

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: David Fairris
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 4:43 PM
To: Candice Pegram
Cc:

Subject: Re: 511 S. Oak Knoll Appeal

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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

I believe you have answered your own question.

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026, 4:31 PM Candice Pegram [redacted] wrote:
at 111 north Madison -Playhouse district, just above Union, they have already done that--5 foot separation-a massive block-- to the bldg next door-under construction now-even after strong opposition from PASADENA HERITAGE-A NEIGHBOR!!!
who do the commission members actually work for???!

Candice

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026 at 2:54 PM Nicole Roberts [redacted] wrote:
Oak Knoll Appeal

3/23/26

I am Nicole Roberts, an owner in 501. Let's be clear – we WANT affordable housing in Pasadena. We WANT a diverse neighborhood. But what we of Oak Knoll DON'T want is a big box that could be scaled differently to better suit the character and design of the neighborhood.

Does quality and individuality mean take nothing just because you're well below the California mandates for housing?

Do cultural factors like Pasadena's rich Craftsman heritage of the early 20th century mean nothing when the California housing shortage seems to prioritize density/profit over community design?

Committee members – you represent us. The residents of Pasadena. Kevin Cao and these developers do not live on our block. If you're going to look at the current piecemeal law of California and say, "Well, just be

3/23/2026

glad it's not 8 stories," then you are NOT speaking for those of us who cling to a Pasadena that is, at its core, a low-density, human-scaled neighborhood.

Some immediate issues to keep in mind:

- The Eaton fire of January 2025 has necessitated the influx of Eliot Arts Magnet, which is something like 300+ more students and yet unmeasured light, traffic, and pollution in the area.
- Traffic and safety studies were done well before the fire— where is the updated data on altered road conditions, compromised evacuation routes, and changed traffic patterns?
- The residents of 501 have only a chain link fence separating McKinley/Eliot school and the property. How much of a strain would it be to put the trees on the outside of the 511 building, per City of Gardens guidelines, to not only create:
 - additional privacy and a more passable walkway for the residents of 501 and
 - a barrier to the 24/7 light and noise to provide a better standard of living for all residents?

Again, affordable housing is GOOD – but the unprecedented fire has irrevocably changed the baseline conditions, and current safety-critical data is URGENTLY NEEDED. This isn't about managing inconvenience or "not in my backyard" – it's about ensuring student AND resident safety in a community that just experienced a major emergency.

The 46 units can and WILL go up – but why compromise safety and historical charm, especially when there might be cheaper and better suited alternatives, such as placing the gardens on the OUTSIDE of the building?

Thank you.

Nicole Roberts

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026 at 1:58 PM andy yan wrote:
To Whom It May Concern,

This is Andy Yan from Oak Knoll.

We would like to bring this concern to your attention once again. The only distance between the two buildings is approximately **five (5) feet**, a space that would accommodate **only one fully equipped firefighter**.

Any object falling from their building within this narrow gap could easily land on our back patios, posing **serious risks to both property and personal safety**.

Furthermore, should any damage occur to either building's exterior walls, a **five-foot separation is clearly insufficient** to allow workers to safely perform repairs with the necessary equipment.

Allowing for a **more reasonable distance** between the two buildings may require **minor design adjustments**, but it should **not constitute a major modification** or require additional studies. While it may cause some inconvenience to the developer, we believe that **public safety of the surrounding residents must take precedence**.

Street parking is another major concern for us. The committees already know about our street parking conditions.

Thank you for taking the time to address our concerns.

Jun (Andy) Yan
Resident, _____ e
Pasadena, CA

--
Nicole Roberts
-

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Judy
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 4:44 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Meeting 3/23 - Agend Item 15, Against the 511 S Oak Knoll Unit Appeal

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [earn 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Hello Councilmembers,

I am a Pasadena resident writing to ask you to reject the appeal against the proposed 511 S Oak Knoll apartment building. Affordable housing in reasonable areas will allow nearby businesses (in this case, the Lake Ave. corridor) to flourish and positively boost the city's economy.

Thank you,
Judy Mak

RECEIVED
Brian Fulcher and Amanda Elioff

Pasadena CA 91101

2026 MAR 23 PM 5:03

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

23 Mar 2026

Pasadena Planning & Community Development Department
Pasadena Permit Center
175 Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Attention: Stephanie Cisneros and Kevin Johnson

Subject: **511 South Oak Knoll Avenue, Pasadena, CA**
Four story Multi-Family Development, Case No. DHP2024-00261
Response Comments to the Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026

Dear Mr. Johnson and Ms. Cisneros,

Please consider the following comments and supplemental information regarding the Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026 on the matter of the proposed multi-family development for 511 S. Oak Knoll Avenue. It is expected that we will address many of these topics in a brief presentation at the City Council Public Hearing on 23 Mar 2026, but due to time restrictions, we would like to provide more inclusive written response(s) to the various issues listed in our Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 2025 related to the Concept Design dated 28 Oct 2025.

Overall, we much appreciate your commitment and guidance to this multi-family development project. We share the same commitment for increasing housing in Pasadena and are looking to help guide the Applicant to a more integrated residential neighborhood building and property development solution that achieves all goals for South Oak Knoll Avenue.

1. Response Comments to the City's Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026

For ease of reference, we have prepared a Comparative Table in Appendix B, based on the Appeal Submission dated 07 Nov 2025. We have also enclosed in Appendix C, a "dot-matrix" summary of related letters and correspondence pertinent to the elements of the Appeal to the Design Commission's decision (28 Oct 2025) on the Applicant's Concept Design defined as;

"Applications for Concept Design Review normally address the basic design of a project, including compatibility with surroundings, massing, proportion, siting, solid-to-void relationships, and compliance with applicable design guidelines" [Source: Pasadena Design Commission].

3/23/2026
Item 15

The Appeal to the Design Commission’s decision on the Concept Design (described below) comprised several elements as addressed in the Agenda Report and as further summarized in Table 1. As we understand it, several of these matters are still under study needing additional clarifications and/or are in abeyance until the Final Design and additional information is submitted by the Applicant to the Design Commission for its consideration, evaluation and comment.

For reference and clarification, the Applicant’s submission at the Concept Design (28 Oct 25) stage and in response to the Appeal to the Design Commission’s decision, a “de novo” submission is under consideration by City Council pursuant to the City’s letter dated 29 Oct 2025.

“Please note that appeals and calls for review are conducted as de novo reviews, meaning that the lower decision is set aside and the entire application is reviewed as a new proposal.”

2. Role of the Design Commission in the Proposed Multi-Family Development

We and our neighbors on South Oak Knoll Avenue consider the Design Commission as advocates for “*design excellence*” within the City’s neighborhood development plans and ordinances. The State density bonus considerations (i.e. building height, total and affordable units, concessions) did not in any way subvert the City’s well-established design requirements that were very deliberately and thoughtfully developed to maintain neighborhood character and quality of life for residents of the City. A citation from the Pasadena City Planning’s website includes the following describing purpose and function of the Design Commission.

“Advisory of the City Council on the establishment of design standards, criteria, concepts and policies for the implementation of public and private projects. Reviews projects for the purpose of creating uniform design concepts and to ensure the maintenance of design excellence.”

Please be very respectfully reminded that the Design Commission has in extensive verbal discussions at both the Preliminary and Concept Design Public Hearings expressed considerable informal recommendations to enhance and align the building and property design with the City’s “*design excellence*” charter, City of Gardens and other requirements and aspirations linked to well-established planning goals. In the Appellants’ view that these recommendations, while not formally recorded as “Conditions of Approval”, will again be addressed in the Final Design submission evaluation. Our desire would be to have most of these addressed in a revised Concept Design before costly and time-consuming changes are needed in the Final Design stage.

3. Appellant’s Request for a Recommendation by the City Council in this Appeal

In support of the preceding comments and in light of considerable neighborhood engagement (e.g. letters, petitions and messages) in the Appeal to the present Concept Design decision, we suggest strong consideration for the following at the City Council and Design Commission levels.

- Establish a sub-committee within the Design Commission for focused and constructive design review(s) and compliance matters and especially within the context of the neighborhood “built fabric” and nearby historical features.
- Provide meaningful Community Workshop(s) and liaison(s) to discuss recommend adjustments to the Concept Design before it progresses to the Final Design stage while more fully dispositioning current and past design and functional issues in a timely manner.

The above suggested actions are supported by the following within the Design Commission’s purview (as copied from the Pasadena Planning Department’s website).

“The Commission may approve, approve with conditions, continue to a subsequent meeting, or disapprove applications for Concept Design Review and may establish a subcommittee to conduct additional reviews.”

4. Appellant’s Request of the City Council in this Appeal

The Appellants have expressed considerable merit in their Appeal and, therefore, seek City Council’s approval of the Appeal to Design Commission’s decision on the Concept Design. We are also very encouraged by many additional initiatives and Conditions of Approval developed by the City after 28 Oct 25 (basis of the Appeal) and that are now enclosed in the Agenda Report. We are standing by ready to assist and contribute to several elements of the Appeal to the Concept Design that remain unresolved and/or where additional work is needed to achieve compliance, maintain neighborhood character, produce a distinctive high quality residential property and avoid potentially difficult issues later, in the Final Design stage.

In Appellant’s view, the following should be considered by City Council as part of the scheduled Public Hearing on Monday, 23 Mar 2026. The data and narratives listed in Table 1 support these request as part of the hearing process and desired outcomes.

- Return the Applicant’s *de novo* Concept Design submission to the Design Commission with comments and recommendations (i.e. Conditions of Approval and recommendations, etc.) largely based on the narratives in the Agenda Report.
- Conduct a comprehensive Concept Design review and eliminate design coordination issues, therefore, making the Concept Design compliant with City Ordinances at this stage

of the building and property design. In particular, eliminate the pervasive issues (light emissions, tree protection and building massing) that have been identified and frequently expressed by local residents in both the Preliminary Design (September 2024) and the Concept Design (October 2025) submissions. Please Appendix C for records.

- Eliminate correctable issues (now) at the Concept Design stage and avoid cumulative “*leave for later*” tasks and uncertainties to be resolved in the Final Design submission to the Design Commission and that would still be subject to additional public comment. This would appear to be a far more efficient and less costly approach and especially in consideration of the type and nature of the issues remaining unresolved.

Table 1: Summary and Status of Appeal Issues		
<i>Summary of action items and conclusions arising from the Appeal of the Design Commission’s decision of the Applicant’s Concept Design. While several have been resolved since filing the Appeal on 07 Nov 2025, others remain open and in need of additional attention as described below.</i>		
Item	Description	City Response, Action or Conclusion(s) Related to the Appeal
1	Design Guidelines	
	Described in Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Report for the Design Commission (Concept Design) determined the project is compatible the Appellants (and the South Oak Knoll neighborhood) strongly disagree. • This matter is the primary subject of the Appeal, the City Council hearing and the de novo submission on 23 Mar 2026 • <i>Do not meet Section 1.1, bullet 2 in Attachment I to the Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026.</i>
2	Environmental Impacts	
	Described in Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25	
a	Light Emissions (Appendix H)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to comply with PMC • Applicant needs to hire lighting consultant • Design issue must be resolved with Final Design
b	Noise – emitting from building (Appendix J)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to comply with PMC • Night-time noise baseline not established but needs to be to confirm compliance • Applicant needs to study night-time noise from building meets PMC and baseline dB
c	Noise – reflected by building (Appendix J)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is rare</i> to have a substantial electrical substation in close proximity to residential uses. Appellant is unaware of other similar examples for comparison. • Applicant needs to study potential substation noise reflection from its building onto all neighboring properties after considering acoustical data and its preferred building materials.
d	Street parking (Appendix K)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Day time</i> street parking issues appear not regulated under the Conditions of Approval of the Conceptual Design. Need to be further studied and resolved.

Table 1: Summary and Status of Appeal Issues Summary of action items and conclusions arising from the Appeal of the Design Commission’s decision of the Applicant’s Concept Design. While several have been resolved since filing the Appeal on 07 Nov 2025, others remain open and in need of additional attention as described below.		
Item	Description	City Response, Action or Conclusion(s) Related to the Appeal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nighttime street parking issues have not been resolved. Anyone from 511 can park at night on S. Oak Knoll as presently permitted.
e	Traffic Studies (Appendix K)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current City traffic study pre-dates significant changes to McKinley School (K-8) student and staff populations • Appellant will wait and observe impacts from the increased vehicle traffic at the school.
3	Adjacent HV Substation Described in Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25 (Appendix F.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 28 Oct 2025 Staff Report did not address a response from the Department of Water and Power, hence the concern raised by the Appellant in an Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25. • Appellant will wait to review “PWP Standard Conditions of Approval” referenced in the Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 26 (Attachment B)
4	Fire Safety Described in Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25 (Appendix F.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 28 Oct 2025 Staff Report did not address a response from the Pasadena Fire Department hence the concern raised by the Appellants in an Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25. • Appellant will wait to review “Fire Code Requirements” referenced in the Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 26 (Attachment B)
5	Tree Protection Requirements Described in Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25 (Appendix I)	<p>At present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept Drawings are incorrect in several aspects, hence the Appellant’s serious concerns raised in the Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 25 and again in its letter dated 06 Mar 26. • As far as we are aware, the current Concept Design (as submitted) is non-compliant with the City’s Tree Protection Ordinance and PMC 8.52. • Applicant is still uncertain the Applicant fully disclosed the building foundation construction plan and dimensional layout affecting the roots and canopy to the City’s Consulting Arborist since Concept Design drawings in this regard date to September 2024 and have not been changed • Also, there is no mention of building scaffolding allowance for the proposed building superstructure. Also, no mention the finished building tree clearance allowance distance. • Not addressed in the <i>de novo</i> submission from Applicant

Thank you for your consideration of the enclosed comments, lists and tables as part of our commitment and preparations for the City Council Hearing on Monday 23 Mar 2026.

Please feel free to contact us at any time for clarifications or additional information as needed.

Regards,

Brian Fulcher and Amanda Elioff
541 S. Oak Knoll Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Attachments:

Appendix A – Attachments to the City’s Agenda Report Dated 23 Mar 2026

Appendix B – Summary of Response Comments to the City’s Agenda Report
Dated 23 Mar 2026

Appendix C – Letter and Correspondence Summary to the City Related to the Preliminary
and Concept Designs from the Applicant
+ Signed petitions from engaged neighbors (pdf file)

cc: South Oak Knoll neighborhood contributors to the design assessment and Appeal of the
Concept Design decision.

Appendix A
Attachments to the City’s Agenda Report Dated 23 Mar 2026

Within the Agenda Report, we note that there were several Attachments needing careful attention and comments. At this time, we are not prepared to comment on these beyond what is summarized in the table enclosed in Appendix A but given a little more time and after the Public Hearing on 23 Mar 2026, we will review and respond as appropriate for the benefit of the City, the Applicant and our neighborhood. We will, therefore, appreciate you understanding and patience in this matter.

Table 2: Attachments to the City’s Agenda Report – 23 Mar 2026
 Summary of specific attachments to the Pasadena Planning Department Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026 in preparation for the City Council Public Hearing on 23 Mar 2026. In light of the copious quantity of these documents (some without their original attachments) additional time for reading and review as deemed appropriate by all Parties.

Document Author(s) and Source Information				Primary Topic of Referenced Document										
Att	Title	Source	Pages	Bldg Design / Shape			Environmental Matters				Street Related			
				Bldg	Herti	Hgt	Noise	Light	Tree	Gard	Traff	Park	Trash	
A	Findings of Consistency with Design Review & Private Tree Removal	City Planning	3							•				
B	Recommended Conditions of Approval	City Planning	14	•	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
C	Concept Design Review Staff Report, dated October 28, 2025 (without attachments)	City Planning	11	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
D	Request for Appeal Application (with Attachments) Environmental Documentation	<i>Appellant</i>	219*	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
E	Environmental Documentation	City Planning	1783	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
F	Concept Design Review Decision Letter (with Attachments)	City Planning	27	•	•	•		•	•					
G	Development Plans	<i>Applicant</i>	37	•	•	•				•	•			
H	Weblinks to the Central District Specific Plan and Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-Family Residential Districts	City Planning	300**	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Table 2: Attachments to the City's Agenda Report – 23 Mar 2026													
<i>Summary of specific attachments to the Pasadena Planning Department Agenda Report dated 23 Mar 2026 in preparation for the City Council Public Hearing on 23 Mar 2026. In light of the copious quantity of these documents (some without their original attachments) additional time for reading and review as deemed appropriate by all Parties.</i>													
Document Author(s) and Source Information				Primary Topic of Referenced Document									
Att	Title	Source	Pages	Bldg Design / Shape			Environmental Matters				Street Related		
				Bldg	Herti	Hgt	Noise	Light	Tree	Gard	Traff	Park	Trash
I	Design Guidelines Applicable to the Project	City Planning	4	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
J	Local Mobility Analysis	City Planning	143								●	●	
	Correspondence	Multiple	42	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Total Page Count appended to letter		983										

* Includes all correspondence and tree Addendums

** All sections of codes (some not applicable)

Appendix B
Summary of Response Comments to the City’s Agenda Report
Dated 23 Mar 2026

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments <i>The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.</i>			
1	Design Guidelines		
	<p><i>The design as accepted does not comply with the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Districts (Design Guidelines) as stated in the City's Findings for Concept Design Approval.</i></p>	<p><i>The Appellant asserts that the proposed design, as approved, is out of character with the context of the neighborhood and maintains an inappropriate massing that should be re-designed to be more sensitive to the neighborhood to allow for a reduction of the scale and increased privacy and natural light to adjacent properties. The Appellant has requested that the applicant restudy the project with regard to massing, setbacks, materiality, roof forms, landscaping, and arrangement of the interior main garden and exterior enclosed hallways to provide for a design that responds to the neighborhood in a more compatible manner and at a smaller scale with more green space while providing for the programming proposed at the site. In addition, the appellant argues that the use of SDBL, which the project is taking advantage of, creates discrepancies with the City of Gardena requirements and guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Staff and the Design Commission assessed the project for consistency with the applicable design guidelines, within the constraints of the SDBL allowances. The project provides affordable units on-site and makes use of SDBL to achieve a density bonus and requests one concession to increase the allowable building height. Staff and the Design Commission determined that the project is consistent with the applicable design guidelines and standards subject to Conditions of Approval in Attachment B, which will be addressed during the Final Design Review phase. The Findings in Attachment A and the Design Commission staff report from the October 28, 2025 meeting in Attachment C provide analysis of the project's consistency with the applicable design guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Upon approval of the Concept Design Review application, and in conjunction with the adopted conditions of approval, the Design Commission</i></p>	<p>Please see the numerous letters starting 24 Sep 24 up to and including the formal Appeal letter dated 07 Nov 2025 for amore extensive response. The Concept Design as submitted, DO NOT meet numerous Ordinances and exhaustively described in the referenced letters.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 24 Sep 24 letter (Prelim Design) 28 Jul 25 follow-up 27 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

		<p>found that the project was consistent with the purposes of design review and with the applicable design guidelines. The project was determined to provide a strong integration with the pedestrian experience along the street, provide a high level of compatibility with the surrounding context in a creative manner, and provide for additional housing with a mix of market- rate and onsite inclusionary affordable units.</p> <p>Subsequent to the filing of a Request for Appeal, Staff coordinated a meeting on December 18, 2025 between the applicant and the appellant to discuss concerns raised in the appeal application and determine if design modifications could be pursued to help alleviate some of these concerns. Staff provided options to potentially allow a redesign to address the appellant's concerns and potentially avoid an appeal. The applicant has indicated to staff that they studied a variety of alternatives based on comments and conversations at the December meeting, which included increasing the side setbacks at the north and south, placing an ancillary garden at the southwest side rather than at the center, and narrowing of the main garden courtyard at the center to allow the building to be set back further. The applicant found that these alternatives would deviate from the Zoning Code and require the use of additional waivers, adversely impact the project design, including introduction of a fifth floor to accommodate the lost square footage and units that would result from the redesigns, and were therefore determined to be infeasible or otherwise incompatible with the neighborhood. Subsequently the applicant informed staff that they would not be pursuing modifications to the project and requested to proceed with the appeal of the project as approved by the Design Commission.</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p>Lighting Impacts The Appellant argues that impacts from the light emitted from the enclosed corridors on the north and south sides of the new building have not been fully studied.</p>	<p>“...The project will be required to comply with all Building Code requirements pertaining to interior and exterior lighting. Per the Building Code, minimum lighting for emergency requirements is one foot-candle, which is a very low level of light; however, there is no maximum lighting level, except as it relates to energy efficiency. There are measures that can be taken to avoid light spillover from the interior corridors, including providing</p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response This appears to be a very appropriate response given the current situation, BUT the Appellant remains very concerned the Applicant will continue to approach this matter as a “leave for later” issue and not assertively determine a working solution. This is a pervasive issue</p>

<p>Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.</p>		
		<p>fixture shields and directing light inward. These measures pursued will ensure the project is consistent with the purposes of Design Review, specifically Section 17.61.030.A.4.b, "enhancing the surrounding environment" by limiting or avoiding light spillover onto adjacent properties.</p> <p>To further ensure consistency with this goal, staff recommends a Condition of Approval requiring the Applicant to engage a lighting consultant to demonstrate that the lighting levels within the interior corridors along the north, south and west walls of the building will not result in substantial light spillage onto adjacent properties and to implement the consultant's recommendations as part of the project's lighting design, for review during Final Design Review and Building Plan Check. A lighting impact assessment (e.g., photometric plan) or other equivalent standards may be used to address light concerns.</p>
		<p>preset on the Preliminary design in Sep 2024 and again in the Concept Design , Oct 2026 and with a building design that utilizes exterior corridors for the upper three floors on both the north and south sides of the building.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 24 Sep 24 letter (Prelim Design) 28 Jul 25 follow-up 27 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>
3	Noise Impacts	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Appellant argues that impacts to nighttime noise from the proposed 46 air conditioning units at the roof of the project operating simultaneously have not been sufficiently studied and addressed. In addition, the Appellant argues that additional noise will occur from the 4-story vertical walls reflecting existing noise coming off of the adjacent substation [located southwest of the project site]. The Appellant also asserts that existing 	<p>The Noise Study prepared by EcoTierra (Attachment E) assessed stationary noise sources, which include HVAC units. The study determined that, due to the location of the units with respect to building height and distance from surrounding residents, the noise generated from HVAC units would not exceed ambient noise levels. EcoTierra advised that there are no requirements to take noise readings at night for residential projects for CEQA noise analysis. The only uses or scenarios that would require noise analysis at night or over the course of 24-hours would be excessively noisy land uses that would be operational during nighttime hours, such as warehouse uses, manufacturing uses, or vehicle dispatch centers. Residential uses would not generate operational noise at day or night that would have the potential to exceed the established significance thresholds and would therefore not have a significant impact.</p> <p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response(s) The Appellant remains very concerned about nighttime noise generated by the multi-family building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It does not seem reasonable to assume that 46 individual roof-top air conditional unit would not remain below ambient noise levels Building 501 is a mere 10 feet from the property line and the proposed 511 development. Other multi-family buildings located to the west are also very close and would most certainly be impacted by night-time noise generated by the 511 development.

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments
 The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

	<p>ambient [night-time] noise measurements should have been taken in the evening hours when ambient noise is lower.</p>	<p>Standard mechanical equipment for a residential project is not an unusual occurrence that results in an impact.</p> <p>According to their analysis, EcoTierra indicated that each HVAC unit would operate at 44.5 dBA (individually), which is substantially less than the existing noise levels in the project vicinity; the existing noise levels currently exceed 60 dBA during daytime, which is established as 6 AM to 11PM. For comparison, a refrigerator condenser emits noise at 40 dBA. The threshold for a significant noise impact is 5 dB over ambient noise at the property line per the City’s Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>“..... The distance of 20 feet is conservative because it does not reflect the additional distance due to the elevated position of the HVAC units on the roof of the proposed building. If four HVAC units were running together at a distance of 20 feet, the noise level would be 50.52 dBA, which is still below the existing noise levels measured by EcoTierra.</p>	<p>A review of the City’s day and night-time noise Ordinances is needed regardless of the CEQA requirements. Typically, the following ae considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day-time = 63 dBA • Night-time = 5 dBA over ambient Once established) <p>The Appellants request a practical noise study of the 46 roof-top air conditioning units as part of the Concept Design stage BEFORE it may be later found that while operating together at night-time, they exceed the City’s allowable night-time noise levels and a redesign and (noise attenuation provisions) are needed to be compliant.</p> <p>The Appellants respectfully disagree with the yellow-highlighted portion the adjacent narrative.....having prior “noisy” experience with AC units.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the Staff report dated 28 Oct 25 (Appendix D) night-time ambient noise level were not measured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No field measurement • No baseline data for comparison • Need to consider all receptors; to the west and north
		<p>With regard to potential noise generated from the existing substation reflecting off of the proposed new building, this is not a topic studied in a Noise Study as there are no metrics for measuring this. In addition, due to the urban nature of the context, it is presumed that there can and will be noise that reflects off of buildings, however this is not a CEQA topic that is studied and there is not insufficient evidence to support a finding of a significant impact with respect to this project.</p> <p>In addition, it is not a unique condition to have an electrical substation in close proximity to residential uses; examples include the Wilson Substation at McDonald Park within the Bungalow Heaven Landmark District, the Goodrich Substation within Eaton Wash and near residences on Eaton Drive north of Maple Street, and the Villa Substation</p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response This appears to be a very appropriate response given the current situation, BUT the Appellant remains very concerned the Applicant will continue to approach this matter as a “leave for later” issue and not assertively determine a working solution. This is a pervasive issue preset on the Preliminary Design in Sept 2024 and again in the Concept Design , Oct 2026 and with a building design that utilizes exterior corridors for the upper three floors on both the north and south sides of the building.</p>

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments <i>The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.</i>			
		<p><i>behind residences on Summit and Marengo Avenues south of Villa Street.</i></p>	<p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 28 Jul 25 Concept Design prep 06 Oct 25 follow-up 27 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>
4	Street Parking		
	<p><i>The Appellant argues that there may be impacts to street parking due to the fact that overnight parking permits will not be issued to residents of the proposed [511] project. The Appellant questions how this will be enforced and how this may affect daytime parking permits.</i></p>	<p>Parking, including street parking, is not a topic that is required to be studied under CEQA. Based on the number of units and bedroom mix, the project is required to provide 67 on-site parking spaces. The project provides 67 parking spaces and complies with the Zoning Code.</p> <p>The Department of Transportation provided a Condition of Approval that prohibits the issuance of permanent on-street, overnight parking permits for the residents of this project. This Department will oversee the implementation and enforcement of this condition upon project completion, as is typical for most new housing projects in the Central District.</p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response Thank you for the response. The Appellants and our neighbors will also be observant of potential street parking issues during the construction phase. We would expect that this matter will be addressed separately in the future.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 23 Sep 24 (Prelim Design prep) 28 Jul 25 follow-up 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

5	Traffic Congestion		
	<p>The Appellant argues that traffic studies prepared do not reflect the new population at the McKinley School.</p>	<p>The project scope is below the adopted threshold for requiring a CEQA-level traffic analysis. Projects greater than or equal to 50 units require CEQA-level traffic analysis. A Local Mobility Analysis (LMA, see Attachment J) was prepared for the proposed project, which studied both current and future baseline conditions for traffic volumes. LMA is not a study conducted pursuant to CEQA and is used to determine if local improvements are needed and available to address localized traffic conditions associated with the project.</p> <p>The LMA concluded that the proposed project will not have a negative impact on the existing active transportation system within a 0.25-mile radius, per the City’s guidelines, upon implementation of a recommended Condition of Approval requiring the Applicant to fund a traffic signal improvement at the intersection of Lake Avenue and Del Mar Boulevard. While the LMA used traffic counts collected in <u>December 2024</u>, which was prior to the Eaton Fire and subsequent move of the Eliot School to McKinley Elementary, staff of the Department of Transportation confirmed that the additional population is not anticipated to change the findings of the LMA based on the intersection Level of Service studied. The temporary addition of Eliot School students to the McKinley School site will not result in a substantial deficiency that would require additional permanent roadway improvements.</p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response Thank you for the response. The Appellants and our neighbors will also be observant of potential traffic congestion increases that have already occurred due to the following conditions at the McKinley School and after the City’s LMA was completed in December 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 300 more students have been added • Unknown additional parent (and vehicles) drop-offs and pick-ups daily • Unknown number of additional school teaching and operations staff deployed • Unknown number of additional school operations deliveries and maintenance required to service the expanded school population and operations. <p>The Appellant would expect that this matter will be addressed separately in the future. Additionally, we respectfully disagree with the adjacent portion of the narrative highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 23 Sep 24 (Prelim Design prep) 28 Jul 25 follow-up 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

6	PWP Substation		
	<p><i>Adjacent Substation: The Appellant is concerned that the Department of Water and Power, which oversees the adjacent substation, has not reviewed or commented on the proposed project.</i></p>	<p><i>The Department of Water and Power reviewed the project during Concept Design Review and provided standard conditions of approval that the project will be required to address during the Plan Check review process and/or during construction. The conditions are included in Attachment B and do not affect the overall design of the proposed project.</i></p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response Thank you for the response. As the Appellants did not see an inclusion on the Concept Design Submission related to the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and its substation (address = 525 S. Oak Knoll Avenue), this prompted and question.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 28 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>
7	Building Fire Safety		
	<p><i>The Appellant argues that fire safety concerns have not been adequately addressed and requests a fire protection plan to demonstrate access to the new building and adjacent properties given the proposed setbacks from property lines, building height, and interior corridors.</i></p>	<p>The project will be reviewed for Fire Code requirements during the Plan Check process. Since the Design Commission review of the project, the Fire Department has reviewed the project and has provided standard Conditions of Approval. The conditions are included in Attachment B and do not require design changes to be made to address fire safety code requirements.</p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response Thank you for the response. The Appellants are pleased that the Pasadena Fire Department has started to weigh-in on the design. Best to do this at the Concept Design stage and to address / mitigate / eliminate avoidable fire safety issues BEFORE the final stage The Appellants (and others) will review Attachment B more in depth and respond separately if required.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions</p>

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

			<p>28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 28 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Native Tree Protection</p> <p><i>Tree Protection: The City’s Tree Protection Ordinance is cited for the City’s trees, however, protection of the tree "OS1" is not sufficiently addressed in the design or the Conditions of Approval. In addition, the Concept Design drawings do not accurately show the Canyon Live Oak Tree in its correct position relative to the property line and proposed building.</i></p>	<p><i>The appellant’s property contains a protected Canyon Live Oak tree, the canopy and root structure of which extend onto the project site. During the Design Commission review of the project, measures were implemented to ensure protection of the tree; however, the Appellant argues that additional measures are necessary to ensure the protection of the tree during and after construction. In addition, the Appellant argues that a proper assessment of the replacement value of the Canyon Live Oak needs to be made and verified and that an additional five-feet or more will be needed for the placement of shoring and scaffolding for construction, in order to further protect the roots, canopy, and drip line of the tree (for a minimum of 22 feet from the trunk of the tree).</i></p> <p><i>The tree and its relationship to the proposed project were evaluated by three consulting arborists - one hired by the applicant, one hired by the appellant, and one hired by the City. All three arborists visited the project site on two separate occasions prior to the DC meeting. The original application, supported by the Applicant’s arborist, proposed trenching eight to nine feet from the trunk of the tree. Concerns were raised early in the process that this may be too close to the tree’s root system. In response, the <u>City’s consulting arborist</u> evaluated the project and inspected the tree’s root system to understand how the project may or may not impact it. Based on assessment and recommendations by the City’s consulting arborist, the Applicant modified the parking plan and relocated parking space No.48 so that trenching can be extended another eight to nine feet to the west</i></p>	<p>Appellant’s Supplemental Response Thank you for the very comprehensive response. The Appellants are pleased that the City is taking a strong active interest in address measures to protect the mature native Canyon Live Oak tree that is situated on the 541 property and extends into the 511 property. This majestic tree must not be in any way marginalized or dismissed through building encroachments, pruning or root bulb intrusions in the building design and property development. Moreover it needs to be afforded all “care and protections” in the same manner as all other Native trees under PMC 8.52. This tree is a very key and distinctive visual element in the South Oak Knoll residential neighborhood.</p> <p>The Appellants are still very concerned about the following critical considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deviations from the City’s Tree Protection Ordinance (Chapter 8.52) as well as associated descriptive and dimensional requirements. Please reference City Standard drawing S-642 • Public Safety. Please reference a preliminary Risk Analysis enclosed in Appellant’s letter dated 06 Mar 2026.

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

	<p>and occur approximately 17 feet from the trunk of the tree. The City’s consulting arborist determined that this distance would be sufficient to address all construction requirements, including shoring and scaffolding. The other two arborists did not provide updated reports to dispute or contradict the recommendations from the City’s arborist. However, the Appellant’s arborist spoke at the Design Commission hearing and expressed concern with the potential for additional excavation beyond the proposed foundation wall and its proximity to the tree root structure. The City’s [consulting] arborist finds that the excavation as proposed will not harm the tree.</p> <p>In addition, the City’s consulting arborist reviewed the level of canopy pruning that would be required to accommodate the project (including construction equipment and scaffolding) and determined that it would require 10% to 20% of the canopy to be pruned, and noted that this is an acceptable level of pruning, if conducted during an appropriate time of year. The pruning would only need to occur at the north side of the tree, immediately adjacent to the proposed project. Additional pruning at the other side(s) of the tree would not be required and there would not be concern about the longevity or health of the tree based on this minimal pruning. The tree protection requirements by the City are also required to be met to ensure preservation and protection of the tree and were included as conditions of approval as recommended by the City’s consulting arborist, in addition to a condition requiring pruning work for construction equipment and scaffolding to only occur from October to February to reduce the stress placed on the tree.</p> <p>Staff has worked with the Applicant to ensure drawings are correct and reflect exact locations, dimensions, etc. The location is based on a professional survey conducted for the project (see page 2 of Attachment G) and the colored elevations depicting the tree location are utilizing a general graphic element for the tree and not the actual tree on site. The most accurate depiction of the tree and its canopy is reflected in the survey, which is the basis for the site and floor plans that were</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree heath and protection during and after building (and extended foundation) construction • Integration of the tree (roots and canopy) into the 511 property and landscape design. • Long-term maintenance and care of the Protected tree from 511. <p>At this time, notwithstanding the City Consulting Arborist’s report, and subject to more discussions and modified building layout drawings, the Appellants are still VERY concerned about the full and complete assessment(s) of impact(s) on the Protected tree that have not been sufficiently addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Protection Zone (per City Ordinances) • Protective fencing (per S-642) • Building excavation and foundation construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Location, depth and thickness ○ Support-of-Excavation design including materials, means and meths of construction • The Appellants (and others) will review Attachment B more in depth and respond separately if required. <p>All of the above directly influence the building (and foundation) footprint.....which are considered some of the most important building blocks of the Concept Design. Hence a full and comprehensive Tree Protection Plan needs to be completed as part of the adjusted Concept Design and not “left for later”, resulting in potentially awkward and costly rework, redesign and substantial compromises.</p>
--	--	--

Table A-1: Summary of the Appellant’s Appeal Issues, City Responses and Additional Comments

The summary below lists the Appellant’s Appeal issues based on the 07 Nov 2025 letter, the City responses and additional information and clarifications from the Appellant. Based on the following, it apparent there is more work to do to resolve several pervasive issues with the Applicant’s current de nova Concept Design.

		<p>developed for the project. During Final Design Review, Staff will continue to work with the Applicant to ensure the drawings are correct and accurate. Also, a Tree Protection Plan is required and is a Condition of Approval that will be reviewed and approved prior to construction with monitoring during construction.</p>	<p>Additionally, <i>all</i> Concept Design drawings must adequately and correctly illustrate the Protected tree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location and size • Other descriptive data to be corrected and consolidated <p>To properly and correctly represent the Protected tree within the proposed building since it was apparent in several discussions and past presentations, the Protected tree was NOT correctly described, hence design development (i.e. building footprint) and key decisions were flawed.</p> <p>Reference discussions and correspondence include the following.</p> <p>Discussions 24 Sep 24 Design Comm’n Public Hearing on Prelim Design 28 Oct 25 - Design Commission Public Hearing on Conc Design 12 Nov 25 - meeting with the City 20 Nov 25 - meeting with Applicant 18 Dec 25 - meeting with the City and Applicant</p> <p>Correspondence 15 Sep 24 28 Jul 25 Concept Design prep 27 Oct 25 Conc Design Hearing 28 Oct 25 – Public Hearing 07 Nov 25 Appeal Letter 06 Mar 26 – Composite summ’y 23 Mar 26 Agenda Report reply</p>
--	--	---	--

Appendix C

Letter and Correspondence Summary to the City Related to the Preliminary and Concept Designs from the Applicant

Table D-1 from 07 Nov 2025 Appeal letter (with Appendices) revised to include additional correspondence up to 23 Mar 2026.

Document Authors and Source Information				Primary Topic per Communication										
Item	Source	Location	Date	Bldg Design / Shape			Environmental Matters				Street Related			
				Bldg	Herti	Hgt	Noise	Light	Tree	Gard	Traff	Park	Trash	
A	Letters – Formally Written													
1	Brian Fulcher & Amanda Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	Sep 24 (A)	●	●	●		●	●					
2	Brian Fulcher & Amanda Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	23 Sep 24	●	●							●	●	
3	Brian Fulcher & Amanda Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Jul 25	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
4	Brian Fulcher & Amanda Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	06 Oct 25				●							
5	Amanda Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	27 Oct 25	●			●	●	●					
6	Brian Fulcher & Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Oct 25	Fire	Safety	●			●					
7	Sue Mossman	Madison Heights	28 Oct 25	●	●	●								
8	Brian Fulcher & Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	07 Nov 25	Fire	Safety	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
9	Brian Fulcher & Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	06 Mar 26						●					
10	Leon Bitting and Shauna Clark	Oak Knoll Resident	18 Mar 26	●	●	●						●	●	
11	Sue Mossman	Oak Knoll Resident	20 Mar 26	●	●	●				●				
12	Christine Copper	Oak Knoll Resident	22 Mar 26	●					●					
13	Brian Fulcher & Elioff	Oak Knoll Resident	23 Mar 26				●	●	●	●	●	●	●	

Table D-1: Summary of Letters and Communications
 Summary of formal letters, messages and other communications submitted to the Pasadena Design Commission related to the Preliminary and Concept Design for the proposed multi-family development at 511 S. Oak Knoll Avenue. A matrix of the primary topics per communication is also listed for ease of reference. Persons who attended the Hearing on 28 Oct 25 are shaded in green

Document Authors and Source Information				Primary Topic per Communication										
Item	Source	Location	Date	Bldg Design / Shape			Environmental Matters				Street Related			
				Bldg	Herti	Hgt	Noise	Light	Tree	Gard	Traff	Park	Trash	
B E-Mail Messages and Calls														
1	Buff Gontier	Oak Knoll Resident	21 Sep 24	●							●	●	●	
2	Arthur Gontier Buff Gontier(B)	Oak Knoll Resident	21 Sep 24	●							●	●	●	
3	Cybelle Sato	Oak Knoll Resident	21 Sep 24	●		●	●	●				●	●	
4	Ben Bock	Oak Knoll Resident	23 Sep 24	●			●	●				●		
5	David Fairris	Oak Knoll Resident	23 Sep 24								●	●	●	
6	Chris Saylor(B)	Oak Knoll Resident	23 Sep 24								●	●	●	
7	Marwin and Nancy Goble	Oak Knoll Resident	__ Sep 24			●	●					●	●	
8	Lisa Jacobs	Oak Knoll Resident	19 Oct 25	●	School		●	●			●	●	●	
9	Nicole Roberts	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Oct 25	●	School	●		Safety			●	●	●	●
10	Andy Yan	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Oct 25	●	●		●	Safety			●			
11	David Fairris	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Oct 25			●						●	●	
12	Chris Saylor	Oak Knoll Resident	28 Oct 25											
13	Ben Brock	Oak Knoll Resident	06 Nov 25	●		●	●				●	●		
14	Lisa Jacobs	Oak Knoll Resident	08 Mar 26	●		●	●	●	●	●				
15	David Fairris	Oak Knoll Resident	16 Mar 26	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
16	Roger Servick	Oak Knoll Resident	18 Mar 26	●	●	●					●			
17	Nancy and Marwin Goble	Oak Knoll Resident	18 Mar 26	●	●	●						●	●	
18	Chriss Saylor	Oak Knoll Resident	20 Mar 26	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	

(A) Added - Was not included in the 07 Nov 25 Appeal letter table
 (B) Not included (not found or duplicated)

I support the appeal of the Pasadena Design Commission's approval of 511 South Oak Knoll Ave Development and agree to be listed as a signatory.

No.	Name	Signature/Date	Address
1.	Donna Lee	 3/12/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave
2.	KEVAN MOSCOSO	 3/12/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave.
3.	Valerie Wilding	 3/14/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave #6
4.	Randy Myers	 3/14/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave.
4.	Dennis Dugill	 3/14/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave
4.	Anna Martinez	 3/18/26	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave, # 9
29	Lynne Bassis	 3/19/26	" # 29

Sign Here

I support the appeal of the Pasadena Design Commission's approval of 511 South Oak Knoll Ave Development and agree to be listed as a signatory.

No.	Name	Signature/Date	Address
	ANDREA BEESLEY	 3-13-26	5120 S OAK KNOLL # 20 PAS 91101
	Jesus Rodriguez	 3/14/2026	500 S OAK KNOLL #16 91101 Pasadena
	Adriana Kelish	 3/14/2026	500 S OAK KNOLL #16 91101 Pasadena
	Carilla Risom	 3/14/2026	500 S Oak Knoll Ave #52 91101 Pasadena
	Jasmine Pineda	 3/14/2026	510 S Oak Knoll Ave #19 91101 Pasadena
	Daniel Macedo	 3/14/2026	500 S OAK KNOLL #16 PAS 91101
	Dolores Tamara	 3/14/2026	510 S. Oak Knoll Ave #5 PAS 91101
	Elizabeth Kelso	 3-15-2026	775 S. Hudson Ave Pasadena 91106
	Elena Nikol.	 3-15-2026	500 S OAK KNOLL 91101
	GREG KEUSH	 3/16/26	775 S. HUDSON PASADENA 91106
	Yungju Park	 3/16/26	510 S. OAK KNOLL 91101

Thank you!
 Lisa #17

Sign Here

I support the appeal of the Pasadena Design Commission's approval of 511 South Oak Knoll Ave Development and agree to be listed as a signatory.

No.	Name	Signature/Date	Address
	Harold HARRISON	[Signature] 3/14/26	500 S. OAK KNOLL PAS 91101
	Sara Jane Burr	[Signature]	500 S. Oak Knoll Ave, Pasadena 91101
	Lynne Bassis	[Signature]	500 S. OAK KNOLL #29, Pasadena 91101
	MICHAEL E. MEDRANO	[Signature] 3/14/26	500 S. OAK KNOLL - PAS 91101
	REYNA MOSCOSO	[Signature]	500 S. OAK KNOLL 91101.
	DONNA MOSCOSO	[Signature]	500 S. oak knoll ave 91101
	Cybele Sans	[Signature] 3/14/26	500 S. oak Knoll Ave, PAS 91101
	HENRY MOSELEY	[Signature] 3/15/26	500 S OAK KNOLL AVE, PAS 91101
	Olive Moseley	[Signature] 3/15/26	500 S oak knoll ave, pas 91101
	Agnes Tony	[Signature] 3/16/21	500 S. OAK KNOLL AVE 91101

Thank you!
 Jean - in #17

www.change.org/p/511-s-oak-knoll-is-too-big-too-boxy

petition_signatures_jobs_491060809_20260317223205

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country	Signed On
Lisa Ann Jacobs				United States	2026-03-02
Amanda Elioff	pas	CA	90014	United States	2026-03-02
Nancy Petersen	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Desiree Gill	Pasadena	CA	91107	United States	2026-03-02
Abbie Miller	Los Angeles	CA	90025	United States	2026-03-02
Verónica Cross	Monrovia	CA	91016	United States	2026-03-02
David Fairris	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Brian Fulcher	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Alessia Aguilar	Riverside	CA	92504	United States	2026-03-02
Mira Maatouk	Altadena	CA	91001	United States	2026-03-02
Wenda Friesner	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Sandra Sinanian	Los Angeles	CA	90039	United States	2026-03-02
Alexis Estrada	Pasadena	CA	91107	United States	2026-03-02
Jose Pimentel	Azusa	CA	91702	United States	2026-03-02
Peri Corso	Los Angeles	CA	90028	United States	2026-03-02
William Olson	Pasadena	CA	91106	United States	2026-03-02
Rene Moreno	Burbank	CA	91501	United States	2026-03-02
Christopher Almeida	South Pasadena	CA	91031	United States	2026-03-02
Anne Rodman	Pasadena	CA	91103	United States	2026-03-02
Carl ebinger	Altadena	CA	91001	United States	2026-03-02
Alex Alleruzzo	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Lesley Schott	Santa Ana	CA	92706	United States	2026-03-02
Anne McNeill	La Crescenta-Montrose	CA	91214	United States	2026-03-02
Janet Kubler	Valencia	CA	91355	United States	2026-03-02
ARMAGHAN RAEI	Glendale	CA	91208	United States	2026-03-02
Amanda Knight	Los Angeles	CA	90048	United States	2026-03-02
Jessica Menchaca	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
Valerie Okorochoa	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-02
E. Thomas Kotrla	Los Angeles	CA	90042	United States	2026-03-02

Nancy Fox				United States	2026-03-03
Buff Gontier	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-03
Vivian Woolfson	Pasadena	CA	91105	United States	2026-03-03
Andrea Leos	Arcadia	CA	91007	United States	2026-03-03
Colleen Hall-Johnson	Pasadena	CA	91104	United States	2026-03-03
Lance Armor		HI		United States	2026-03-03
Dylan Sherman	Whittier	CA	90602	United States	2026-03-03
Rodolpho Solorzano	Orange	CA	92868	United States	2026-03-03
Amy Barach	Pasadena	CA	91104	United States	2026-03-03
Jon Inwood	Brooklyn	NY	11226	United States	2026-03-03
Beatrix Zilinskas	Van Nuys	CA	91406	United States	2026-03-03
Rene Lopez	Van Nuys	CA	91405	United States	2026-03-03
Zaid Bari	Los Angeles	CA	90272	United States	2026-03-03
Kent Kunitsugu	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-03
Bellanira Tigulla	Pasadena	CA	91104	United States	2026-03-03
Martha Mora	West Covina	CA	91790	United States	2026-03-03
Elizabeth LeVin	Tustin	CA	92780	United States	2026-03-03
Michael Prusek	Arcadia	CA	91006	United States	2026-03-03
Deborah Tannenbaum	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-03
Mari Noosh	Anaheim	CA	92807	United States	2026-03-03
Chanelle zinzanza	Edmonton		T6H 5W6	Canada	2026-03-03
Lilian De La Torre	Perris	CA	92571	United States	2026-03-03
behnaz Panah	Glendale	CA	91206	United States	2026-03-04
Navid Masoudinia		CA	92627	United States	2026-03-04
Daniel Quezada	Los Angeles	CA	90005	United States	2026-03-04
Alli Zand	Los Angeles	CA	91367	United States	2026-03-04
kat sal	laguna beach	CA	92651	United States	2026-03-04
Brittney Alvarez	Pasadena	CA	91104	United States	2026-03-04
سارا پاکدامن	Irvine	CA	92614	United States	2026-03-04
Nicholas Gorman	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-04
Ashley M	Newport Beach	CA	92658	United States	2026-03-04
Dan De Yo	Yorba Linda	CA	92886	United States	2026-03-04

Neda Moetamedi	Arcadia	CA	91007	United States	2026-03-04
reza nasr	Los Angeles	CA	90048	United States	2026-03-04
Manya Mohsenian	Ladera Ranch	CA	92694	United States	2026-03-04
Jennifer Bohnert	North Hills	CA	91343	United States	2026-03-04
Jesus Canales	San Francisco	CA	94116	United States	2026-03-04
Kimia bagheri	Van Nuys	CA	91406	United States	2026-03-04
Debra Roswell	San Bernardino	CA	92407	United States	2026-03-04
zara Hamidi	Santa Ana	CA	92706	United States	2026-03-04
Myra Arbabi	Sherman Oaks	CA	91403	United States	2026-03-04
Rosa mohammadi	Laguna Niguel	CA	92677	United States	2026-03-04
Eric Helge	Pasadena	CA	91105	United States	2026-03-04
Jaurdan Budgett	Belton	MO	64012	United States	2026-03-04
Patty Fan	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-04
James Hamilton	Northridge	CA	91343-1848	United States	2026-03-04
Benjamin Bock	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-05
Sahand Safaei	Van Nuys	CA	91401	United States	2026-03-05
Christopher Stephenso	Hacienda Heights	CA	91745	United States	2026-03-05
polin yadak	Anaheim	CA	92825	United States	2026-03-05
Vida Sina	Glendale	CA	91208	United States	2026-03-05
Sudie Laraen	Los Angeles	CA	90066	United States	2026-03-05
marjan asvadi	Los Angeles	CA	90017	United States	2026-03-05
Juan Castro	Victorville		92392	United States	2026-03-05
Heidi Kash	Agoura Hills	CA	91301	United States	2026-03-05
Mo Ely	Mission Viejo	CA	92692	United States	2026-03-05
Nazanin Kashani	Pico Rivera	CA	90660	United States	2026-03-05
Holly Flanagan	Los Angeles	CA	90045	United States	2026-03-05
Geoffrey Frank	Pasadena	CA	91107	United States	2026-03-05
Krystine Moreno	Los Angeles	CA	90011	United States	2026-03-05
stephanie lopez	Riverside	CA	92506	United States	2026-03-05
Miles White	Agoura Hills	CA	91301	United States	2026-03-05
Juli Ramos Gutierrez	Los Angeles	CA	90045	United States	2026-03-06
Telena Hill	Skokie	IL	60076	United States	2026-03-06

Caleb Martinez				United States	2026-03-06
Ariel Bermudez	Corona	CA	92982	United States	2026-03-06
Jorge Guzman	Moreno Valley	CA	92555	United States	2026-03-06
Claudia Beeman	Newport Beach	CA	92663	United States	2026-03-06
Jermain G	Woodland Hills	CA	91364	United States	2026-03-06
claudia gonzalez	Chino	CA	91710	United States	2026-03-06
Tyrie B	Moreno Valley	CA	92551	United States	2026-03-06
Jasmen Karami	Burbank	CA	91504	United States	2026-03-06
Milo Cuevas	Ontario	CA	91762	United States	2026-03-06
Leila Shabani	Van Nuys	CA	91406	United States	2026-03-06
Harvey Cordner	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-06
Reid schenck	Pasadena	CA	91105	United States	2026-03-07
Hem-young deFazio	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-09
Laura Hobart	Pasadena	CA	91101	United States	2026-03-10