

Molinar, Tess

From: mgtTeam@LC-MR.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2020 8:46 AM
To: Moran, Katherine; Molinar, Tess
Cc: Pelayo, Rodrigo; Johnson, Kevin; Renee Pierson (blackphoot@yahoo.com); Martha Little; Janet Whaley (janet1860@charter.net); Anne Davis (annevdavis@gmail.com)
Subject: Comments on Pasadena Hearing Officer Special Meeting, June 17, 2020, Agenda Item # 2.C: TTM #82693: 351 Adena Street – Council District #3 with attachment
Attachments: PickelChilkCommentsOnTTM82693 signed.pdf

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Comments on Pasadena Hearing Officer Special Meeting, June 17, 2020, with attachment, Agenda Item #2.C: TTM #82693: 351 Adena Street – Council District #3
Tentative Tract Map: To allow the creation of nine air parcels on one land lot for residential condominium purposes. This is for the creation of air parcels only.

Honorable Alex Garcia:

In the attached PDF letter are alternative recommendations and detailed comments of 341 Adena residents on process oversights, air rights, and unaddressed environmental concerns for the June 17 hearing.

Commenter's Recommendations on Agenda Item 2.C TTM #82693

- 1) Suspend determination of findings that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects), and re-open CEQA review for appeals in Consolidated Design Review in Case #PLN2019-00148 and TTM #82693; and
- 2) Do not approve the Tentative Tract Map with conditions until CEQA findings can be appealed and reviewed in this TTM #82693 and Case #PLN2019-00148

Regards,
Frederick H. Pickel

mgtTeam@LC-MR.com

341 Adena St.
Pasadena, California 91104

Mailing address:
PO Box 92314
Pasadena, CA 91109-2314
Home office 323-937-7920
Cell 818-519-3456

Carol Chilk
Frederick H. Pickel
341 Adena Street
Pasadena, CA 91104
mgtTeam@LC-MR.com
Tel. 323-937-7920

July 17, 2020

Attention: Katherine Moran, Tess Molinar
Planning & Community Development Dept.
Planning Division, Current Planning Section
175 North Garfield Ave
Pasadena, CA 91101
Tel. 626-744-8740
kmoran@cityofpasadena.net
tmolinar@cityofpasadena.net

Comments on Pasadena Hearing Officer Special Meeting, June 17, 2020,
Agenda Item #2.C: **TTM #82693: 351 Adena Street - Council District #3**

Tentative Tract Map: To allow the creation of nine air parcels on one land lot for residential condominium purposes. This is for the creation of air parcels only.

Honorable Alex Garcia:

Following are alternative recommendations and detailed comments of 341 Adena residents on process oversights, air rights, and unaddressed environmental concerns for the June 17 hearing.

Commenter's Recommendations on Agenda Item 2.C TTM #82693

- 1) Suspend determination of findings that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects), and re-open CEQA review for appeals in Consolidated Design Review in Case #PLN2019-00148 and TTM #82693; and
- 2) Do not approve the Tentative Tract Map with conditions until CEQA findings can be appealed and reviewed in this TTM #82693 and Case #PLN2019-00148

Process oversights

We don't believe due process was delivered in this case on environmental review because of covid-19 closures, state and local emergency declarations and lack of response to specific information requests that blocked access to documents essential to filing an appeal to the March 11 decision letter on the Consolidated Design Review Case #PLN2019-00148 ("March 11 Letter"), as follows:

1. On March 11, I received a copy of the March 11 Letter by email, and the same day asked via email for access to the associated project plans. This is part of a series of emails requesting this information.
2. On March 17, I called and left a voicemail for Rodrigo Pelayo, asking for a time to see the plans associated with the 351 Adena development and March 11 proposed decision letter. I noted in my voicemail that I am in the class of vulnerable persons for covid-19, but wanted to find a way to see the materials and respond prior to the 10 day deadline on appeals.
3. On March 18, Mayor Tornek announced the closing of the Permit Center. And I never received call, email, or letter responding to my voicemail asking for access to the plans or informing us that the appeal period would NOT be extended because of these emergency declarations.
4. On June 10, I emailed Rodrigo Pelayo and others asking again to see the site plan information for the proposed redevelopment. No answer was received until June 15, an hour after I received electronic links to the plans from the contact person for this hearing, less than 48 hours before comments were due.

For these reasons, we request that the TTM #82693 decision and the March 11 Letter along with the environmental review remain open and/or be re-opened for appeal, reconsideration, and modification, especially given the potential Brown Act and CPRA concerns by the lack of access to information relevant to the review and appeal of the March 11 Letter and the bearing of the March 11 Letter on the actions proposed for this TTM #82693.

Air rights

We are under the impression that air parcels are typically associated with mixed use developments or large multi-family developments. We'd like to understand why they

are proposed for a small residential project. In some cases, air parcels have been used to obviate the need for a condominium association. That would be a cause for concern for neighbors and residents alike. As neighbors, it is in our best interest to have a central entity to handle disputes (such as maintenance of the 18" strip and new retaining wall between the west edge of the development and our eastern property line). It would also be in everyone's best interest to have an organization that can mediate disputes between owner-occupied units and those with absentee landlords (with long or short term rentals). To ensure good governance and prevent abuses (such as uncontrolled Air BNB rentals), we would not support actions which might preclude the creation of a condominium owner's association.

Unaddressed environmental issues

Although we understand that environmental matters may not be addressed in tomorrow's hearing, we dispute that due process was observed in the matter of environmental review and we would like to use this opportunity to address our specific environmental concerns and grievances.

Now that we have been given a single day in which to review the 31 page detailed project plans associated with TTM#82693 and the March 11 Letter, without the benefit of any experts or professionals of our own, we conclude that we do have several concerns related to health, noise, air and light pollution that deserve consideration and a response. We suspect additional issues might surface if given time to solicit input from our neighborhood association. At a minimum they are as follows:

1. Noise and air pollution: By moving the driveway from the east to the west side of the property, a private road for 18 cars will be created, directly next to our property, that didn't previously exist. The noise and pollution from these cars will be funneled into a narrow channel rather than the open parking lot that currently exists. The increase in proximity to pollution from reorienting traffic from the property from east to west remains a fundamental and serious design flaw that we'd like to see addressed.
2. Noise pollution: The gates that will be installed next to our property from the new driveway exit will generate incremental noise from opening and closing at all hours of the day and night. Please provide more information on the type of gate that will be used and some reassurance about how noiseless it will be.
3. Noise pollution: It's not easy for amateurs like us to find the location of the air conditioner condensers on these plans. They are typically noisy. Can someone

please help us locate the condensers for Building 2 and reassure us that they will not add to the noise that the property will generate.

4. Light pollution: It appears that there are quite a few lights on the far west side of the buildings that will potentially create light pollution for our property. It's unclear how they will be aimed and shielded. What their collective impact will be on our property and adjoining properties at night. Please provide reassurance on this point.
5. Air pollution from demolition and construction: We don't see any specific mitigations for dust, vermin and - especially, asbestos - other than some generalities about health in the building standards code mandatory measures. Please elaborate on how these issues will be handled and what type of oversight will be provided to ensure compliance. In addition, please address specifically how vermin control from demolition will be handled without adverse impact on neighborhood and wildlife like squirrels and birds.
6. Health impacts: Please address where garbage receptacles will be located and ensure that they are not along the western border with our property. What arrangements will be made to ensure that none are "unofficially" located there by residents (a current problem)?
7. Health and safety impacts: The 18" strip between the new western retaining wall of the project and our property line can become a hazard if not properly maintained (i.e. with weed and trash abatement). Please help us understand how that strip will be accessed (unclear from the diagrams) and where maintenance responsibility will lie, especially if there are problem with the retaining wall design or there is damage to this new retaining wall.
8. Neighborhood safety: Vacant lots and construction sites, as we know from experiences in other parts of N. Pasadena, are subject to vagrancy, vandalism and fire. There are already enough problems with trash burning, fireworks and other public hazards from these sources. Please address what additional security measures will be brought to bear to keep neighbors safe.
9. Historic property impacts: Please address risk for damage to 341 Adena - a landmarked property - in terms of the potential damage from construction dirt, dust and asbestos to paint and architectural fixtures, and from excavation to shifting earth which can cause cracking and sticking doors in all the structures (garage, driveway walls, cement block wall and house). Please include an explanation for any contentions that there are no risks, or what mitigations or

remediations will be offered to address these possible risks. The site plans do not correctly show the outline and position of 341 Adena versus the new buildings at 351 Adena, especially the eastern most upper floors of the Landmarked 341 Adena.

10. Historic preservation: While this site's Adena Cottage at 361 Adena was denied Landmark status primarily because "it lacks architectural integrity due to substantial fire damage in the 1960"¹, however, substantial portions of the front of this 1885 house² and some of the interior retain their historical character. It is one of a diminishing number of 1880's houses in Pasadena. Some effort should be made to incorporate all or some of the original historic elements of the Adena Cottage into the development. If the City determines this is infeasible, and the Adena Cottage is to be totally demolished, the notable interior and exterior elements, including door hinges and hardware, fireplace tile, and overmantel, should be made available to Pasadena-based architectural salvage dealers.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations, concerns, and issues.

Regards,



¹ Agenda Report by the City Manager to City Council, Designation of 361 Adena Street as a Landmark, February 27, 2006, page 1. http://ww2.cityofpasadena.net/councilagendas/2006%20agendas/Apr_24_06/6B.pdf

² The 361 Adena's age has been misstated 1904 in the March 11 Letter. See the Agenda Report by the City Manager to City Council, Designation of 341 Adena Street as a Landmark, January 23, 2006, Exhibit 1. Further evidence is available to support a pre-1888 age for 361 Adena. http://ww2.cityofpasadena.net/councilagendas/2006%20agendas/Jan_23_06/6B.pdf