



PASADENA PERMIT CENTER

www.cityofpasadena.net/permitcenter

REQUEST FOR APPEAL

APPLICATION INFORMATIONProject Address: 202 North Euclid Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101Case Type (MCUP, TTM, etc.) and Number: Minor Conditional Use Permit No. 7318Hearing Date: June 18, 2025Appeal Deadline: June 30, 2025**APPELLANT INFORMATION**APPELLANT: Park & Velayos LLP on behalf of ARE-Pasadena No. 5, LLCTelephone: [213] 570-8000Address: 801 South Figueroa Street, Suite 450Fax: []City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90017Email: jerickson@parkvelayos.comAPPLICANT (IF DIFFERENT): Erica S. Tamblyn

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):

Please see attached.

Signature of Appellant

6/30/2025

Date

*** OFFICE USE ONLY**PLN # 2025-00039 CASE # MCUP # 7318PRJ # /DESCRIPTION Appeal of MCUP # 7318DATE APPEAL RECEIVED: 6/30/2025APPEAL FEES: \$ 1624.31RECEIVED BY: ALW

Attachment to Request for Appeal

This matter is being appealed on behalf of our client, ARE-Pasadena No. 5, LLC. Minor Conditional Use Permit No. 7318 ("Project") for the property located at 202 North Euclid Avenue ("Property") was considered by the Hearing Officer on June 18, 2025, and the Hearing Officer approved the Project in the letter dated June 23, 2025. Our client's property is located adjacent to the Property. However, our client did not learn of the Project until the day of the hearing. While the Project application was filed on or around March 4, 2025, approximately 15 weeks prior to the hearing, the applicant did not reach out to our client during that time. Upon our client learning about the Project, we promptly submitted a letter requesting a continuance of the hearing to provide the time needed to understand the Project given the lack of information and to meet with the applicant and the City to work together with an appropriate amount of time to understand and discuss the Project, which we still hope to do. However, the Hearing Officer did not grant a continuance and instead approved the Project. Accordingly, to preserve our rights and meaningfully participate in this process, we are appealing the Hearing Officer's decision.

The Hearing Officer's decision in this case was rushed and did not: 1) comply with the Zoning Code which does not allow for a minor conditional use permit in this instance; 2) make the appropriate findings and provide findings that are supported by evidence; and 3) comply with CEQA or provide evidence to support an exemption from CEQA.