

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Lihua Liu
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 10:54 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Appeal and Objection to Approval of the 600 N. Rosemead Blvd. Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from '

[rn 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.

Pasadena City Council
City of Pasadena
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

My husband and I are longtime resident and homeowner in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood whose property directly backs onto the proposed development at 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard. I respectfully submit this letter to appeal and object to the approval of the proposed 133-unit affordable housing project, including 50 units designated for formerly homeless individuals.

To be clear, we support thoughtfully planned affordable housing that complies with applicable laws, respects surrounding neighborhoods, and adequately protects public health and safety. However, I have serious concerns that this project, as currently proposed and approved, fails to meet those standards.

First, substantial questions remain regarding whether the project legitimately qualifies for the state density bonus and associated concessions being relied upon to justify approval of a structure that exceeds the City's zoning height allowance by three stories. If the project does not meet the legal requirements for those incentives, then the basis for approval should be reevaluated immediately.

Second, we are deeply concerned that no meaningful environmental review has been conducted despite the project's significant potential impacts on neighboring residents. The project proposes approximately 150 rooftop air-conditioning condenser units immediately adjacent to an established single-family residential neighborhood. The cumulative noise, vibration, heat, and long-term maintenance impacts of this equipment raise serious quality-of-life and public health concerns. Given the scale and proximity of the project, reliance on generalized or theoretical noise assumptions without a comprehensive and independently verified environmental analysis is insufficient.

Third, the project's parking plan appears inadequate for a development of this size and intensity. With only 55 parking spaces proposed for 133 residential units, substantial overflow parking into neighboring residential streets is foreseeable. Existing residents already experience parking constraints, and the project is likely to significantly worsen congestion, street accessibility, and neighborhood safety conditions.

In addition, the massing and scale of the project are fundamentally incompatible with the adjacent single-family residential neighborhood. The approval of a development substantially exceeding established zoning standards without adequate safeguards or transparent justification undermines public confidence in the City's planning process and raises concerns regarding consistency, fairness, and accountability in project review.

In the event the project is not denied, we respectfully request that the City impose additional conditions of approval to mitigate the significant impacts on adjacent single-family homes. Specifically, due to the elevated topography and the direct interface between the multi-story development and neighboring residential properties, the developer should be required to construct and permanently maintain an effective solid noise and privacy barrier along the shared property line,

including appropriate landscaping and acoustic mitigation measures. This should include consideration of a solid wall or equivalent acoustic/privacy barrier of sufficient height, potentially up to 10 feet where legally permissible and technically appropriate, to protect neighboring homes from excessive noise, visual intrusion, light spillover, and loss of privacy.

In addition, the developer should be required to complete an independent acoustical study evaluating the cumulative operational impacts of the rooftop mechanical equipment on adjacent residences, including nighttime conditions and hillside sound propagation effects. The study should be conducted by a qualified third-party acoustical consultant independent of the developer. The City should also require post-installation acoustical testing and ongoing compliance monitoring to verify that operational noise levels remain within applicable Pasadena noise standards at neighboring residential property lines.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the City Council:

1. Reconsider and reverse approval of the project in its current form;
2. Require a full and independent environmental review evaluating cumulative impacts related to noise, parking, traffic, public safety, and neighborhood compatibility;
3. Conduct an independent verification of the project's eligibility for state density bonus incentives and concessions;
4. Require meaningful mitigation measures, including sound and privacy barriers, landscaping buffers, and independent acoustical review and monitoring; and
5. Ensure that any future proposal for this site complies with applicable zoning standards and includes enforceable protections for neighboring residents.

The residents of Pasadena place their trust in the City to apply laws fairly, protect public safety, and preserve the integrity of the planning process. We respectfully urge the Council to exercise careful oversight and reconsider this project before irreversible impacts are imposed on the surrounding community.

Thank you for your consideration and service to the residents of Pasadena.


Respectfully submitted,
Lihua Liu

Pasadena

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sossy Astourian
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 11:22 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Opposition to 600N apartment
Attachments: What the City Can Do to Protect Our Community-final.pdf

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from astourians@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[] 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.

Sent from my iPhone

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AT 600 NORTH ROSEMEAD BOULEVARD IS TOO LARGE What the City of Pasadena Can Do to Protect Our Community

City officials are considering approval of a 132-unit “100% affordable” housing project at 600 N. Rosemead Blvd. The Zoning Code limits building height to 3 stories or 38 feet for properties in this area. The developer wants to build an additional 3 stories, for a total of 68 feet high—SIX stories PLUS rooftop equipment and structures.

A building SIX stories high is too large for this site, but the additional three stories are permitted by the state Density Bonus Law IF the property is within one-half mile of a “major transit stop.” GC§65915(d)(2)(D)

How to measure distance? A straight line OR the path of a pedestrian?

- **Straight-line** (as-the-crow-flies): City uses straight-line distance from nearest point on project property to nearest point on transit property, citing Cal HCD AB2097 Technical Advisory (TA). AB2097 is a 2022 law about Minimum Parking Requirements. TA also says:
 - “Note: other statutes may measure distance from transit differently from AB2097.”
 - Cal HCD letter to City of San Clemente says straight-line measurement of distance to transit does not apply when statutes mention walking distance.
 - **Nothing** in the Density Bonus Law (GC§65915) specifies straight-line measurement.
- **Pedestrian route** (“walkability” and “unobstructed access to transit”):
Density Bonus Law requirements for access to a “major transit stop”:
 - “unobstructed access to the major transit stop” means a resident is able to access the major transit stop without encountering natural or constructed impediments.” (GC§65915(p)(2)(B))
 - “located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, and there is unobstructed access to the major transit stop from the development” (GC§65915(p)(2)(A))
 - “walkability access to transit services” (GC§65915(p)(7))
 - 90% of residential units and 75% of the entire parcel area must be within one-half mile of the “major transit stop.” GC§65915(o)(5) and PRC§21155(b)
 - Density Bonus Law requirements ensure a resident walks no farther than one-half mile from their apartment to the major transit stop.
- ALL of the project area and residential units at 600 N. Rosemead Blvd. are farther than one-half mile from the “major transit stop” (north side of Foothill Blvd. west of Rosemead Blvd.) when the distance is measured using the path of a pedestrian.
- Only 20 feet of one corner of the property is within one-half mile using the straight-line method; nearly all the property and residential units are beyond one-half mile.

Clearly, the proposed building does not qualify for the additional 3-story density bonus.

[See next page for what the City can and should do about it.]

What the City of Pasadena Can and Should Do to Protect Our Community

City officials claim they are powerless to protect us from this development, but the law allows them to **lower the density bonus if the development does not meet the requirements** of the Density Bonus Law. GC§65915 (n)

This project is not within ½ mile of a major transit stop, so **it does not meet this requirement of the Density Bonus Law**. Therefore, **it should not be eligible for the additional 3-stories** above the maximum 38-foot height allowed by the Zoning Code.

The General Plan Land Use Element for East Pasadena states: ***“Concentrate development adjoining the [SMV Station], reducing densities outward as transitions for the protection of adjoining residential neighborhoods.”*** (Policy 33.1)

The project location is at the outer boundary of the East Pasadena Specific Plan in an area designated “Low Commercial.” The buildings on this block are one, two or three stories. The project is immediately adjacent to a three-story multi-family dwelling, and shares its rear property line with one-story, single-family homes in the Lower Hastings Ranch Area.

According to the Density Bonus Law, the Zoning Code and the East Pasadena Specific Plan, the **Design Commission should reduce the Density Bonus for this project** to the 38-foot maximum height allowed by the Zoning Code.

By law, this building must provide affordable housing **for at least 55 years**. If we don't do this right, the **adverse consequences will plague our community for more than five decades**.

A six-story building is too large for this site and neighborhood. Instead, **build three stories** like the other building on this property and other properties in this neighborhood. It will **decrease the adverse impacts** of excess density on this and surrounding neighborhoods for 55 years or longer.

What YOU Can Do to Help Protect OUR Community

TODAY: SEND MESSAGES TO:

Rather Duong, Planning & Community Development Dept. (626)744-7346

rduong@cityofpasadena.net

Design Commission, commentsDC@cityofpasadena.net

Gene Masuda, District 4 Councilmember, (626) 744-4740 nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net

Victor Gordo, Mayor, (626)744-4111 vgordo@cityofpasadena.net

APRIL 14, 2026 at 6:30PM ATTEND the (FINAL) DESIGN COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

Jackie Robinson Park Rec. Center (Multi-Purpose Room), 1081 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Pasadena

NOTE: Meeting agenda and City staff report to be posted by April 10, 2026 at

<https://www.cityofpasadena.net/commissions/design-commission/>

Information provided as a community service to residents by Lower Hastings Ranch Association, Ronnie Po, President, ronniepo@gmail.com

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kimberly Yamamoto
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 11:33 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Appeal of 600 N. Rosemead Blvd 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I support affordable housing in Pasadena, including in East Pasadena. But this appeal is not a general vote on affordable housing. It is a review of whether the prior approval of this specific project should be allowed to stand.

It should not. The staff report shows why: 133 units, 55 parking spaces, and a normal zoning requirement of 215 spaces. That is a 160-space gap.

Supporters may say no parking is required because the project is near transit. But “no minimum parking requirement” is not the same as “no parking demand.” The approval depends on technical and disputed claims about major-transit-stop eligibility, including which stop qualifies, how the half-mile was measured, and whether the bus-route or regional-plan theory actually applies. That should be independently verified in the record before this approval is upheld.

Supporters may also say residents will not own cars. That is not a fair or evidence-based assumption. Pasadena’s own income limits show low-income households of three or four people can earn over \$100,000. These are working households, and many will need cars.

Please grant the appeal. At minimum, remand the approval and require independent transit verification, a curb-by-curb parking inventory, nighttime parking counts, and an enforceable parking and curb-management plan before the City allows this approval to stand.

Best regards,

Kimberly Yamamoto
Lower Hastings Ranch residents

05/18/2026
Item 11

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Grace W Hurd <grace@cityofpasadena.net>
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 12:15 PM
To: Gordo, Victor
CC: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Hampton, Tyron; Bernard, Nicole (Dist1); Cole, Rick; DerBoghossian, Megheti; jljones@cityofpasadena.net; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; chapman@cityofpasadena.net; Lyon, Jason
Subject: 5/18 Council agenda item 11. Appeal of 600 N Rosemead

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

Appeal of the approval of the project at 600 N. Rosemead

Honorable Mayor and Council Members

We do not support the project at 600 North Rosemead and believe approval of the project should be reconsidered and the appeal of Lower Hastings Ranch Association (LHRA) granted. We support the LHRA's appeal and wish to record our support with this statement.

We have heard that this is a State mandate and the City's Council's "hands are tied," but we believe real consideration has not been given to the many, many negative impacts this development will have on our community, as have been discussed by the many, many current residents and tax payers who have spoken in opposition to the project in prior hearings before the Design Commission and before the City Council.

In particular these are issues relating to the oversized development and density, the scant allowance for adequate parking for anticipated new residents to this oversized development and the stretching of available resources (like water) in a community where we have been told for many, many years that our resources are limited and we need to conserve. We have conserved and now we get this for our effort.

How does this oversized, ill thought out project and others like it make sense for our City at this time? Instead of considered planning, we see mad rushing and grabbing at the first ideas that come along in order to satisfy State mandates. Once built, this project will live in our community for a long time. We need to consider what we are putting in motion now and what we are creating for the future.

We urge you to listen to and give real consideration, now, to the valid objections of those who live in the community currently and grant LHRA's appeal.

Thank you.

Graceann Weigel Hurd & Frederick Hurd
East Eaton Wash Neighborhood

05/18/2026
Item 11

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Andrew Dupont <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 1:11 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Vote YES to Affordable Homes in East Pasadena

[I] **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.

Council Member,

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I'm writing to support the proposed development of 133 units of affordable housing at 600 N. Rosemead Blvd.

Increasing housing supply is a "burden" that must be shared state-wide. It requires collective action to prevent the dynamic that offloads those burdens onto poorer communities. That is why state law says what it says. Every time a community tries to take the easy way out and kick the can down the road, it makes things worse for everyone. I like Pasadena, but it is not more entitled to "stay the same" than other cities in California.

I also don't want to live in a city that's officially hostile to the idea of new neighbors moving in.

Please do not let yourselves be talked into the idea that denying this development (or the funding thereof) will do anything positive or meaningful. Allowing this project is not only compulsory under state law; it's also the right thing to do. Even if you disagree with state law, it ought to be engaged with on good faith.

Thanks,
Andrew Dupont

Andrew Dupont

Pasadena, California 91107

05/18/2026
Item 11

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Alexander Jimenez
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 1:24 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment: Rebuttal of Staff Recommendation per Appeal Point 2 re: 600 N Rosemead Project

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

Dear Mayor Gordo and members of the City Council,
Regarding Agenda item 11, on the May 18 council meeting, Staff has not established a legally sufficient basis to deny Appeal Point 2 on the theory that the project is within one-half mile of a Major Transit Stop.
Staff relies on two separate claims: first, that the Foothill/Rosemead stop currently qualifies because Foothill Transit 187 and Metro 266 operate at 20-minute-or-less peak intervals; and second, that the Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa stop qualifies because it is identified in SCAG's "2050 Plan."
However, the published timetables do not clearly establish the first point. The official Foothill Transit web schedule provides exact stop-level times for the Foothill/Rosemead stop on line 187, and those exact times show multiple morning peak gaps greater than 20 minutes, exceeding even 30 minutes. Metro 266's official timetable likewise uses approximate timepoints and includes peak-period gaps that exceed 20 minutes. Because Public Resources Code § 21064.3 requires two or more major bus routes with service intervals of 20 minutes or less during morning and afternoon peak commute periods, staff should provide exact stop-level schedules and a clear methodology before treating Foothill/Rosemead as a qualifying MTS.
On the second point: Staff has incorrectly indicated that the Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa stop is bindingly designated as an MTS in the currently adopted RTP/SCS. The current SCAG plan materials reviewed are Connect SoCal 2024, and Chapter 3 discusses Transit Priority Areas generally, but does not identify Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa by name as a Major Transit Stop. The SCAG 2050 plan is not an adopted plan, and therefore has no binding authority. To treat it as such is to treat any hypothetical stop listed in any hypothetical plan as relevant in the here-and-now, which is no basis for decision-making.
The supplemental materials to Connect SoCal2024 describe the RTP's general requirement to identify transportation facilities, but do not provide a stop-by-stop MTS designation for this intersection. HCD's AB 2097 technical advisory says that RTP-listed MTSs can remain binding for AB 2097 eligibility, however, that document is expressly an interpretation for AB 2097 parking exemptions, not a binding adjudication of this Density Bonus appeal. In other words, the Commission is not compelled to follow the guidance of the HCD as it has not provided any regarding the determination of an unlisted MTS.
Moreover, staff actually misstated the second point of appeal. Staff previously indicated that the second stop was part of a Rapid Transit Corridor, which holds a stricter basis for proximity measurement. This point of appeal, having been entirely ignored by staff and replaced with the false assertion that the current SCAG plan designates the stop as a MTS, stands as submitted and is grounds for upholding the appeal in full.
Therefore, based on the record presented, the Commission and council are not compelled to treat either Foothill/Rosemead or Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa as a Major Transit Stops unless staff identifies the exact adopted RTP/SCS page, table, map, dataset, adoption action, and/or stop-level schedule that legally establishes the designation. Moreover, staff offered no rebuttal to the actual point of appeal regarding the Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa stop. If staff cannot do either at the current time, the commission and council must uphold the appeal and reject the 600 N Rosemead project presented by Elysian/FSY as failing to qualify for SDBL concessions. Let us be clear: if the Council allows this building to proceed, it is breaking the law. The building does not qualify for SDBL, therefore, approving it as proposed would mean approving illegal concessions for this project.
Thank you,
Alex Jimenez, Renter at 500 N Rosemead



ALEX JIMENEZ DESIGN

alexjimenezdesign.com

05/18/2026
Item 11