Pelt, which has support in the community, will be able to achieve local listing status. As to the building at 501 South Arroyo Parkway, its fate is not so clear, particularly since preserving this building in the name of historic preservation appears primarily for the purpose of “transferring” enormous height entitlements to the proposed new Project buildings – see discussion below on proposed heights. Approving the Variance for the building at 501 South Arroyo Parkway involves balancing competing policy and entitlement perspectives, and the Commission should consider denying the Variance for the building at 501 South Arroyo Parkway in order to reduce the height or heights of the new proposed buildings.

Required Findings for Variance. It is not clear that the Commission can make required Findings 2, 3, 4 and 5 for approval of the Variance. Approval of the Variance for both buildings, in fact, will result in two new Project buildings of enormous height that will adversely impact adjacent neighborhoods, and, granting the Variance as to both buildings will NOT be in conformance with the goals, policies and objectives of the General Plan and the purpose and intent of the Central District Specific Plan. See. below. And, it is not clear if the Variance is consistent with the purposed and intent of the Planned Development Zoning scheme.

5 CEQA Certification: Variance for Historic Resources.

Deferral of approval of the required listing of 501 and 523 South Arroyo Parkway until significantly after final approval of the PD and related Entitlements violates CEQA. Such deferral constitutes impermissible deferred Mitigation as well as impermissible

deferred analysis. The EIR cannot be Certified unless and until both buildings in question are listed, and any other procedure renders the EIR legally Inadequate.

Improper Alternatives Analysis. The EIR is legally Inadequate in that the Alternatives analysis fails to consider and analyze an Alternative in which the building at 523 South Arroyo Parkway, the Lewis Iron Building, is the sole historic resource subject to the granting of the Variance and excluding consideration of the 501 South Arroyo Parkway building.

.6. EIR Certification: The EIR Analysis of Project Water Supply is Inadequate.

The EIR analysis of Project Water Supply is inadequate even though the EIR is fairly recent. New information and changed circumstances both render the analysis out-of-date, incomplete, illogical, and misleading to the public. Since preparation and circulation of the EIR, California's drought emergency has significantly worsened over the last several months and on a day-by-day basis, and is now unprecedented, leading, in part, to Pasadena taking steps to address the situation as of September 1, 2022, including mandating one-day a week outdoor watering and mandating additional water conservation measures. As a result, the EIR and all supporting studies and documents, such as the state Water Supply Assessment (WSA), must be updated to meet the present, current situation, and the EIR Supplemented including circulation of all supplemental EIR Project water supply documentation and analysis. Matters which should inform the updated analysis include, but are not limited to, the precise current drought conditions including MWD Colorado River impacts and mitigations that should be imposed considering significant Pasadena and Project water supply impacts, the Cumulative impacts of concurrent large development projects in Pasadena, and appropriate Project Alternatives given the water supply situation.

The current EIR Project water supply analysis, which we believe must be updated, is quoted, and summarized below. Note the following definitions: Adopted 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for the City of Pasadena, and State required WSA: water supply assessment (WSA)

Project CEQA Initial Study dated August, 2021; Page 2-60:

"The Project would increase demand for potable water. The PWP has concluded the Project does not meet the thresholds to require a Water Supply Assessment pursuant to SB 610 (Sections 10910 et. seq. of the California Water Code) (Dion 2020). However, potential impacts related to the sufficiency of water supplies for the Project will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR." Note: a WSA was prepared for the Draft EIR.

Project Water Supply: Draft EIR. Dated January 2022; Page 3.11 et seq.

Threshold 3.11b: Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

....

“Project Water Supply Sufficiency

As stated previously, the 2020 UWMP aligns with Pasadena’s population and land use and is consistent with SCAG population and employment projections; and thereby includes potential water demands that would be generated by land use changes and new commercial and residential developments like the Project. Additionally, PWP staff reviewed the WSA for the Project and concluded that the WSA meets the requirements of SB 610 and SB 221 and concurs that PWP would have sufficient water supplies to meet existing demands combined with the Project’s estimated demands of 76 afy and cumulative demands anticipated in the 2020 UWMP(PWP 2022). Therefore, there would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. **There would be a less than significant impact related to water supplies, and no mitigation is required (emphasis added).**”

Project Water Supply: Final EIR dated May, 2022; Page 21.

“**Response 105.2.** As discussed, beginning on page 3.11-1 of the Draft EIR, a water supply assessment (WSA) was prepared for the Project. As stated on page 3.11-1:

“It is noted that the Project and Project with Building A Residential/Commercial do not qualify as a “project” under Senate Bill (SB) 610, which requires preparation of a WSA (Section 10912[a] of the Water Code). Nonetheless, based on comments received on the Notice of Preparation of this Draft EIR **and given that all of California’s 58 counties are under a drought emergency proclamation as of the preparation of this EIR (California 2021)**, a WSA was prepared for the Project and Project with Building A Residential/Commercial to inform the environmental analysis.” (Emphasis added.)

The results of the WSA were summarized in Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR and provided as Appendix I. As discussed on page 3.11-23: Therefore, there would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

There would be a less than significant impact related to water supplies..."
(Emphasis added.) Note: This is one typical Final EIR Response to Water Comments.

7. Required Findings for PD and Related Entitlements.

All required Findings for approval of the PD and related Entitlements cannot be made, particularly the following proposed Findings: 1, 2, 4 and 5. Proposed Approvals 2, 3 and 4 should not be adopted by the City Council.

This proposed PD is enormous including two massive new buildings proposed at 90 plus feet in height, almost double what would be permitted in the usual course – even for a PD. In fact, this proposed Project is out of scale, out of character, adversely impacts adjacent neighborhoods, is detrimental to the public interest and general welfare of the City and does not conform to the General Plan or the Central District Specific Plan. This proposed commercial Project overwhelms not only its surroundings, but also the vision and intent, goals and objectives of all applicable Planning documents and regulations.

In considering whether or not all the required Findings for the PD and related Entitlements can be made, the Commission should also consider the following Design Commission Preliminary Consultation comment made to the applicant and attached to the Staff Report: The proposed buildings are substantially higher than existing surrounding development and also exceed the height limit for new development along Arroyo Parkway.

8. CEQA Certification: Land Use and Planning. The proposed Project, a massive PD, is not adequately analyzed in the EIR in terms of project-specific Land Use and Planning significant impacts, and, in terms of cumulative impacts. This proposed PD is inconsistent with applicable land use plans. CEQA Guidelines section 15125, subdivision (d) requires an EIR to disclose any inconsistencies between a project and applicable land use plans. On this basis alone, the Commission should not Certify the EIR.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments and concerns.

Sincerely,
Linda Vista-Annandale Association
/s/ Nina Chomsky
Nina Chomsky, President
cc: LVAA Board of Directors



RECEIVED

2022 OCT 24 PM 1:42

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

Board of Directors

President

David G. Covell, Jr.

Vice President

Lynn Mehl, Ph.D.

Secretary

Loretta Mockler

Treasurer

Stephen Ralph

Board Members

Renée D. Benjamin, Esq.
Martha M. Denzel
Sandra Burton Greenstein
Angela Hawekotte, Esq.
Angie O'Brien
Lucy W. Pliskin, Esq.
Linda Polwrek
Theresa M. Pranata, Esq.
Abel Ramirez
Uma Shrivastava
Rande S. Sotomayor, Esq.
Kris Stevens, Ph.D.
Carol Thomson
Maureen Tyra, MSW

Executive Director

Akila Gibbs

Advisory Council

Becky Thyne, Esq., Chair
William Bogaard
Gene A. Buchanan
Katherine Enney, Ph.D.
Margie Gregg Grossman
Alice S. Huang, Ph.D.
Laura Mosqueda, M.D.

October 24, 2022

Jason Van Patten

Senior Planner

Planning & Community Development

City of Pasadena

Dear Jason,

I am the Executive Director of the Pasadena Senior Center. I am writing in support of the Affinity Project at 465-577 S. Arroyo Parkway.

Pasadena has a large population of older adults who are living alone and want/need to transition to assisted living and memory care facilities.

Many are on a waiting list that includes 80 people in waiting. Many wait so long they are forced to move out of area, even when they love living in Pasadena.

The Affinity Project will offer much needed senior housing and memory care. The project will be located in the middle of the town near family, friends, health care and public transportation, making it very convenient.

I truly believe the Affinity Project will have a significant impact on the quality of life for older adults and their families, which is why I support the project.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at (626) 685- 6703.

Sincerely,

Akila Gibbs

Executive Director

85 EAST HOLLY STREET PASADENA, CA 91103
NONPROFIT I.D. #95-2085393

www.pasadenaseniorcenter.org

phone: (626) 795-4331
fax: (626) 577-4235

10/24/2022
Item 16

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Diane Smith
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 2:53 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Gordo, Victor; Wilson, Andy; Hampton, Tyron; Jones, Jason; Williams, Felicia; Rivas, Jessica; Masuda, Gene; Madison, Steve; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Support for Affinity Project - PD#39 on Arroyo Parkway

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [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...](#)

Dear Pasadena City Council Members,

The Affinity Project is a perfect example of the kind of development we need in Pasadena. It meets two critical needs. This project will provide much-needed housing while also supporting the growing healthcare industry in our city.

We're all very aware of the housing shortage, however, we don't often hear about the need for new housing for seniors. The Affinity's mixed-use development will provide both assisted and independent housing options for seniors. That will allow Pasadena's older residents to stay in the neighborhood and maintain relationships with local friends and family.

Another component of the project is a state-of-the-art medical building in the growing medical and technology corridor near Huntington Memorial Hospital. It's critical that we have the infrastructure in place to support this industry and that is exactly what Affinity's new medical office facility will provide. Class A medical office space will help attract top physicians and researchers to the Huntington Hospital Corridor.

The Affinity Project is an ideal combination of housing and medical space. Seniors can retire and remain in the community, and have close access to healthcare professionals. That means that seniors can maintain their relationships with doctors and other service providers.

I think this project will be a welcome addition to the area and I strongly encourage your support.

Sincerely,

Diane Smith

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Denise Quan
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 4:54 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Wilson, Andy
Subject: Affinity Project (Planned Development #39)

[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 Honorable Mayor Gordo and the Pasadena City Council:

As a resident of Madison Heights, which is adjacent to the proposed Affinity Project (Planned Development #39), I hope that you will consider these important points while reviewing this project:

1. TREES: The developer should be required to plant trees in the ground with sufficient root space for full maturity, rather than in raised planters on the ground level. This can even be done over parking garages, by eliminating just a couple of spaces. Despite their claims, planting in the ground will vastly reduce required water use over time, while helping ensure greater size and success for the trees. Both are very important considerations to our city.
2. HEIGHT: The height of the new buildings should be below 75' where they front Arroyo Parkway and California Blvd, and then step up. We do not want the southern entrance to our city to become a stark, uninviting canyon — particularly so close to residential neighborhoods and several Landmark Districts (including the soon-to-be-finalized Madison Heights Landmark District).
3. SIDEWALKS: For all the new construction in this development, sidewalks should be 15 feet, plus 0-3' setbacks. This is consistent with the updated Specific Plan that will likely soon be approved for this area, and it will make the area safer and much more pedestrian-friendly. This is especially important as we add so much new housing and office space in this area, while trying to encourage multi-modal transportation.
4. NO HISTORIC RESOURCES VARIANCE: This project should not be granted an additional height Variance for Historic Resources. That law was not intended for this sort of project. This variance cannot be used if a hardship is of the developer's own making, yet that is exactly what this developer did, by choosing to classify it as a "Planned Development" project.
5. CITY HAS WIDE LEEWAY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS: Because this is being proposed as a Planned Development, the City has wide leeway to impose conditions of approval as seen fit. All of these requirements can — and should — be made.

Thank you very much.

Denise Quan

Pasadena, CA 91106