

# **ATTACHMENT B**



## REQUEST FOR APPEAL

### APPLICATION INFORMATION

Project Address: 974 N. Holliston Ave., Pasadena, CA 91104

Case Type (MCUP, TTM, etc.) and Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Appeal Deadline: 7/11/2024

### APPELLANT INFORMATION

APPELLANT: Linda Buckingham

Telephone: [408] 206-6500

Address: 974 N. Holliston Ave., Pasadena, CA 91104

Fax: [ ] \_\_\_\_\_

City: Pasadena State: CA Zip: 91104

Email: Linda2Pasadena@yahoo.com

APPLICANT (IF DIFFERENT): \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby appeal the decision of the:

☐ Hearing Officer

☐ Zoning Administrator

☐ Design Commission

☒ Director of Planning and Development

☒ Historic Preservation

☐ Film Liaison

### REASON FOR APPEAL

The decision maker failed to comply with the provisions of the Zoning Code, General Plan or other applicable plans in the following manner (use additional sheets if necessary):

This appeal requests delaying the Bungalow Heaven Historic Contributing Home reclassifications until at least October 2024 to allow time for two critical actions: 1) researching and substantiating any detrimental impact on the 67 homeowners, and 2) ensuring due process by the Bungalow Heaven Neighborhood Association (BHNA) to collaborate with the affected homeowners. BHNA only included the reclassification effort in their weekly emails starting June 13, 2024, leading to inadequate communication and notification to residents. Two local realtors have indicated that reclassification may reduce the pool of buyers for these homes. Additional time is required to assess any impact. Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Buckingham

Signature of Appellant

7/5/2024

Date

\* OFFICE USE ONLY

PLN # \_\_\_\_\_ CASE # \_\_\_\_\_ PRJ # \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION \_\_\_\_\_

DATE APPEAL RECEIVED: \_\_\_\_\_ APPEAL FEES: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ RECEIVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

APP-RFA Rev: 1/18/07



## REQUEST FOR APPEAL

### APPLICATION INFORMATION

Project Address: BUNGALOW HEAVEN LANDMARK DISTRICT  
Case Type (MCUP, TTM, etc.) and Number: BH CONSERVATION PLAN AMMENDMENT  
Hearing Date: unknown Appeal Deadline: 7/11/24

### APPELLANT INFORMATION

APPELLANT: JOE LANDIS Telephone: 310 254-4395  
Address: 857 N. MICHIGAN AVE Fax: [ ]  
City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: JYTLANDIS@gmail.com  
APPLICANT (IF DIFFERENT): \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby appeal the decision of the:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing Officer       | <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Administrator                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Design Commission     | <input type="checkbox"/> Director of Planning and Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Preservation | <input type="checkbox"/> Film Liaison                         |

### REASON FOR APPEAL

The decision maker failed to comply with the provisions of the Zoning Code, General Plan or other applicable plans in the following manner (use additional sheets if necessary):

Disagree with portions of the BHCP Amendment proposal.  
see attached.

[Signature] Signature of Appellant 7/10/24 Date

\* OFFICE USE ONLY

PLN # \_\_\_\_\_ CASE # \_\_\_\_\_ PRJ # \_\_\_\_\_  
DESCRIPTION \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPEAL RECEIVED: \_\_\_\_\_ APPEAL FEES: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ RECEIVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Per the proposed Bungalow Heaven Conservation Plan Amendment Narrative, three changes are proposed. I disagree with change I. I agree with change II and III.

I. Extending the “period of significance” to its logical stopping point in 1956. The period of significance is presently indirectly defined as ending in 1939, which leaves out a major portion of the Minimal Traditional and Ranch style homes.

Very much in disagreement. I do not believe that Minimal Traditional and Ranch style homes were considered for inclusion to the initial 1989 conservation plan as conforming. I feel the 1939 date was used solely as it was 50 years prior to the date of the charter. Given more time and resources to define all the home in the neighborhood at the time the conservation plan was established, the date of significance would likely have been 1929, the end date of the Revival period.

The amendment document talks about logical stopping points and assumptions by many. These are certain persons opinions and do not include all neighborhood residents. I feel most in the neighborhood could not even tell you what a “minimal traditional” home is. I had to Google it.

II. Making pro forma and terminology changes to recognize the 2004 expansion of the district and the 2021 revision of the Pasadena Historic Preservation Ordinance, including terminology updates.

Ok

*III. Appending an addendum providing a baseline list of the contributing resources within the landmark district. All landmark districts created in recent years are required to have such a list to assist in administration.*

Adding a list of which units are Conforming or Non-Conforming is appropriate and will save the Planning Department time and add consistency.

In summary, the initial conservation plan was not intended to protect minimal traditional homes but the neighborhood in general. Saving the “bungalows”, and maybe “revivals”, was the justification used. Protecting the neighborhood from the demolition and/or replacement of bungalows and revival period homes for the construction of condos or apartments is a good thing. However, extending this protection to place additional restrictions on homes constructed after those periods (1929?) is overstepping the initial district conservation plan. The initial Bungalow Heaven conservation plan never included Minimal Traditional or Ranch style homes. I see no need to classify them now as either conforming or significant. The neighborhood history is related to “bungalows” and possibly “revivals” but not others. Adding additional style homes at this point due to their age seems quite unnecessary other than to add restrictions on non-bungalow or non-revival style homes. I’m guessing that the 1939 date used in the original BH charter was selected due age (50 years prior) and for no other reason. Extending that date now to 1956 is not necessary to keep the neighborhood protected.

Most persons probably don’t care or even realize what is happening as the Bungalow Heaven Association (BHA) has been very quiet about this outside any Association meeting. Most don’t care as it doesn’t affect them. It does however affect the 67 units moved from Non Conforming to Conforming, mainly due to their classification by the BHA as Minimal Traditional.

I recommend modifying the Amendment to include only parts II and III.

I could continue but I believe you get the point. I will save further comments to the appeal hearing, if any.

Jon Landis  
857 N Michigan Ave