

## Varsh, Tess

---

**From:** Pattyl Aposhian [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 5, 2021 12:59 PM  
**To:** Driver, Jennifer; PublicComment-AutoResponse; Jomsky, Mark; Mermell, Steve  
**Subject:** Public Comment for 35 N Lake Futures Academy Hearing 5/5/21

**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. [Learn more...](#)

May 5, 2021

Dear Planning Commission and Pasadena Leadership,

As a long-time resident of Pasadena, a passionate and committed contributor to the City of Pasadena community, a local property owner, and a mother, I am writing to object to the Conditional Use Permit and Variance for Futures Academy, at 35 N. Lake Avenue.

In addition to all the reasons for denial of the Conditional Use Permit and Variance eloquently stated in the Staff Report, with which I concur, I wish to make the following points.

First, 35 N. Lake Avenue is an unsuitable building for a school. This building is a commercial office building, with dozens of tenants who use the building for commercial office purposes.

- This building has no outside space for children to utilize.
- This building has no separate entrance lobby for children.
- This building has no designated drop-off area for children or nearby parking for waiting parents.
- This building offers NONE of the ancillary physical amenities a “school” has and that our children need.
- This building offers none of the additional security and screening measures our children need.

This is not a suitable building in which to locate a school.

As the State of California and the City of Pasadena has wisely required, children need outdoor spaces, areas for study and solitude, areas for student support and counseling, security and screening, and common areas for student use.

None of these are present at 35 N Lake Ave.

This casual treatment of our most vulnerable and “at risk” demographic – our youth – is an insult to them, an affront to my values as a parent and risks a number of poor outcomes for our children.

Second, Futures Academy is not a “school.”

At best, Futures Academy is a tutoring center. Its website talks extensively about its 1:1 teacher – student ratio. It talks about part-time programs. It talks about how Futures Academy “doesn’t look like a “normal” school.” This is because it is not a “school.”

And while its website mentions WASC accreditation, WASC is not state agency but a private entity that also accredits supplementary educational programs, online schools and non-degree granting programs. WASC accreditation does not make a school a “school.”

Please do not be misled.

Third, the entire area around 35 N Lake Avenue is an unfit area for children. In addition to many nearby commercial office buildings and busy intersections, there are a number of restaurants, bars and liquor stores in the area. There is even a cannabis dispensary within 600’ of this proposed location. The City of Pasadena made a clear decision to keep cannabis away from children, so shouldn’t the reverse also apply? We should and we must keep schools away from cannabis.

Last, as a local property owner, issuing a CUP to Futures Academy is not only in conflict with the goals of the General Plan and the proper land uses in the area, as the Staff Report clearly sets out, it would also potentially raise environmental and CEQA issues, potentially limit the uses of any number of adjacent properties going forward, diminishing their value and changing the character of this commercial neighborhood (as this “school,” if permitted, may become a “sensitive receptor” for those uses in an area where it should not be permitted in the first place).

For all of the foregoing reasons I object to the Conditional Use Permit and Variance for Futures Academy, at 35 N. Lake Avenue.

In Common Cause,

Pattyl Kasparian