



PASADENA PERMIT CENTER
www.cityofpasadena.net/permitcenter

ATTACHMENT F

REQUEST FOR APPEAL

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Project Address: 1530 Scenic Drive, Pasadena, CA 91103

Case Type (MCUP, TTM, etc.) and Number: HDP #7134

Hearing Date: April 16, 2025 Appeal Deadline: April 28, 2025

APPELLANT INFORMATION

APPELLANT: Sharon Bober Telephone: [661] 904-1696
Address: 1560 Scenic Drive Fax: [] _____
City: Pasadena State: CA Zip: 91103 Email: collegemathprof@gmail.com

APPLICANT (IF DIFFERENT): _____

I hereby appeal the decision of the:

<input checked="" 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):

See Attachment A.

DATE RECEIVED

APR 28 2025

PASADENA
PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Signature of Appellant

April 28, 2025

Date

* OFFICE USE ONLY

PLN # ZENT2023-00073 CASE # HDP #7134 PRJ # _____
DESCRIPTION Appeal of HU decision to approve HDP #7143
DATE APPEAL RECEIVED: 4/28/25 APPEAL FEES: \$ 2,051.89 RECEIVED BY: J. Gambacorta

APP-RFA Rev: 1/18/07

Attachment A
HDP #7134: 1530 Scenic Drive
REASONS FOR APPEAL

The Hearing Officer did not correctly consider and apply all applicable Pasadena Ordinances and policies to the proposed Project, including without limitation, Pasadena's Zoning Code and Hillside Overlay Ordinance (Hillside Ordinance). All required Findings for Approval cannot be made, and, therefore, the proposed Project should not have been approved by the Hearing Officer. Specifically:

1. Neighborhood Compatibility. The Hearing Officer erred in approving 1,519 square feet over the maximum allowable amount of 2,761 square feet per the Hillside Ordinance. The proposed house is approximately twice the size of a typical modest home on Scenic and is not in scale and character or compatible with the defined neighborhood. A major purpose of the Hillside Ordinance is to preserve adjacent neighborhood scale and character. Required Finding 10 cannot be made because the massing, scale, and building articulation of the proposed dwelling or other structure is NOT compatible with the neighborhood as viewed from public or private streets, and, therefore, there is no basis for approval of the requested excess Neighborhood Compatibility square footage.
2. Biological Resources. The Constraints Analysis required by the Hillside Ordinance and the Biological Resources Report are both incomplete, incorrect, and inadequate. There is direct and substantial evidence, including direct observations by neighbors and numerous photographs, that a significant Wildlife Corridor crosses the proposed Project site through which large numbers of local Wildlife travel and birds fly over. This Corridor is part of the recognized Wildlife Corridor system in the Linda Vista-Annandale neighborhood and is connected to the Corridor that exists through the Arroyo and the open Cottonwood and St. Katherine's Canyons (aka Cottonwood II) located close to the Project site. Cottonwood is owned by the Arroyos and Foothills Conservancy and is a recognized and dedicated Wildlife Corridor preservation area. Required Findings 1 and 2 cannot be made because staff and the Biological Resources consultant should have known and properly analyzed that there are Biological constraints to implementation of the proposed Project. The proposed Project is likely to have an effect on wildlife movement and habitat and is located near preserved areas or significant ecological areas.
3. Excess Grading. The Preliminary Grading Plan indicates that 2,413 cubic yards of dirt (approx. 161 dump trucks) will be exported from the site while only 270 cubic yards will be used as fill. The proposed grading of the site is not balanced and violates the Hillside Ordinance which requires that Hillside projects minimize grading and instead requires that projects respect environmental equilibrium by respecting and preserving natural and existing grade. Therefore, required Findings No. 1, 2,3,4,5,6 and 8 cannot be made. The proposed grading alters the topography of the site for the apparent purpose of concealing the actual mass and scale of the proposed Project including the 6-car garage to be placed

below the resulting grade. The amount of excessive grading will impact the Wildlife Corridor on the site without consideration of the significant impacts of such grading on Wildlife and will create the need for extensive hauling of dirt and debris off the site with significant impacts to the defined Scenic neighborhood.

4. Trees. The proposed Project removes half of the mature protected and other Trees on the site in order to accommodate Project size, siting and excess grading and other impacts. These existing Trees contribute to the character of the defined neighborhood and support and enhance the Wildlife Corridor on the site. Although there is a required Tree replacement plan, the loss of mature canopy Trees will take many years to "replace." Further, it is not clear that many of the replacement Trees will survive over the long run, particularly the larger replacement Trees. The excessive loss of mature Trees onsite is directly related to the size, siting, grading, and construction required by the proposed Project and the Project should be reduced in size and redesigned to preserve more of the mature, healthy canopy Trees on the site.
5. Claimed CEQA Exemption. The following "features" of this proposed Project distinguish it from others in the Exempt Class: excessive Neighborhood Compatibility square footage, impacts on Biological Resources, excessive grading, and excessive removal of mature Trees. These features, taken singly or together, will result in significant Environmental impacts which will require specific, detailed, and enforceable Mitigation measures. Therefore, the claimed Exemption is not correct, and an Initial Study should be prepared to determine appropriate Environmental review under CEQA.
6. Variance for Excess Hardscape. The Hearing Officer erred in granting the requested Variance. The need for the requested Variance for excess hardscape in the Front Yard is self-imposed, and, therefore, none of the required Variance Findings can be made. If the proposed Project were smaller and more compatible, it is likely that the need for this Variance could be avoided.
7. Construction Management Plan. A site-specific Construction Management Plan should be prepared as part of any proposed Project approval and included as an enforceable Condition of Approval due to the special circumstances of construction and development in the Hillside areas of the Linda Vista-Annandale area and this specific location. Scenic narrows as it approaches the site with challenges to maneuver and turn around. The amount of proposed grading requiring significant export plus excessive mature Tree removal will result in hundreds of required trucks to remove the dirt and other material over time. This site is in the highest Wildfire hazard and risk zone and Scenic and all adjacent streets must be fully available and "open" for evacuation purposes including evacuations on very short notice and full available access for all firefighting and other emergency vehicles and equipment must be provided. All construction and grading activities of any kind including construction vehicles and equipment should be prohibited on Red Flag Days.