

# Agenda Report

May 18, 2026

**TO:** Honorable Mayor and City Council

**FROM:** Planning Department

**SUBJECT:** **QUASI-JUDICIAL ACTION: APPEAL OF THE DESIGN COMMISSION'S DECISION TO APPROVE AN APPLICATION FOR CONSOLIDATED DESIGN REVIEW (DHP2026-00073) FOR A PROJECT AT 600 N. ROSEMEAD BOULEVARD THAT INCLUDES A NEW FIVE-STORY, 82-UNIT, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING AND THE ADAPTIVE REUSE OF AN EXISTING TWO-STORY, OFFICE BUILDING INTO 51 DWELLING UNITS FOR A TOTAL OF 133 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (131 AFFORDABLE UNITS AND TWO MANAGER UNITS).**

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the City Council:

1. Find that the action proposed in the agenda report is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15332 (Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects), and that there are no features that distinguish this project from others in the exempt class, and that no exceptions to the exemption apply because there are no cumulative impacts, no unusual circumstances, no damage to scenic highways, no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and the project is not located on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, and;
2. Adopt the findings in Attachment A that the project will comply with the purposes of design review, the design-related goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan, and the Design Guidelines in the East Pasadena Specific Plan and that the removal of seven protected trees meets findings #2 and #6 of Pasadena Municipal Code (PMC) Section 8.52.075.A (Tree Protection Ordinance), and the concessions comply with state law; and,
3. Deny the appeal and approve the applications for Consolidated Design Review, Private Tree Removal and Density Bonus with incentives and five concessions subject to the conditions in Attachment B, which shall be reviewed by staff during plan check prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure compliance, unless otherwise stated.

**BACKGROUND:**

On March 9, 2026, the applicant, Elysian Housing, LLC – Greg Comanor, submitted an application for Consolidated Design Review for a new five-story, 110,593 square-foot, multi-family residential building with 82 dwelling units and the adaptive reuse of an existing two-story, 56,828 square-foot office building to 51 dwelling units. A total of 133 dwelling units and 55 at-grade parking spaces are proposed on the 2.15-acre site (131 affordable units and two managers’ units). A Private Tree Removal application to remove seven protected trees was also submitted. On April 14, 2026, the Design Commission reviewed and approved the applications and adopted the environmental determination at a noticed public hearing; the staff report for that meeting is included as Attachment C.

On April 24, 2026, the appellant, Lower Hastings Ranch Association, filed an appeal citing disagreements with the findings for Consolidated Design Approval, the granting of a density bonus, the building height, the environmental determination, and the completeness of the Consolidated Design Review application. The full appeal application is included in Attachment D.

**REQUIRED APPROVALS:**

The project is located in the East Pasadena Specific Plan (EPSP-d2-CO-D-2) zoning district. The applicant proposes a 100% affordable housing project (exclusive of two manager units). Under State Density Bonus Law (SDBL), a minimum 80% of the units must be for low-income households (up to 80% Area Median Income) and a maximum 20% of the units must be for moderate income households (up to 120% Area Median Income). The applicant may elect to provide housing for lower income groups (e.g., very low or extremely low-income households) and provide on-site services for residents. Prior to determining the application complete, Zoning staff reviews the proposed use for zoning compliance. The Zoning Code defines affordable housing projects as ‘multifamily housing’; if the use includes on-site services, it can also be defined as ‘supportive housing.’ Both uses are allowed by-right on the project site. The Design Commission does not review the use of the site as this is reviewed prior to application completeness and is not part of the design review action.

The zoning district allows a density of up to 48 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), or 103 units, on the project site. As a 100% affordable housing project within ½-mile of a major transit stop (MTS), the project automatically receives incentives to allow unlimited density, three additional stories (or 33 additional feet) above the height limit, and no minimum parking requirement. Table 1 outlines what is permitted under the City’s Zoning Code and SDBL and what is proposed for the project.

**Table 1: Zoning Code Comparison to SDBL Provisions**

Standard	Zoning Code	SDBL	Project
Maximum Density	103 units (or 48 units/acre)	No maximum	133 units (a 27.9% bonus or 62 units/acre)
Maximum Height	38 feet	33 additional feet = 71 feet	68 feet
Minimum Parking	201 spaces for units + 14 guest spaces = 215 spaces	No parking required	55 spaces

Under SDBL, the project is allowed up to five concessions from the development standards of the Zoning Code. The applicant requests the following five concessions:

1. **Reduced Front Yard Setback:** A 10-foot front yard setback reduction in lieu of the average blockface requirement, where a minimum of 20 feet is required, pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.070.B.
2. **Increased Length of the Street Façade:** From the maximum 60 feet allowed to 200 feet, pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.070.E.1.
3. **Exemption from Garden Requirements:** From the RM-48 main garden requirement for multifamily projects in the EPSP-d2-CO-D-2 zoning district pursuant to PMC Section 17.22.080.
4. **Alternative Open Space Standards:** Utilize the Adaptive Reuse open space development standards in lieu of the required RM-48 garden standards for multifamily projects, pursuant to PMC Section 17.50.030.F.
5. **Deviate from the Parking Location Requirement:** Provide a parking structure that is not located within the rear 40% of the site in lieu of the parking location requirement for podium buildings, pursuant to PMC Section 17.46.020.K.4.

With the exception of the incentives and requested concessions afforded through SDBL, the project complies with all other development standards.

The only entitlement required for the project is Design Review, where the Design Commission reviews the project for consistency with the purpose of the City’s design review process and any applicable design guidelines (including those found in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the East Pasadena Specific Plan and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial and Multi-family Residential Districts). Through the design review process, modifications to the buildings can be required related to mass and scale, articulation and modulation, fenestration, or other design-related standards. However, the project’s square footage, density, maximum height, and other development standards in the Zoning Code cannot be reduced beyond what the code and SDBL allow. As this is an appeal of a Design Review application, the review by the City Council is limited to the project’s consistency with applicable design guidelines and environmental determination as well as the tree removal application.

A typical Design Review occurs in a three-phase process starting with Preliminary Consultation, followed by Concept Design Review and then Final Design Review. The CEQA review is also completed during the Concept Design Review phase. For projects where more than 50% of the units are affordable, Concept and Final Design Review are combined into a single Consolidated Design Review phase to streamline the development review process.

The Design Commission reviewed and approved the application and CEQA determination on April 14, 2026 by a vote of 6-0 with two members absent. Commissioners found that the project was consistent with the applicable design guidelines as outlined in Attachment A, upon implementation of the conditions of approval included in Attachment B. At the meeting, conditions were added for the applicant to work with a Subcommittee of the Design Commission to further refine the overall building design including delineating the fifth floor by requiring additional study of the recess depth and its fenestration pattern, reducing the height of the wall enclosing the accessibility ramp, further studying the front setback to be more consistent with the existing building to provide a greater buffer from the street, and clarifying the method of color application for the awnings/sunshades. Please refer to Attachment C (Design Commission staff report for the Consolidated Design Review) for a detailed analysis of the project and the applicable design guidelines.

For additional information, the project plans are provided in Attachment H and links to the Design Guidelines in the East Pasadena Specific Plan and the Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-Family Residential Districts are provided in Attachment I. Additionally, the Design Guidelines staff determined to be applicable to the project during Preliminary Consultation are provided in Attachment J.

### **STAFF RESPONSE TO APPEAL:**

The appellant argues that the proposed project is not consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan Land Use Element, SDBL, and the Zoning Code for exceeding building height. Additionally, the appellant states that the noise and vibration study did not take into account the aggregate noise impact to nearby sensitive receptors. Staff has provided the following responses to each appeal point:

*Appeal Point 1 – General Plan Land Use Element: The project violates the General Plan, Land Use Element, Goal 33.1.*

Staff Response: The appellant asserts that the proposed project and by reference, its location, is inconsistent with Policy 33.1 of the Land Use Element (LUE). Goal 33 identifies East Pasadena as “a semi-urban environment with higher-density mixed-use developments incorporating retail, office and housing uses to provide increase[d] opportunities [to] encourage transit use and walking. Policy 33.1 states, “Concentrate development adjoining the Sierra Madre Villa Metro Gold Line station (now the A Line), reducing densities outward as transitions for the protection of adjoining residential neighborhoods.”

This policy references the location of the Sierra Madre Villa A Line station and the resulting transit-oriented development standards that are in place to encourage higher density development in the closest proximity to the station. In the plan area the highest densities of 87 du/acre are near the A-Line station and lower densities are located further away. Consistent with the Zoning Code, multi-family housing with a density of up to 48 du/ac is a permitted land use on the project site. Moreover, SDBL mandates additional incentives be allowed to encourage higher-density housing beyond what is already permitted by the Zoning Code and the EPSP, when within ½-mile of an MTS, such as unlimited density, additional height/stories and no parking for qualified affordable housing projects. As such, the proposed project is not inconsistent with Goal 33 and Policy 33.1 of the LUE by providing multi-family housing close to transit, and goods and services that relieve reliance from vehicles.

Furthermore, the Land Use Element of the General Plan states:

*“East Pasadena is the second most intensive center for employment and a regional retail area of the City, providing jobs, goods and services to the City. The vision for this area is to provide additional employment opportunities by facilitating expansion of existing businesses and development of new businesses, while adding new housing opportunities to enable residents to live close to jobs and transit. Most of the area could be infilled by a mix of commercial, offices, and housing. Large parcels would be encouraged to be redeveloped as a cohesive and walkable district with development concentrated in proximity to the Sierra Madre Villa Metro Gold Line station, and establishment of a more traditional street grid. The Sierra Madre Villa Transit Village is transitioning from a suburban to a semi-urban environment with higher-density mixed-use developments incorporating retail, office and housing uses to provide increased opportunities to walk and use transit.”*

Staff finds that the project is consistent with the General Plan as it provides additional housing in close proximity to transit, retail, and job opportunities and the deviation to development standards are allowed under SDBL.

Appeal Point 2 – State Density Bonus Law: *Density Bonuses were granted without adequate evidence that the project is within ½-half mile of an MTS as defined by Government Code (GC) §65915(o)(5) and Public Resources Code (PRC) §21155(b).*

Staff Response: Staff reviewed SDBL (Government Code §65915(o)(5)) and Technical Advisory (TA) memos from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) regarding MTS and concluded the project site is within ½-mile of an MTS based on the following:

- An MTS includes “the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” (per PRC 21064.3).

- Under SDBL, an MTS includes stops that currently meet the frequency requirements outlined above as well as stops that are included in a regional transportation plan (even if it currently does not meet the frequency requirements outlined above) (per Government Code § 65915(o)(5) and PRC § 2115(b)).
- Peak hours are defined as 6 to 9 a.m. and 3 to 7 p.m. (per January 2025 HCD TA).
- Under SDBL, the city shall not impose vehicular parking standards if a qualifying development has unobstructed access to an MTS. Unobstructed access to an MTS means “a resident is able to access the MTS without encountering natural or constructed impediments. For purposes of this subparagraph, ‘natural or constructed impediments’ includes, but is not limited to, freeways, rivers, mountains, and bodies of water, but does not include residential structures, shopping centers, parking lots, or rails used for transit.” (per GC Section 65915(p)(2)(B)).
- If any point of the site is within ½-mile of an MTS, an applicant may seek a density bonus, other incentives or concessions, waivers or reductions of development standards (per GC Section 65915(o)(3)).

There are two MTSs in the vicinity of the project site. The intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Rosemead Boulevard is currently served by two bus lines with a frequency of service interval of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods: Foothill Transit 187 and Metro 266. In addition, the intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Sierra Madre Villa Avenue is identified as an MTS in the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) 2050 Plan, which is the regional transportation plan that applies to Pasadena. Under Section 65915(o)(3), the project is within a one-half mile of a major transit stop if any point on the development is within one-half mile of any point on the property on which a major transit stop is located.

For the purposes of parking standards, there is also unobstructed access to a major transit stop under Section 65915(p)(2)(B), because there are no freeways, rivers, mountains or bodies of water between the project site and the identified MTSs; therefore, the distance measurement is required to be made in a straight line between the site and the stops. Utilizing official City and SCAG mapping tools, the project site is 0.49 mile from the Foothill/Rosemead MTS and 0.46 mile from the Foothill/Sierra Madre Villa MTS. In addition, while only the southern portion of the project site is within ½-mile of the MTS, since any point of the site is within the radius, the applicant may seek the requested density and other incentives and concessions.

*Appeal Point 3 – Building Height: The height proposed for Building B [the proposed southern building] will exceed the maximum height permitted by the Zoning Code for this location.*

Staff Response: The height limit for this site based on its zoning designation is 38 feet. However, because the project is a 100% affordable housing project (exclusive of manager units) and qualifies for density bonus under SDBL, it is allowed an additional

33 feet in height for a total maximum height of 71 feet. The proposed building is 68 feet high and complies with the height allowance permitted by SDBL.

*Appeal Point 4 – Noise and Vibration Technical Study: The Noise and Vibration Technical Report used to grant a CEQA Class 32 Exemption was incomplete and/or inaccurate, in that it did not state or explain the aggregate noise levels caused by the proposed 150 HVAC outdoor condenser units and the impact on sensitive receptor sites.*

**Staff Response:** For this appeal, the CEQA consultant reevaluated the Noise and Vibration Technical Study and reached the same conclusion as originally published in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report that was released in April 2026 (Attachment E) in regard to the aggregate noise level and any potential impact to nearby sensitive receptors. The proposed 150 HVAC condenser units will be centrally located and arranged in clusters on the roof across Buildings A (the existing building) and B, setback from the roof edges, and will be concealed by equipment screens. These condenser units are residential-scale ductless outdoor condensing units that are typical of multi-family residential development and are consistent with the noise environment in the vicinity of the project. The nearest sensitive noise receptors are residences to the south, adjacent residences to the east (along Rim Road), the Sierra Madre Villa Avenue Baseball Field and Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and residences across Sierra Madre Villa Avenue. The nearest distances from the rooftop HVAC equipment to the adjacent properties are 41 feet, 52 feet, and 74 feet from the south, east and north property lines, respectively. The HVAC specifications indicate that the proposed HVAC units would produce an outdoor sound pressure output level of approximately 58 dBA from a distance of 3.3 feet.

The noise study analyzed the most conservative scenario where all 150 HVAC units are in operation at the same time and that all units operate at the nearest setback distance from the adjacent property lines (even though the roof plan shows HVAC units are located at varying distances from the property lines). The recorded ambient noise levels at the adjacent property lines is 67 dBA at the south residential project, 51 dBA at the east residential neighborhood, and 51 dBA at the north commercial project. The estimated HVAC noise levels at the adjacent property lines will be 57.9 dBA at the south, 55.8 dBA at the east, and 52.7 dBA at the north. This meets the PMC requirement of not exceeding the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at any property line.

Furthermore, the estimated noise levels do not account for additional reductions that would occur from the proposed rooftop screening or other factors, such as buildings, atmospheric absorption, tree canopy, or other intervening features that may further reduce line of sight sound transmission to other properties. As such, the proposed HVAC units, even under the most conservative scenario, would not exceed the City's noise standards or result in a substantial increase to the ambient noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors.

*Appeal Point 5 – Incomplete Application: The application was incomplete, in that it lacked required and/or satisfactory information causing the Design Commission to add 39 Conditions of Approval related to Design and Historic Preservation, and additional Conditions of Approval related to other City departments.*

Staff Response: The application was deemed complete on April 1, 2026. The submitted application contains the items required by the submittal checklist. The inclusion of conditions of approval is standard practice for entitlement applications, and they reflect requirements of multiple departments to ensure the project meets all applicable codes and regulations. The Design Commission will add conditions of approval to ensure the project approved reflects the review body's comments and final requirements. There is no set number of conditions that can be placed on a project's approval as each project is different. In general, staff formulates necessary conditions upon in-depth and detailed review of the project plans during the drafting of the staff report and the Design Commission modifies or adds to the conditions during its review.

### **COUNCIL POLICY CONSIDERATION:**

The proposed project is consistent with multiple goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan including the following Guiding Principles:

- Guiding Principle 1: "Growth will be targeted to serve community needs and enhance the quality of life. Higher density development will be directed away from residential neighborhoods and into the Central District, Transit Villages, and Neighborhood Villages. These areas will have a diverse housing stock, job opportunities, exciting districts with commercial and recreational uses, and transit opportunities. New development will build upon Pasadena's tradition of strong sense of place, great neighborhoods, gardens, plazas, parks, and trees."
- Guiding Principle 3: "Pasadena will be an economically vital city by providing jobs, services, revenues, and opportunities. A diverse economic base with jobs for Pasadena residents will be fostered; existing businesses will be encouraged to stay or expand; affordable housing will be provided for the labor pool; the continued fiscal health of the city will be ensured."
- Guiding Principle 5: "Pasadena will be a city where people can circulate without cars. Specific plans in targeted development areas will emphasize a mix of uses, pedestrian activity, and transit; public and private transit will be made more available; neighborhood villages and transit villages will reduce the need for auto use."

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with Goal 1 (Sustainable Growth); Goal 2 (Land Use Diversity); Goal 4 (Elements Contributing to Urban Form); Goal 7 (Architectural Design and Quality); Goal 10 (City Sustained and Renewed); and Goal 21 (Desirable Neighborhoods). The proposed project will adaptively reuse an underutilized site and building and will provide new and diverse housing within walking distance to transit, community amenities, job opportunities and retail centers. The project will increase the housing stock and assist in addressing the housing affordability crisis that

has affected the region. The proposed project is also an economic development opportunity that will introduce new residents to the area that will support and sustain local businesses.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

Following a detailed environmental analysis conducted by Impact Sciences, included in Attachment E, staff recommends that the project be determined exempt from environmental review pursuant to CEQA, §15332, Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects.

To qualify for this exemption, a project is required to meet the following criteria:

- a. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.

*As described in detail in this report and supporting attachments, the project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation, all applicable general plan policies and the applicable zoning designation and regulations, with allowed modifications under SDBL. The project does not require any variances and meets all applicable development standards.*

- b. The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

*The project site has an area of 2.15 acres and is surrounded by urban uses including single- and multi-family residential buildings, professional office buildings and retail/shopping centers.*

- c. The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.

*The site is developed with a two-story office building and a two-story parking structure with no value as habitat for any special status species. The site has also been previously graded in order to construct the existing building and parking structure and is surrounded by developed properties.*

- d. Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

*The technical studies in Attachment E demonstrate that the project will not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise or air quality. The project will adhere to applicable regulations and permitting requirements by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ordinance and will not have impacts to water quality.*

- e. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

*The project has been reviewed by all utility providers, which determined that they are able to serve the project.*

In addition, to qualify for any CEQA exemption, the project must meet the following criteria per §15300.2 (Exceptions):

- a. Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

*The proposed project qualifies for a Class 32 exemption and therefore this exception is not applicable.*

- b. Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

*There are no other proposed projects of the same type in the same place as the proposed project. There are no projects of the same type within the immediate area, and the closest new multi-family residential project is located approximately 0.60 miles south at 170 N. Halstead Street, the recently completed Rose Town Apartments with 48 dwelling units, which is significantly lower in density than the proposed project.*

- c. Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

*There are no unusual circumstances associated with the proposed project. It is a land use that is authorized to be developed on the site by the Zoning Code and located on a previously developed lot in an urban area of the City of Pasadena. There are no other features that distinguish this from other in-fill projects in the exempt class.*

- d. Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

*The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the*

*viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to designated state scenic highways.*

- e. Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

*The project site is not included on a list of hazardous waste sites compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.*

- f. Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

*The project site is a developed lot and does not contain any historical resources. The existing office building was evaluated through the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) process and determined to be ineligible for designation as a landmark. The adjoining commercial and single-family residential buildings are also not historic resources or located within a historic or landmark district. The closest historic resource is The Stuart Pharmaceutical Building at 3360 E. Foothill Boulevard, which is about 0.60 miles south of the project site, which would not be affected by the project.*

Based on this analysis, staff recommends that the Council determine that the project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA under class 32, "infill development projects."

#### **LOCAL MOBILITY ANALYSIS:**

Separate from the environmental (CEQA) analysis that was conducted for the project, traffic consultant Iteris, under contract to the City, conducted a Local Mobility Analysis (Attachment F) to determine if the project should be required to contribute to roadway improvements to address any vehicular, pedestrian or bicycle traffic deficiencies in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Based on the non-CEQA analysis, staff finds that the project would not result in traffic deficiencies that would warrant roadway improvements.


#### **CONCLUSION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council uphold the decision of the Design Commission to determine the project is exempt from CEQA under Class 32 and that the City Council deny the appeal and approve the Consolidated Design Review application subject to the findings in Attachment A and the recommended conditions of approval in Attachment B. Staff and the Design Commission conducted a thorough analysis of the project through Preliminary Consultation and Consolidated Design Review.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact as a result of this action.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JASON MIKAELIAN, AICP  
Acting Director  
Planning & Community Development  
Department

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rathar Duong  
Senior Planner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN JOHNSON  
Principal Planner

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MATTHEW E. HAWKESWORTH  
Interim City Manager

Attachments: (10)

- A. Findings of Consistency with Design Review, Private Tree Removal and Concessions
- B. Recommended Conditions of Approval
- C. Consolidated Design Review Staff Report, dated April 14, 2026 (without attachments)
- D. Request for Appeal Application
- E. Environmental Documentation
- F. Local Mobility Analysis
- G. Consolidated Design Review Decision Letter (with Attachments)
- H. Development Plans
- I. Weblinks to the East Pasadena Specific Plan and Design Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-Family Residential Districts
- J. Design Guidelines Applicable to the Project