

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: William M. Paparian
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2026 6:58 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: May 18th Council meeting - Item #12 TEFRA Hearing for 600 N. Rosemead, LP

05/18/2026
Item 12

[!] **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's Thoughtful Decision on the 600 North Rosemead Project

As the Pasadena City Council prepares to reconsider the 600 North Rosemead project, many residents are hoping for a clear and balanced understanding of what's at stake. The developer is seeking approval for up to \$65 million in tax-exempt multifamily housing revenue bonds through the California Municipal Finance Authority.

TEFRA — the federal public approval process established by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 and Internal Revenue Code §147(f) — was designed to give local communities a meaningful voice in projects that receive this substantial tax benefit. It requires the Pasadena's City Council to hold a properly noticed public hearing and then decide, through a resolution, whether to grant approval. This is a thoughtful legislative responsibility rather than a routine formality. Our Council members have the discretion to approve, deny, or continue the item after listening carefully to everyone involved. Staff recommendations are valuable, but the ultimate decision belongs to our elected leaders.

Understanding the deep concerns on all sides

We all recognize the pressing need for affordable housing — for working families, seniors, and those still recovering from recent fires and other hardships. At the same time, it's completely understandable that neighbors worry about how new developments may affect daily life in Pasadena: parking, traffic, building scale, wildfire evacuation safety, and the unique character that makes our neighborhoods feel like home. Many residents have raised sincere, good-faith questions about project details such as unit mix, tenant selection, and transparency. These concerns flow from a genuine love for our community.

The TEFRA process gives our Council a valuable opportunity to honor both the urgent need for housing and the desire to protect Pasadena's livability and soul. Importantly, denying or delaying approval would create no financial risk for the City — the resolution clearly states that Pasadena assumes no liability for the bonds. It would simply encourage the applicant to explore other financing options or respond more fully to outstanding questions.

TEFRA denials do occur — and other cities have approached them with care

Neighboring communities have faced similar difficult choices and responded after listening closely to their residents:

In April 2026, the Santa Clarita City Council declined a TEFRA resolution for up to \$65 million in bonds for The Master's University after hours of public comment. Residents and the Property Owners Association shared heartfelt worries about the university's purchases of nearby single-family homes, which they believed were changing the rural and equestrian character of Placerita Canyon. They also raised concerns about potential loss of property tax revenue, short-term rentals in a fire-prone area, and limited transparency. The Council encouraged ongoing community engagement, recognizing the depth of local feelings.

That same month, the Antioch City Council deadlocked on a \$50 million request for the Hillcrest Summit Apartments, an affordable housing project. Neighbors expressed genuine fears about safety near a busy commercial site, traffic impacts, and design challenges, while feeling the process limited full local oversight. The conversation highlighted how challenging these balances can be.

In Concord in 2024, the Council denied TEFRA approval for The Ashbury project (181 affordable units) after some members voiced thoughtful concerns about concentrating affordable housing downtown and its alignment with fair housing goals. And years earlier, Fresno's 1997 denial of a similar request was upheld in federal court. The Ninth Circuit affirmed that elected bodies may decline approval for legitimate, non-

discriminatory reasons rooted in local impacts and community needs.

These examples show that local leaders can make measured, compassionate decisions after truly hearing residents — even when the issues are complex — while still working toward solutions for our region's housing challenges.

A chance to lead with empathy and balance

For the 600 North Rosemead project, similar community questions have arisen. Whatever path the Council chooses, it will not overturn existing land-use approvals, but it can create space for continued dialogue and better outcomes.

Pasadena has always stood out as a city that balances progress with preservation — a place where compassion and careful planning go hand in hand. At the upcoming hearing, our Council has the opportunity to listen with open hearts to all perspectives and make a decision that reflects our shared values.

This moment offers a chance not only to address one project, but to show how we can meet housing needs while continuing to care for the neighborhoods and neighbors we hold dear. Your voice matters — attending the hearing or reaching out to Council members can help ensure every perspective is heard.

In the end, this is about more than bonds or development. It's about how we care for each other and the special community we all call home. A measured, compassionate approach honors both our challenges and our hopes for Pasadena's future.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Andreas Köse
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 3:41 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment in support of the appeal of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard

05/18/2026
Item 12

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

[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.

This letter is regarding agenda items 11 & 12 of the May 18 2026 City Council meeting

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am writing to request that the City Council grant the, set aside or remand the approval, and decline to move forward with TEFRA/CMFA financing approval unless and until the record is corrected.

This letter is not a statement against affordable housing in Pasadena. Affordable housing is needed. The issue before the Council is whether this specific approval should stand when the record does not adequately address the project's transit eligibility, parking demand, street parking capacity, site planning, and operational impacts.

The City's own staff report shows why the appeal should be granted. The project proposes 133 total residential units, consisting of 131 affordable units and two manager units. The unit mix includes 8 studios, 57 one-bedroom units, 34 two-bedroom units, and 34 three-bedroom units. The project provides only 55 parking spaces. The same staff report identifies the City's ordinary zoning-code parking baseline as 215 spaces. The report also states that, because the project is being treated as a 100 percent affordable housing project within one-half mile of a major transit stop, it receives unlimited density, additional height, and no minimum parking requirement under state density-bonus law.

Those facts make the transit and parking issues central to the appeal. The Council should not uphold an approval that depends on major-transit-stop eligibility unless the City has made a clear, independent, publicly reviewable determination identifying the exact qualifying transit stop, the legal measurement method, the current route or regional-plan basis, and the applicable statutory authority. HCD's AB 2097 guidance confirms that major-transit-stop determinations involve specific criteria, including rail or bus rapid transit stations, qualifying intersections of two or more major bus routes with 20-minute-or-less peak service intervals, and regional transportation plan issues.

The applicant's own legal submission asserts that the project is within one-half mile of two alleged major transit stops: Foothill/Rosemead and Foothill/Sierra Madre. It also states that proximity to a major transit stop was not within the Design Review Board's purview and related instead to the City's ministerial density-bonus approval. That distinction matters. If the Design Commission did not decide the transit eligibility issue, the Council should not treat the approval as though that issue has been fully resolved.

The parking issue is equally serious. A legal parking exemption does not eliminate real parking demand. The City should not infer from "no minimum parking required" that residents, visitors, caregivers, service providers, delivery vehicles, rideshare vehicles, moving trucks, and guests will have no impact. The 160-space difference between the City's ordinary zoning baseline and the proposed 55-space supply requires a practical answer: where will the vehicles go?

The answer should not be unsupported reliance on Rosemead Boulevard. Residents familiar with the corridor know that legal and usable curb parking is limited by driveways, curb restrictions, bus stops, commercial frontage, visibility concerns, and practical access constraints. Before the Council upholds the approval, the record should include a curb-by-curb inventory of legal parking spaces within the relevant radius, evening and overnight occupancy counts, weekend counts, existing commercial demand, loading analysis, and an enforceable parking and curb-management plan.

The City's own parking rules further demonstrate why street parking should not be treated as an easy solution. Pasadena's permit materials state that overnight parking generally requires a permit between 2 a.m. and 6 a.m.; permits may be denied

if parking is available on-site or within 600 feet; no more than two nighttime and two daytime permits may be issued to one residence; and permitted vehicles must park within 500 feet of the permittee's residence and not in prohibited or painted-curb zones or in front of nonresidential frontage. These restrictions do not create parking capacity. They make it more important for the City to prove capacity before relying on street parking.

The approval record also should not assume that affordable-housing residents will be car-free. That assumption is not fair, accurate, or respectful of future residents. This project includes 34 two-bedroom units and 34 three-bedroom units, making it foreseeable that many residents will be working families. Pasadena's own 2025 income limits show that a three-person household can qualify as low income at \$109,050, and a four-person household can qualify at \$121,150. These are working households, and many working households in Southern California need cars because their jobs, schools, childcare, medical appointments, and family obligations are not always accessible by transit.

The design and site-planning issues also support remand. The staff report acknowledges that the Design Commission asked for further study of massing and the east façade relationship to the single-family residences behind the project. The report states that stepped upper floors were not included because they could reduce unit count and size. The report also notes that an alternative location for the children's and teen's play area could not be achieved other than the proposed location underneath the building due to site constraints and project scope. These are not minor details; they show that the site is being pushed to accommodate a program that has not been adequately reconciled with parking, access, open space, and neighborhood interface.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the City Council:

1. Grant the appeal of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard.
2. Set aside or remand the approval for corrected findings and further review.
3. Require an independent City determination of the project's claimed major-transit-stop eligibility, including the exact stop, measurement method, route-frequency basis, and legal authority.
4. Require a real parking study, including curb-by-curb legal parking inventory, overnight and weekend occupancy counts, visitor/loading needs, and enforcement feasibility.
5. Require an enforceable parking, loading, delivery, rideshare, visitor, construction, and curb-management plan.
6. Require revised findings addressing realistic car ownership for working families and residents of two- and three-bedroom units.
7. Deny or continue the TEFRA/CMFA financing resolution until the appeal issues are resolved and the record is complete.

The City can support affordable housing and still require accurate findings, lawful entitlement determinations, and responsible site planning. This approval should not be upheld on assumptions.

Please include this letter in the administrative record for the appeal and the TEFRA hearing.

Respectfully,

Andreas Koese

. . . Rosemead Blvd

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Gloria Newton >
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 4:04 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Item 12: Support for 600 N Rosemead

[!] **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 City Council:

I am writing today in support of the proposed redevelopment for 600 N. Rosemead Blvd. into affordable housing.

I know that this development has raised very strong emotions on all sides of the issue. One of the prominent emotions that I have observed is that of fear. Residents in the adjacent neighborhood have expressed fears regarding the potential changes this development would bring to the demographic makeup, traffic patterns, and character of the area. Similar fears have been felt and expressed by groups as long as societies have been organized around private property, and these feelings are a powerful motivating force.

I have a different set of fears should this development, and others in the future, be hindered. I am afraid that our homeless population will continue to increase, with even more people camping out on our streets, in our parks, and on our doorsteps, as is the case with the Pasadena business where I work. I am afraid that PUSD will be forced to close even more schools because families who would enroll their children there can't afford to live in our city. This may sound overly dramatic, but I am deeply, deeply afraid that our society will not survive if we cannot see beyond our own individual wants and needs, unwilling to imagine the benefits of acting for the good of others if we perceive that it will require a sacrifice on our part.

I am not a resident of the neighborhood where this development is planned, which to some disqualifies me from having a valid opinion. But what happens in District 4 affects the entire city. Is affordable housing going to always be concentrated in the districts where I've spent my 38 years in Pasadena, continuing unhealthy patterns of economic segregation? Or will we take a different path, one that leads toward social and economic equality, making us stronger and more resilient? Mayor and Council members, I urge you to follow that second path.

I commend the council for the seriousness in which you take this and all issues presented to you. Yours is not an easy job, and I thank you for your service.

Sincerely,
Gloria Newton
District 5, 91106

"Start where you are.
Use what you have.
Do what you can."
--Arthur Ashe

05/18/2026
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Thomas Tai
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 9:04 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Support for Items 12 and 13 5/18/26 meeting

[] **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.

To the Mayor and Members of the Pasadena City Council:

I am writing in support of the staff recommendations for Items 12 and 13 on the May 18, 2026 council agenda. It is vital that we approve financing for these two affordable housing projects and ensure that Pasadena is a reliable and serious partner in addressing the housing crisis.

Your support for affordable housing is greatly needed and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Thomas Tai

05/18/2026
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Rick Jackson
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 9:31 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Agenda items 11 & 12

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

[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.

Advance letter to Council

Subject: Please Grant the Appeal and Continue or Deny TEFRA Approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am writing to request that the City Council **grant the appeal of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard**, set aside or remand the approval, and decline to move forward with TEFRA/CMFA financing approval unless and until the record is corrected.

This letter is not a statement against affordable housing in Pasadena. Affordable housing is needed. The issue before the Council is whether this specific approval should stand when the record does not adequately address the project's transit eligibility, parking demand, street parking capacity, site planning, and operational impacts.

The City's own staff report shows why the appeal should be granted. The project proposes 133 total residential units, consisting of 131 affordable units and two manager units. The unit mix includes 8 studios, 57 one-bedroom units, 34 two-bedroom units, and 34 three-bedroom units. The project provides only 55 parking spaces. The same staff report identifies the City's ordinary zoning-code parking baseline as 215 spaces. The report also states that, because the project is being treated as a 100 percent affordable housing project within one-half mile of a major transit stop, it receives unlimited density, additional height, and no minimum parking requirement under state density-bonus law.

Those facts make the transit and parking issues central to the appeal. The Council should not uphold an approval that depends on major-transit-stop eligibility unless the City has made a clear, independent, publicly reviewable determination identifying the exact qualifying transit stop, the legal measurement method, the current route or regional-plan basis, and the applicable statutory authority. HCD's AB 2097 guidance confirms that major-transit-stop determinations involve specific criteria, including rail or bus rapid transit stations, qualifying intersections of two or more major bus routes with 20-minute-or-less peak service intervals, and regional transportation plan issues. ([Cal HCD](#))

The applicant's own legal submission asserts that the project is within one-half mile of two alleged major transit stops: Foothill/Rosemead and Foothill/Sierra Madre. It also states that proximity to a major transit stop was not within the Design Review Board's purview and related instead to the City's ministerial density-bonus approval. That distinction matters. If the Design Commission did not decide the transit eligibility issue, the Council should not treat the approval as though that issue has been fully resolved.

The parking issue is equally serious. A legal parking exemption does not eliminate real parking demand. The City should not infer from "no minimum parking required" that residents, visitors, caregivers, service providers, delivery vehicles, rideshare vehicles, moving trucks, and guests will have no impact. The 160-

space difference between the City's ordinary zoning baseline and the proposed 55-space supply requires a practical answer: where will the vehicles go?

The answer should not be unsupported reliance on Rosemead Boulevard. Residents familiar with the corridor know that legal and usable curb parking is limited by driveways, curb restrictions, bus stops, commercial frontage, visibility concerns, and practical access constraints. Before the Council upholds the approval, the record should include a curb-by-curb inventory of legal parking spaces within the relevant radius, evening and overnight occupancy counts, weekend counts, existing commercial demand, loading analysis, and an enforceable parking and curb-management plan.

The City's own parking rules further demonstrate why street parking should not be treated as an easy solution. Pasadena's permit materials state that overnight parking generally requires a permit between 2 a.m. and 6 a.m.; permits may be denied if parking is available on-site or within 600 feet; no more than two nighttime and two daytime permits may be issued to one residence; and permitted vehicles must park within 500 feet of the permittee's residence and not in prohibited or painted-curb zones or in front of nonresidential frontage. These restrictions do not create parking capacity. They make it more important for the City to prove capacity before relying on street parking.

The approval record also should not assume that affordable-housing residents will be car-free. That assumption is not fair, accurate, or respectful of future residents. This project includes 34 two-bedroom units and 34 three-bedroom units, making it foreseeable that many residents will be working families. Pasadena's own 2025 income limits show that a three-person household can qualify as low income at \$109,050, and a four-person household can qualify at \$121,150. (City of Pasadena) These are working households, and many working households in Southern California need cars because their jobs, schools, childcare, medical appointments, and family obligations are not always accessible by transit.

The design and site-planning issues also support remand. The staff report acknowledges that the Design Commission asked for further study of massing and the east façade relationship to the single-family residences behind the project. The report states that stepped upper floors were not included because they could reduce unit count and size. The report also notes that an alternative location for the children's and teen's play area could not be achieved other than the proposed location underneath the building due to site constraints and project scope. These are not minor details; they show that the site is being pushed to accommodate a program that has not been adequately reconciled with parking, access, open space, and neighborhood interface.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the City Council:

1. **Grant the appeal** of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard.
2. **Set aside or remand the approval** for corrected findings and further review.
3. Require an independent City determination of the project's claimed major-transit-stop eligibility, including the exact stop, measurement method, route-frequency basis, and legal authority.
4. Require a real parking study, including curb-by-curb legal parking inventory, overnight and weekend occupancy counts, visitor/loading needs, and enforcement feasibility.
5. Require an enforceable parking, loading, delivery, rideshare, visitor, construction, and curb-management plan.
6. Require revised findings addressing realistic car ownership for working families and residents of two- and three-bedroom units.
7. **Deny or continue the TEFRA/CMFA financing resolution** until the appeal issues are resolved and the record is complete.

The City can support affordable housing and still require accurate findings, lawful entitlement determinations, and responsible site planning. This approval should not be upheld on assumptions.

Please include this letter in the administrative record for the appeal and the TEFRA hearing.

Respectfully,

Ricky and Vickie Jackson


Pasadena, Ca 91107

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Laura Ellersieck <
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 3:36 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Hampton, Tyron; Cole, Rick; jljones@cityofpasadena.net; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason
Subject: 5/18 Council agenda item 12. TEFRA hearing for 600 N Rosemead

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from '
<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Learn why this is important at

[] 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.

Honorable Mayor and Council Members

Re: Tax-Exempt bonds for the project at 600 N. Rosemead

Instead of just rubber stamping these requests that seemingly have no financial impact on the City, it might be one piece of the process that could provide some leverage in getting more desirable projects.

According to the Staff Report, "As part of the public hearing, the City Council may also consider whether it is in the public interest and for the public benefit".

Later, under "Policy Consideration", it says "The proposed action is consistent with the City's General Plan - Housing Element and the Five-Year Consolidated Plan. It also supports and promotes the quality of life and the local economy - a goal of the City Council's Strategic Plan."

I contend it is in fact inconsistent with the General Plan because it is inconsistent with the zoning. And in not providing sufficient parking, it degrades the quality of life for the existing population, and lessens what it would otherwise be for the future tenants.

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura Ellersieck
East Eaton Wash Neighborhood

05/18/2026
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: patl
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 8:29 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: ronniepo@gmail.com; Scott Shimamoto; Laura Ellersieck
Subject: May 18 City Counsel Meeting-Support Lower Hastings Ranch Appeal

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

[learn why this is important](#)

[1] **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.

Hi City Counsel,

On Item 12 on the Agenda, I like to request for Public Hearing (TEFRA Hearings) that provides members of the community an opportunity to speak in favor or against the use of the tax-exempt bonds for financing the project. Please record my request for TEFRA Hearings on Item 12 for the Meeting today May 18.

Thank you!


Pat Luangeaktrakul
East Eaton Wash Neighborhood

05/18/2026
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sossy Astourian <
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 8:51 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: smva@group.io
Subject: Oppose the 600 N Rosemead very large apartment.
Attachments: Advance Letter to Council.docx

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

05/18/2026
Item 12

Advance letter to Council

Subject: Please Grant the Appeal and Continue or Deny TEFRA Approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am writing to request that the City Council **grant the appeal of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard**, set aside or remand the approval, and decline to move forward with TEFRA/CMFA financing approval unless and until the record is corrected.

This letter is not a statement against affordable housing in Pasadena. Affordable housing is needed. The issue before the Council is whether this specific approval should stand when the record does not adequately address the project's transit eligibility, parking demand, street parking capacity, site planning, and operational impacts.

The City's own staff report shows why the appeal should be granted. The project proposes 133 total residential units, consisting of 131 affordable units and two manager units. The unit mix includes 8 studios, 57 one-bedroom units, 34 two-bedroom units, and 34 three-bedroom units. The project provides only 55 parking spaces. The same staff report identifies the City's ordinary zoning-code parking baseline as 215 spaces. The report also states that, because the project is being treated as a 100 percent affordable housing project within one-half mile of a major transit stop, it receives unlimited density, additional height, and no minimum parking requirement under state density-bonus law.

Those facts make the transit and parking issues central to the appeal. The Council should not uphold an approval that depends on major-transit-stop eligibility unless the City has made a clear, independent, publicly reviewable determination identifying the exact qualifying transit stop, the legal measurement method, the current route or regional-plan basis, and the applicable statutory authority. HCD's AB 2097 guidance confirms that major-transit-stop determinations involve specific criteria, including rail or bus rapid transit stations, qualifying intersections of two or more major bus routes with 20-minute-or-less peak service intervals, and regional transportation plan issues. (Cal HCD)

The applicant's own legal submission asserts that the project is within one-half mile of two alleged major transit stops: Foothill/Rosemead and Foothill/Sierra Madre. It also states that proximity to a major transit stop was not within the Design Review Board's purview and related instead to the City's ministerial density-bonus approval. That distinction matters. If the Design Commission did not decide the transit eligibility issue, the Council should not treat the approval as though that issue has been fully resolved.

The parking issue is equally serious. A legal parking exemption does not eliminate real parking demand. The City should not infer from "no minimum parking required" that residents, visitors, caregivers, service providers, delivery vehicles, rideshare vehicles, moving trucks, and guests

will have no impact. The 160-space difference between the City's ordinary zoning baseline and the proposed 55-space supply requires a practical answer: where will the vehicles go?

The answer should not be unsupported reliance on Rosemead Boulevard. Residents familiar with the corridor know that legal and usable curb parking is limited by driveways, curb restrictions, bus stops, commercial frontage, visibility concerns, and practical access constraints. Before the Council upholds the approval, the record should include a curb-by-curb inventory of legal parking spaces within the relevant radius, evening and overnight occupancy counts, weekend counts, existing commercial demand, loading analysis, and an enforceable parking and curb-management plan.

The City's own parking rules further demonstrate why street parking should not be treated as an easy solution. Pasadena's permit materials state that overnight parking generally requires a permit between 2 a.m. and 6 a.m.; permits may be denied if parking is available on-site or within 600 feet; no more than two nighttime and two daytime permits may be issued to one residence; and permitted vehicles must park within 500 feet of the permittee's residence and not in prohibited or painted-curb zones or in front of nonresidential frontage. These restrictions do not create parking capacity. They make it more important for the City to prove capacity before relying on street parking.

The approval record also should not assume that affordable-housing residents will be car-free. That assumption is not fair, accurate, or respectful of future residents. This project includes 34 two-bedroom units and 34 three-bedroom units, making it foreseeable that many residents will be working families. Pasadena's own 2025 income limits show that a three-person household can qualify as low income at \$109,050, and a four-person household can qualify at \$121,150. (City of Pasadena) These are working households, and many working households in Southern California need cars because their jobs, schools, childcare, medical appointments, and family obligations are not always accessible by transit.

The design and site-planning issues also support remand. The staff report acknowledges that the Design Commission asked for further study of massing and the east façade relationship to the single-family residences behind the project. The report states that stepped upper floors were not included because they could reduce unit count and size. The report also notes that an alternative location for the children's and teen's play area could not be achieved other than the proposed location underneath the building due to site constraints and project scope. These are not minor details; they show that the site is being pushed to accommodate a program that has not been adequately reconciled with parking, access, open space, and neighborhood interface.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the City Council:

1. **Grant the appeal** of the Design Commission approval for 600 N. Rosemead Boulevard.
2. **Set aside or remand the approval** for corrected findings and further review.
3. Require an independent City determination of the project's claimed major-transit-stop eligibility, including the exact stop, measurement method, route-frequency basis, and legal authority.

4. Require a real parking study, including curb-by-curb legal parking inventory, overnight and weekend occupancy counts, visitor/loading needs, and enforcement feasibility.
5. Require an enforceable parking, loading, delivery, rideshare, visitor, construction, and curb-management plan.
6. Require revised findings addressing realistic car ownership for working families and residents of two- and three-bedroom units.
7. **Deny or continue the TEFRA/CMFA financing resolution** until the appeal issues are resolved and the record is complete.

The City can support affordable housing and still require accurate findings, lawful entitlement determinations, and responsible site planning. This approval should not be upheld on assumptions.

Please include this letter in the administrative record for the appeal and the TEFRA hearing.

Respectfully,

[Name]

[Address or Neighborhood]

[Email]

[Phone, optional]