



P.O. Box 4173 Glendale CA 91202  
[www.GlendaleHistorical.org](http://www.GlendaleHistorical.org)

April 10, 2023

Re: (Agenda Item 9a) re: Public Hearing on Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of Design Review Case No. PDR-000838-2023 located at 1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue

Dear Mayor Brotman and Members of the Glendale City Council:

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed development slated at 1642 South Central.

The Glendale Historical Society (TGHS) respectfully requests that you deny the appeal of the applicant and affirm HPC's unanimous decision to reject demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue, an undisputed historic resource. This property, built in 1913, is one of the last historic Craftsman bungalows in the Tropico section of Glendale.

TGHS believes that a clear balance between preserving a historic resource and gaining additional housing can be made. The EIR outlined two alternatives that preserved the historic resource. Alternative 2 called for reduced density and allowed for the historic resource to be moved on the lot to allow for a total of 15 units. Alternative 3 also called for reduced density, for the resource to remain in place, and allowed for a total of 11 units.

TGHS is painfully aware that new housing is needed and has supported new development that incorporates existing historic resources. Harrower is an excellent example of that collaborative effort. Either Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 would meet all of the project goals. Moreover, both would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact that would result from the demolition of 1642 South Central. TGHS would support either alternative.

The Glendale Historical Society (TGHS) advocates for the preservation of important Glendale landmarks, supports maintaining the historic character of Glendale's neighborhoods, educates the public about and engages the community in celebrating and preserving Glendale's history and architectural heritage, and operates the Doctors House Museum. TGHS is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization, and donations to TGHS are tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

To date, no documentation has been provided to show that either of the alternatives are not economically feasible. The threshold for infeasibility is not that one or all of the stated alternatives are more expensive or less profitable, than the proposal to demolish the historic resource. The expectation is that if any documentation regarding feasibility is presented to the city, an independent review will occur and the final analysis will be publicly available.

Lastly, TGHS is concerned about the precedent that would be set if demolition is approved for this historic resource. The developer for 1624 South Central has admitted that he purchased the property with full knowledge that the dwelling was historic and that he planned to demolish it. If City Council were to allow this to happen, it would send a message to other developers that they would be given approval as well.

Glendale recognized the importance of Craftsman properties when it commissioned a survey in 2007. Since then, a number of properties have been demolished. In fact, there are three that are currently proposed for demolition (not including 1624 South Central) and will be heard at the April 11th City Council Meeting.

We believe that it is important to preserve Glendale's historic Craftsman homes. Incorporating this historic resource into a smaller, well integrated housing development is a win-win. This is currently being done with another historic Craftsman on Kenwood Ave.

Demolishing 1624 South Central and forgoing the opportunity to create a unique housing development for another cookie cutter mid rise housing structure that will blend into all of the others that have been recently built, would be a lost opportunity.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Schwab-Sims", written over a light gray rectangular background.

John Schwab-Sims  
President  
The Glendale Historical Society

cc: Suzie Abajian, City Clerk  
Roubik Golanian, City Manager  
Bradley Calvert, Director of Community Development  
Jay Platt, Senior Urban Designer

Catherine Jurca  
Glendale, CA

April 8, 2023

The Honorable Mayor Brotman and Members of the City Council  
City of Glendale  
via email

RE: Agenda Item 9b, Appeal of Project at 1642 S. Central Ave.

Dear Mayor Brotman and City Council Members:

Please deny the appeal of the Historic Preservation Commission's unanimous decision to reject demolition of the historic Craftsman at this address. The HPC instructed the applicants to prepare a revised project under alternative 3 of the EIR.

The HPC carefully considered this Project and discussed and deliberated for approximately 3.5 hours over two hearings. If you want to understand the problems with the EIR and the project, you should focus on the first HPC hearing on January 19, 2023. The Staff Report ends at about 1.18.00, and questions and discussion begin then. I don't understand why the Council Staff Report covers only the second hearing, in February, because the discussion was more robust at the January hearing, given that the applicant returned with the exact same project at the February meeting.

I think (and I said) that Staff is doing the city a disservice by not recommending approval of a project alternative. The bottom line is that Council *cannot approve the project* and would need to choose an alternative. I also have concerns about the EIR, which I outline below.

### **Alternative 3 Reduces Environmental Impacts and Is Feasible**

At the January hearing I brought up section 21001 of the Public Resources Code that deals with a local agency's obligation to choose an alternative that substantially reduces environmental impacts if it is feasible.

The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.

Contrary to the impression in the April 11 Staff Report (p. 15), I am familiar with the rest of this section of the PRC, and we discussed it at the hearing: "The Legislature further finds and declares that in the event specific economic, social, or other conditions, make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The applicant states in the appeal that Alternative #3 “is NOT economically feasible.” The Staff Report, in suggesting that Council could approve the project, states:

Here, the applicant has indicated they have specific evidence supporting why development of Alternative #3 would be economically infeasible, even though Alternative #3 would preserve the historic resource (p. 15).

But there is no evidence to support the claim of economic infeasibility. None was presented to the HPC, and none is produced here. The fact that an alternative is more expensive or less profitable is not sufficient to show that the alternative is infeasible. *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. County of Santa Barbara (Goleta I)* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167 held that a record that included no analysis of the comparative costs, profits, or economic benefits of a scaled-down project alternative was insufficient to support findings of economic infeasibility. And in *Preservation Action Council v. City of San Jose* (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1336, the Court reiterated that evidence presented by an applicant as to claimed infeasibility of an alternative must be independently analyzed by the lead agency. Further, in *Uphold Our Heritage v. Town of Woodside* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 587, the Court ruled that a project applicant’s “willingness...to accept a feasible alternative” is not a measure of feasibility: “To define feasible [in this way] would render CEQA meaningless.”

Furthermore, alternative #3 meets *all* of the project goals, which are:

- 1) Contribute to the health of the City through an economically viable infill project that would provide an increase in residential units to help meet housing demand in the City and better meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements for the region.
- 2) Construct a new multi-family residential building with new architectural designs and energy efficient building systems that promote energy conservation that furthers the City’s policy goals expressed in the Greener Glendale Plan.
- 3) Provide new residential opportunities that offer multi-modal opportunities taking advantage of the close proximity to Larry Zarian Transportation Center.
- 4) Enhance the general welfare of the public by offering affordable housing opportunities and help meet the City’s affordable housing goals and needs outlined in the City’s Housing Element.
- 5) Develop new residential opportunities close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale.

As there is no evidence that the alternative is infeasible, and it meets not only many but all of the project goals, and it obviously substantially reduces environmental impacts by retaining the historic Craftsman house in its original location, Council cannot approve the project.

### **Problems with the EIR**

The HPC did not take lightly its decision to vote against certification of the EIR, even as we supported a project redesign in line with Alternative 3.

An EIR is required to disclose impacts and mitigate or avoid those impacts where feasible. To that end, an EIR is required to study *feasible* project alternatives. And, as I

have pointed out, the public agency should not approve a project when, as in this case, there is a feasible alternative that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of a project.

The HPC questioned whether the alternatives are actually feasible; if not, then the EIR cannot be certified, because it must study *feasible* alternatives. The Project was supposed to be heard in December 2022, and it got pushed back to January 2023. The only change between the Staff Reports was that Alternatives 2 and 3 were suddenly described as “approximately” 15 and 11 units, and other language was added in each case to indicate that “the unit count...is likely to be lower” (this language remains in the final HPC Staff Report, February 16, 2023, pp. 6-7). During questions staff stated that they do not expect the projects to be able to accommodate the number of units stated in the alternatives but could not clearly explain why. This is important because if the unit count is “likely” to be less than 15 or 11 units, then those do not qualify as “feasible” alternatives and would not meet the requirement that an EIR study feasible alternatives. The Council Staff Report has eliminated the “likely to be lower” language but still leaves the unit count as “approximate” (pp. 7 – 8).

Staff stated that the applicant is not required to provide detailed plans for the alternatives. That is true, but the EIR needs to study a project alternative in sufficient detail to know whether it is actually feasible.

The EIR also requires identification of an “environmentally superior alternative” to the project (beyond the “no project” option). Staff chose alternative 2, which moves the Craftsman on the lot, as the environmentally superior alternative, even though alternative 3 would leave the Craftsman where it has been for the last 110 years. The HPC thought this was ridiculous. Staff claim that they chose alternative 2 because it also meets more of the project objectives (because it provides more units), but that is NOT what “environmentally superior” means. It means the fewest environmental impacts.

While it is true as stated in the Council Staff Report, that I “was troubled that the noise/vibration consultants were not available during the second meeting” (p. 12), it neglects to mention that I was equally upset by the fact that they were nowhere to be found during the first meeting, or that I had specifically requested that someone capable of answering our questions come to the next hearing. As the environmental review authority for this project, the HPC should not have to beg for access to people who can explain the findings in the EIR.

I urge you to watch the consultants from SCWA try to answer questions at the January hearing, which begins around 2 hours 48 minutes. They were so hopeless that Dennis Joe finally had to explain that they were just the people who peer-reviewed the EIR. I am indeed “troubled” that the peer reviewers did not seem to understand and certainly could not explain the noise/vibration impacts. Surely, they have to understand what they are reviewing or they do not qualify as peers?!

I and the other commissioners are certainly not experts in noise and vibration impacts, which is why it is so important that people are available who can answer questions.

The reason that the draft EIR had to be amended and recirculated is because the noise/vibration consultant had not noticed that there is a residence (an ADU) within three feet of the property line! That omission hardly inspires confidence. I was concerned about the vibration impacts to this building, as well as to the commercial building to the east, which is five feet from the property line; the owner of that building showed up at both hearings to express his concerns. The people from SWCA simply could not explain the analysis or the feasibility or adequacy of the proposed mitigation to protect these buildings.

The Draft EIR includes the following mitigation measure: "Heavy equipment similar to that of bulldozers shall not be used within 5 feet of any existing neighboring structure" (p. 66). That mitigation measure is removed from the Final EIR, even though there is a building that we now know to be within closer than five feet from the property line. Isn't it more necessary now?

Similarly, this language appears in the Draft EIR, but is not to be found in the Final EIR:

It is assumed that all activities associated with demolition of the existing buildings and construction of the new buildings within 5 feet of any existing nearby buildings would be carried out using hand tools and any large equipment such as a dump truck to carry debris away would remain more than 5 feet from the existing buildings...

It is expected that with the incorporation of standard construction best practices, such as the use of hand tools as equipment for demolition work within 5 feet of existing structures, building damage would not occur. (Draft EIR, p. 65).

It seems as though, with the discovery a building less than five feet from the property line, the "assumptions" about best practices and how to avoid damage to these buildings were eliminated. But are they less true now? Why is this language gone, and what does it mean for adjacent property owners?

The HPC did succeed in getting staff to remove language from the Mitigation Measures that proposed mitigating various noise and vibration impacts "where feasible." Far from being "minor clarifications" (Staff Report, April 11, 2023, p. 22), these changes were crucial to avoiding "impermissibly vague" mitigation (*Sierra Watch v. County of Placer* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 86). If mitigation only happens "where feasible," then impacts may, in fact, not be mitigated. But I believe staff wrongfully claim that mitigation of vibration impacts is not improperly deferred (p. 12):

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 requires a Vibration Analysis Refinement: "Once the specific construction equipment list becomes available, potential vibration damage distance contours shall be refined."

Staff state that

the CEQA Guidelines (as amended in 2018) acknowledge [that] mitigation measures may specify performance standards for mitigating a significant impact when it is impractical or infeasible to specify the specific details of mitigation

during the EIR review process, provided the lead agency commits to implement the mitigation, adopts the specified performance standard, and identifies the types of actions that may achieve compliance with the performance standard. 14 Cal Code Regs §15126.4(a)(1)(B).

Vibration Analysis Refinement is not considered deferred mitigation here because the analysis is required to be completed as part of the Building & Safety plan check review, and the project proponent is required to monitor construction activities in order to avoid or reduce any potential project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the property owner is required to submit the construction vibration monitoring plan to the City for approval (pp. 12-13).

But there is no reason why the “construction equipment list” cannot be identified, and if there are expected differences in equipment, then the mitigation should specify that the equipment with the least vibration shall be used. Why is it “impractical or infeasible to specify the details” here? And it is not a performance standard to say that the project proponent is required “to monitor construction activities to reduce any potential project-related construction vibration damage...and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired.” Monitoring to “document and repair” damage is not mitigation.

There is way too little information about what is required to go into a Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan (M-NO-2). This information should be available—certainly to the adjacent property owners!—before project approval not after.

### **The Housing Element**

To be clear, Alternatives 2 and 3 likewise “assist with citywide housing goals 1 and 3” which include:

Goal 1: A city with a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of current and future residents.

- Policy 1.2: Maintain adequate capacity to accommodate the City’s unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for all income categories throughout the planning period.

- Policy 1.3: Promote the dispersion of affordable housing throughout the City while recognizing the potential for the integration of market rate and affordable units within individual projects.

- Policy 1.4: Encourage higher-density residential development in proximity to public transportation, jobs, services, and activity centers.

Goal 3: A city with increased opportunities for affordable and special needs housing development.

- Policy 3.2: Promote the development of extremely low, very low, low and moderate income housing by allowing developers density bonuses or other financial incentives for providing units for low and moderate income residents. The unit mix and location of affordable housing units in density bonus projects must be approved by the City and included in an affordable housing agreement (p. 16)

## Conclusion

In 1977 Glendale became one of the first local jurisdictions in California to adopt a Historic Preservation Element of its General Plan. Glendale has since recognized the special importance of the Craftsman style—and concerns about its disappearance from our housing stock—when it undertook to survey the remaining Craftsman properties in multi-family areas of Glendale in a 2007 Survey. Since then, dozens of Craftsman homes included in that survey have been demolished. The supply continues to dwindle; indeed, *three more Craftsman-style houses analyzed in the 2007 Craftsman Survey are proposed for demolition under Agenda Item 9a.*

Fewer than 4 percent of properties in South Glendale have been identified as historic resources; these are not a grave impediment to increasing our housing supply. Glendale needs to preserve its most important examples of the Craftsman style if its commitment to historic preservation, which is expressed throughout policy documents and the Municipal Code, is to mean anything. The Staff Report ably indicates the historic value of this 1913 Craftsman property as an “increasingly rare example of early residential development in Tropic” and “an excellent example of the style” (p. 3). The house is in need of restoration, but it could be a remarkable centerpiece of a new, smaller housing project, which is essentially what the HPC asked for. It is unfortunate that the owner, knowing that he was purchasing a historic property (as he acknowledged in response to a question from Chair Chris Cragnotti), did not see the possibility of a project that honors Glendale’s past and looks to the future. I ask you to do that by denying the appeal of a project that would demolish this historic property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Catherine Jurca*

Cc: Suzie Abajian, City Clerk  
Jay Platt, Senior Urban Designer  
Dennis Joe, Senior Planner

P: (626) 381-9248  
F: (626) 389-5414  
E: [info@mitschsailaw.com](mailto:info@mitschsailaw.com)



**Mitchell M. Tsai**  
Attorney At Law

139 South Hudson Avenue  
Suite 200  
Pasadena, California 91101

---

**VIA E-MAIL**

April 10, 2023

City Council  
City of Glendale  
633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103  
Glendale, CA 91206  
Em: [Sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:Sabajian@glendaleca.gov)

**RE: Agenda Item No. 9b: 1642 S. Central Avenue Project**

Dear Mayor Brotman and Honorable Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Southwest Mountain States Regional Council of Carpenters (“**Southwest Mountain States Carpenters**” or “**SWMSRCC**”), my Office is submitting these comments for the City of Glendale’s (“**City**”) April 11, 2023, City Council meeting to support the denial of the 1642 S. Central Avenue Project (“**Project**”).

The Southwest Mountain States Carpenters is a labor union representing 63,000 union carpenters in 10 states, including California, and has a strong interest in well-ordered land use planning and in addressing the environmental impacts of development projects.

As SWMSRCC noted in its January 19 and February 15 comment letters, the Environmental Impact Report (“**EIR**”) for the Project is insufficient in several respects. First, the EIR fails to mitigate noise sources elevated above the ground level as construction of the 5-story building progresses. EIR at 1-6. Such failure is particularly disconcerting given that the EIR recognizes that the Project will have significant noise impacts.

Additionally, the EIR fails to specify whether the Project will be compliant with the 2022 Green Building Code electric vehicle requirements for new multifamily dwellings and uses an outdated model to determine air quality impacts. EIR at 2-26. Thus, the EIR fails to represent the latest scientific and factual data and regulatory requirements.

Finally, as recognized by the Historic Preservation Commission during its February 16, 2023 meeting, the Project has significant and unavoidable historical resource impacts stemming from its proposed demolition of the existing house located at 1642 S. Central Ave., a building of historical significance which dates back to 1913.

In sum, SWMSRCC reiterates its opposition to the Project and supports denial of this appeal. If the City has any questions or concerns, feel free to contact my Office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Talia Nimmer", written over a horizontal line.

Talia Nimmer

Attorneys for Southwest Mountain

States Regional Council of Carpenters

**FRANCESCA SMITH**

April 10, 2022

Mayor Daniel Brotman and City Council Members  
Glendale City Hall  
633 East Broadway  
Glendale, CA 91206  
Sent via e-mail

**RE: April 11, 2023 City Council Agenda Item 9. b.  
Community Development, Public Hearing on Appeal of Historic Preservation  
Commission's denial of Design Review Case No. PDR-000838-2023 located at 1642  
South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue**

Dear Mayor Brotman and Council members Kassakhian, Devine, Asatryan and Najarian:

This letter is being sent on behalf of my family as well as Glendale Residents Against Environmental Destruction (GRAED). Please do not vote to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the 1642 S. Central Avenue Project. Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations because of significant and unavoidable project impacts from (i) the demolition of the existing historic resource at 1642 S. Central Avenue, and (ii) construction generated noise and vibration impacts, and making findings in support thereof; and adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program would disregard California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements.

Given that the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the project demonstrates that there are two feasible preservation alternatives that would incorporate the 1642 S. Central Avenue building into a residential development, approval of the project as proposed would violate the substantive mandate of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). According to CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives *and* would avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)). Two of the proposed alternatives under consideration would feasibly attain the fundamental project objectives as well as avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant impacts on a historical resource.

**Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative**

The 1642 South Central Avenue Project FEIR describes the Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative (Alternative 2). It

would move the existing historic resource located at 1642 South Central Avenue to another location on the Project site. Similar to the Project it would require the demolition of 1608 Gardena Avenue and the existing garage. This Alternative would reduce the Project size from 31 units to 15 residential units, including 11 market-rate and 4 very

low-income units, and a subterranean garage with eight parking spaces. The new development would be located on the southern portion of the site. The Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative would largely preserve the on-site location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of the historic building at 1642 South Central Avenue. This Alternative would change the property's on-site setting by introducing new construction on the parcel, however there is requirement under CEQA to maintain all aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service. In addition, the broader setting of the property has been deeply compromised from the original single-family residential character. Therefore, it would eliminate the significant impact related to historic resources (emphasis added, page 1-6; note the unit allotment has been updated to 14 market-rate and one very low-income affordable unit).

The historical resource is a duplex, so two units would be either part of the 15 described or the alternative would result in 17 total units. It is unclear as described.

### **Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative**

The FEIR for the 1642 South Central Avenue Project described the Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative (Alternative 3) as retaining

the 1642 South Central Avenue duplex in its existing location on the project site, demolish 1608 Gardena Avenue and the existing garage, and build 11 residential units on the remaining site area. The new construction would include 11 residential units, including eight market-rate and 3 very low-income units, and a subterranean garage with eight parking spaces would be constructed on the southern portion of the site in a variety of layouts and sizes.

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would keep the 1642 South Central Avenue residential building in its existing location, demolish 1608 Gardena Avenue and the existing garage, and build 11 new residential units on the remaining site area instead of 31 units. The 11 residential units would include 8 market-rate and 3 very low-income units. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would include a single level subterranean garage with eight parking spaces. The Alternative would be constructed on the southern portion of the site.

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would largely preserve the on-site location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of the historic building at 1642 South Central Avenue. This Alternative would change the property's on-site setting by introducing new construction on the parcel, however there is no requirement under CEQA all aspects of integrity be retained and [*sic*] (see Section 4.1.1.5). In addition, the broader setting of the property has been deeply compromised from the original single-family residential character. This alternative would eliminate significant impacts relating to the demolition of the historic resource (emphasis added, pages 1-6 and 1-7; note the unit allotment has been updated to 10 market-rate and one very low-income affordable unit).

In total, implementation of Alternative 3 would result in 13 residential units, including the 11 new residential units as well as retaining the two existing units in the 1642 S. Central Avenue duplex residence.

California Public Resources Code, Section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” The proposed project environmental review identified two alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects the proposed project: Alternative 2- Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative and Alternative 3- Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative.

The fewest impacts to historical resources would be caused by Alternative 3, as relocation of a historical resource (as proposed in Alternative 2) can cause “adverse change to the significance of an historical ...resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its surroundings such that its significance is materially impaired” (emphasis added, PRC Section 15064.5 b). California PRC, Section 21002 provides that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.”

Without clear reasoning, the FEIR concluded that Alternative 2- Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) “would be the environmentally superior alternative because this Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable historical architectural resources impacts associated with demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue by avoiding demolition of the residence and would meet more project objectives {that are not identified} compared to the [Alternative 3-] Reduced Density (Existing Location) as it would allow for more affordable and market rate residential units [15 or 17 versus 13, a difference of two or four units] and help the City achieve its regional affordability goals [which under the revised unit allocation is now one very low-income unit with either alternative].

Project Objectives are described in Section 2.0 of the FEIR. Five objectives are outlined, each of which would be met or partially met by implementation of Alternatives 2 and 3. They are described in the table on pages 4 and 5.

<b>Project Objectives from FEIR</b>	<b>Alternative 2- Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3- Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative</b>
1) Contribute to the health of the City through an economically viable infill project that would provide an increase in residential units to help meet housing demand in the City and better meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements for the region.	Alternative 2 would contribute to the health of the City through an economically viable [not defined] infill project that would provide an increase in [15] new residential units [demolishing one and ostensibly retaining two, a net difference of 12], to help meet housing demand in the City and better meet the RHNA <sup>1</sup> requirements for the region [not defined either]. The RHNA does not apply to properties smaller than one half an acre as described in footnote 1.	Alternative 3 would also contribute to the health of the City through an economically viable {not defined} infill project that would provide an increase in [11] new residential units [replacing 2] to help meet [undefined] housing demand in the City and better meet the RHNA requirements for the region [also not defined]) The RHNA does not apply to properties smaller than one half an acre as described in footnote 1.
2) Construct a new multi-family residential building with new architectural designs and energy efficient building systems that promote energy conservation that furthers the City's policy goals expressed in the Greener Glendale Plan.	The 2012 Greener Glendale Plan describes an "important but generally unaccounted for type of waste emission is the 'embodied' energy in products consumed." <sup>2</sup> The estimated embodied energy for a single family home is approximately 1,800 JG. <sup>3</sup> The residence that is proposed to be demolished and its garage (1,200 JG) would total approximately 2,000 JG of embodied energy. There is no more energy efficient building material than a building that already exists. The proposed new building would be a multi-family residential building with new architectural designs and energy efficient building systems that promote energy conservation, however not as efficiently as the existing building that would be relocated as part of the alternative, requiring replacement foundation.	The 2012 Greener Glendale Plan describes an "important but generally unaccounted for type of waste emission is the 'embodied' energy in products consumed." The estimated embodied energy for a single family home is approximately 1,800 JG. The residence that is proposed to be demolished and its garage (1,200 JG) would total approximately 2,000 JG of embodied energy. There is no more energy efficient building material than a building that already exists. The proposed new building would be a multi-family residential building with new architectural designs and energy efficient building systems that promote energy conservation, however not as efficiently as the existing duplex residence that would be retained. The historic building would consume the least embodied energy as it already exists.

<sup>1</sup> The subject property is .23 acres in size (FEIR page 2.1). The City of Glendale's "6th Cycle Adopted Housing Element" states on page 4 that that "Sites smaller than a half-acre in size are deemed inadequate to accommodate housing for lower-income housing unless it is demonstrated that sites of equivalent size were successfully developed during the prior planning period for an equivalent number of lower-income housing units as projected for the site or unless the housing element describes other evidence to HCD that the site is adequate to accommodate lower income housing (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (c)(2)(A))."

<sup>2</sup> " Embodied energy is what is used in order to build a given usable object. This includes the energy from material extraction, refining, processing, transporting, and fabricating. This energy is considered to be "embodied" within the item itself.

<sup>3</sup> [Embodied energy calculation for house | Download Table \(researchgate.net\)](#)

<b>Project Objectives from FEIR</b>	<b>Alternative 2- Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3- Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative</b>
3) Provide new residential opportunities that offer multi-modal opportunities taking advantage of the Project's proximity to Larry Zarian Transportation Center.	The proposed alternative would provide 15 new residential units and two existing units that would or already do provide (in the case of the duplex) offer multi-modal opportunities taking advantage of the Project's proximity to the Zarian Transportation Center.	The proposed alternative would provide 11 new residential units (and two existing units) that would offer, or already provide multi-modal opportunities taking advantage of the Project's proximity to the Zarian Transportation Center.
4) Enhance the general welfare of the public by offering affordable housing opportunities and help meet the affordable housing goals and needs outlined in the City's Housing Element.	The proposed alternative includes one very low-income unit that would enhance the general welfare of the public by offering affordable housing opportunities and help meet the affordable housing goals and needs outlined in the City's Housing Element.	The proposed alternative includes one very low-income units that would enhance the general welfare of the public by offering affordable housing opportunities and help meet the affordable housing goals and needs outlined in the City's Housing Element.
5) Develop new residential opportunities close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale.	The proposed alternative would provide 15 new residential "opportunities" or units close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale. The 2 existing units that would be relocated already provide residential opportunities close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale.	The proposed alternative would provide 11 new residential "opportunities" or units close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale. The 2 existing units that would be retained in place already provide residential opportunities close to the existing retail amenities within South Glendale.

Alternatives 2 and 3 meet each of the project objectives as described more fully in the table above. Preservation alternatives actually are not required by CEQA to meet all project objectives, but in this case, Alternatives 2 and 3 fully meet the five described project objectives.

Alternative 2-the Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative should not be considered the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives evaluated as stated in the FEIR (page 4-7). Alternative 2 may eliminate the significant and unavoidable historical resources impact associated with demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue, but because it would be relocated it could yet cause "substantial adverse change" under CEQA. The alternative would not meet "more of the Project objectives" by adding the same number of affordable housing units as Alternative 3, nor would it better satisfy the City's affordable housing goals.

I strongly urge the City Council to listen to your appointed experts on the Historic Preservation Commission: reject the proposed project which calls for the unwarranted and needless demolition of the historical resource at 1642 S central Avenue. Preservation Alternatives were identified and analyzed for this project that are feasible and allow for a "win-win" outcome that would eliminate demolition of the historical resource and fully meet the identified project objectives. Most importantly Alternative 3 would be a project that would not violate CEQA. Numerous community groups and individuals have expressed serious concerns in the Administrative Record, in both writing and in public meetings with the proposed project. I would welcome the

opportunity to work with you on an alternative that would not demolish the historical resource and would provide additional housing in keeping with the project objectives.

Please ensure that this letter and my e-mail are included in the Administrative Record for this project.

Sincerely,

*Francesca Smith*

Francesca Smith

cc: Suzie Abajian, City Clerk

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 1624 S. Central Ave., Glendale  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 3:14:47 PM

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | Follow us!

-----Original Message-----

From: gartenart <[gartenart@aol.com](mailto:gartenart@aol.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 2:58 PM  
To: Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Subject: 1624 S. Central Ave., Glendale

[You don't often get email from [gartenart@aol.com](mailto:gartenart@aol.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I just drove by the subject property, the 1913 Craftsman, a residence considered for destruction, and a behemoth of an apartment building put in its place.

Granted, the lovely building built from a time gone by could use some TLC, but its bones speak of a solid representation of its style so prevalent of those days. It is also true that too many of its relatives have been decimated over the years to make way for a heartless structure such as is being planned to take its place. Must we destroy every single one of these charming jewels to give way to this concrete block? Surely there could be able to find some alternative such as the Historic Preservation Commission suggested.

I trust you will give this project due consideration by denying the appeal and save this rare, and vanishing, example of historic Glendale housing stock.

Respectfully yours,

Ute Baum  
1208 Cottage Grove Ave  
Glendale, Ca. 91205  
Member of Cottage Grove Historic District

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 1913 Craftsman preservation  
**Date:** Monday, April 10, 2023 12:03:19 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Don Anderson <donanderson2001@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 8, 2023 2:00 PM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Devine, Paula <PDevine@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** 1913 Craftsman preservation

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [donanderson2001@hotmail.com](mailto:donanderson2001@hotmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Dear Glendale City Councilmembers:

I am writing to urge you to help preserve the 1913 Craftsman in the Tropic area of Glendale. A proposal to demolish the property has been submitted in order to build an apartment building.

Please help protect Glendale's unique character and history by requiring that the property be preserved. There are many other areas of South Glendale that could be developed which would not put our historic heritage at risk. If we continue at this rate of demolishing so much of our past, most of it will soon be gone and there will be only a few historic homes left in the city. There is no way to recapture this lost history.

Many of us moved here to appreciate the history that Glendale has to offer, and we should all do our best to encourage alternative options that are both fiscally and historically responsible. Please do not allow this historic home to be destroyed.

Sincerely,

Don Anderson

1811 Niodrara Dr., Glendale

**From:** [Adjemian, Aram](#)  
**To:** [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of 1642 South Central Avenue  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 10:27:07 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[HPC Appeal 1642 S Central.pdf](#)

---

This one is for you to put on AMS.

**Aram Adjemian, CMC.**

**Assistant City Clerk • City of Glendale • City Clerk & Elections Services**

613 E. Broadway, Rm 110 • Glendale, CA 91206 • (818) 548-2090 • [AAadjemian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:AAadjemian@glendaleca.gov)



*E-mail correspondence with the City of Glendale (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.*

---

**From:** Grant Michals <grant@michals.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 9:57 AM

**To:** Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Devine, Paula <PDevine@Glendaleca.gov>

**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>; Adjemian, Aram <AAadjemian@Glendaleca.gov>

**Subject:** Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of 1642 South Central Avenue

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

April 11, 2023

Mayor Brotman and Members of the City Council  
City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway  
Glendale, CA 91206  
RE: 1642 S. Central

Dear Mayor Brotman and Council Members:

The Glendale Homeowners Coordinating Council is grateful for the opportunity to provide

comments on the project at 1642 S. Central. We ask that you approve a project alternative that adds housing but retains the existing house.

While we are intensely frustrated with the State's heavy hand in these matters, we do understand that new housing must be built, and that the logical place to increase density is around transit. As an organization, however, we are interested in ensuring some measure of compatibility of mass and scale between existing and new development, and we always advocate for high-quality design, which we struggle to identify in the proposed project.

We also believe it is critical that the City comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. The goal is to protect the built and natural environment. We believe that the project alternatives comply with CEQA, because they are feasible to build, would meet the project goals, and would greatly reduce the environmental impacts.

We note that the Staff Report claims that "the applicant has indicated that they have specific evidence supporting why the development of Alternative #3 would be economically infeasible." Where is the evidence and the independent analysis of it? Developers claim that projects will not "pencil out" all the time. Assertions simply aren't good enough. The GHCC urges you to approve project alternative #3 that adds housing but retains the existing house or produce evidence as to why the project is not feasible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Grant Michals, President

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Attached letter about 1642 S, Central  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 3:13:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [MVSNA Comment Letter on 1642 S Central Ave \(3\).pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Michael Morgan <copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 10:15 AM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Attached letter about 1642 S, Central

You don't often get email from [copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net](mailto:copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Hello Dan,

See I did not say Mayor as you asked. It doesn't see right though!! I just wanted to show you a letter the Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Community Assn(MVSNA) sent letter back in 2019 asking for the property 1642 S. Central to not be demolished. The council in their wisdom voted that the property should not be demolished but saved because of its Historic nature. Please listen to what the Council did then and hopefully do the same.

Regards,  
Michael Morgan

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Craftsman Home; Tripico  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 12:09:51 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Bill <[w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net](mailto:w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2023 5:46 PM  
**To:** Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; [vagajanian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:vagajanian@glendaleca.gov); Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Craftsman Home; Tripico

You don't often get email from [w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net](mailto:w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

As a longtime Glendale resident and advocate for preserving historic buildings, I ask that you please preserve the historic 1913 Craftsman home in the Tropico area of South Glendale. Our craftsman homes have historic beauty and Glendale appears to be losing more and more examples.

I understand that new housing is important but we cannot eliminate our past historic buildings, we have done far too much of this in Glendale already.

Please vote to preserve this beautiful Historic 1913 Craftsman.

Respectfully,

**Bill Vásquez**  
(C) 818-421-3243  
[w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net](mailto:w.vasquez@sbcglobal.net)



**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Historic 1913 Craftsman in the Tropic area of South Glendale  
**Date:** Monday, April 10, 2023 12:02:59 PM

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | Follow us!

-----Original Message-----

From: Araik Sinanian <[araiksinanian@icloud.com](mailto:araiksinanian@icloud.com)>  
Sent: Saturday, April 8, 2023 4:57 PM  
To: Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Subject: Historic 1913 Craftsman in the Tropic area of South Glendale

[You don't often get email from [araiksinanian@icloud.com](mailto:araiksinanian@icloud.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Hello,

I would like to express concern about the residential development in Tropic. I would like to ask you to deny the appeal so that the historic Craftsman is preserved. 96% of South Glendale properties built before 1979 are not historic resources and you can choose from that.

I think as Glendale grows, we need to be mindful of historic properties so that Glendale can keep its historic culture and not lose itself in modernity.

Thank you,  
Araik Sinanian  
Lifelong Glendale resident  
Board Member, Nor Windsor Condos

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Historic Preservation Consideration  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 11:41:21 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Patty Silversher <[psilversher@gmail.com](mailto:psilversher@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 10:02 AM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Historic Preservation Consideration

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [psilversher@gmail.com](mailto:psilversher@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Dear City Council Members,

Tonight you will be considering an appeal to destroy a historic 1913 Craftsman house here in South Glendale where I have lived since 1985. The proposal to build a new affordable housing complex which will have no historical or aesthetic significance is distressing.

I don't understand why new housing projects are not built on properties that have no historical significance.

In this case, it is my understanding that a project alternative has been proposed that would build a smaller housing project while preserving the Craftsman. This would bring together historic preservation AND new housing!

I take great pride in Glendale's historic preservation commitments in the past.

Please, let's not set a precedent that would start destroying what we have worked so

hard for.

I sincerely thank you,  
Patty Silversher  
Adams Hill

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golianian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Item 9b 1642 S. Central and a Hello  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 3:12:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [MVSNA Comment Letter on 1642 S Central Ave \(3\).pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Michael Morgan <copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 10:05 AM  
**To:** Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 9b 1642 S. Central and a Hello

You don't often get email from [copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net](mailto:copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Good Day Councilmember Najarian,

I am writing to you about Item 9b I will keep it brief as you have seen this property 1642. S. Central before in 2019 see attached letter. The Council voted to preserve it and deny its demolition then because of its historic nature. I'm asking you to do it again tonight.

Coming before you is an appeal. I will try to keep it brief. Hearings **9b Community Development, re: Public Hearing on Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of Design Review Case No. PDR-000838-2023 located at 1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue.** As you know their appeal of the **5-0** HPC vote on the 1913 Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central is for it to be demolish(such a historic loss). The HPC **voted** feasible project alternatives but instead they chose to appeal. Knowing full well it would come before you. I would ask as one of the HPC commissioners to **deny** their appeal. **OPTION 4.** Motion to sustain the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to not certify the FEIR and deny the Project Design Review Application. I stand by that decision! The plaintiff realized the Council might be a more sympathetic audience.

I am attaching a letter the Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Neighbor Ass. (MVSNA) wrote you back in 2019 when you were Mayor. The house is over 110 years old built in the City of Tropic surely it deserves a better fate than this. Both the South Glendale Historic Survey and the Glendale Historic Society say and I've seen that this house should be on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources. I have

been around long enough to see all the good you have done. let's leave a little  
Glendale history for the next generation.

Respectfully,  
Michael Morgan

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golianian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Item 9b Appeal of HPC Denial and a Hello  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 3:14:04 PM  
**Attachments:** [MVSNA Comment Letter on 1642 S Central Ave \(3\).pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Michael Morgan <copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 9:45 AM  
**To:** Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 9b Appeal of HPC Denial and a Hello

You don't often get email from [copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net](mailto:copiesunltd@sbcglobal.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Good Day Councilperson Asatryan,

I would like to introduce myself Michael Morgan, I have lived I Glendale for a long time since 1955 in fact. For the moment I am on the Board of the Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Neighborhood Assn(MVSNA) which I serve along with Grant Michals our President. He has nothing but wonderful things to say about you. I'm looking forward to meeting you. I am one of the 5 Commissioners on the Glendale Historic Preservation Commission as of right now the Historian of the Commission.

Coming before you is an appeal. I will try to keep it brief. Hearings **9b Community Development, re: Public Hearing on Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of Design Review Case No. PDR-000838-2023 located at 1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue**. As you know their appeal of the **5-0** HPC vote on the 1913 Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central is for it to be demolish(such a historic loss). The HPC **voted** feasible project alternatives but instead they chose to appeal. Knowing full well it would come before you. I would ask as one of the HPC commissioners to **deny** their appeal. **OPTION 4**. Motion to sustain the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to not certify the FEIR and deny the Project Design Review Application. I stand by that decision! The plaintiff realized the Council might be a more sympathetic audience. Please don' let their cynicism be allowed to win.

This house 1642 S. Central is one of the last Craftsman built(1913) in what was the City of Tropic before it was annexed to Glendale in 1918.Both the Glendale Historic

Society and the South Glendale Historic Resources Survey found the House to be eligible to be on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources most of which have long vanished. Let future generations see what life was like in the last century don't rob them of that history.

Lastly I have attached a letter that our organization(MVSNA) sent back in 2019 when 1642 came before the Council they as now found it a Glendale asset. Please do the same.

Respectfully,  
Michael Morgan

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please Preserve Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central Ave.  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 11:40:17 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Susan Dasso <susandasso@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 10:22 AM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Devine, Paula <PDevine@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>; Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Please Preserve Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central Ave.

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of the City Council,

Please vote against the appeal from the developer to allow demolition of the historic 1913 Craftsman in the Tropic area of South Glendale.

The Historic Preservation Commission **unanimously voted for a project alternative that incorporates the historic Craftsman into a new housing project but** the developer insists on demolition. This is in spite of feasible preservation alternatives.

Please respect the decision and recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission. Why bother having a Commission if it's decisions and recommendations are not followed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Susan Dasso  
923 Cumberland Road

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please Preserve Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central Ave.  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 11:46:19 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Zuzka Eggena <zeggena@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2023 11:20 PM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Devine, Paula <PDevine@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Please Preserve Historic Craftsman at 1642 S. Central Ave.

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Honorable Mr. Mayor and Members of the City Council,

It was just seventeen years ago that Glendale celebrated its centennial and demonstrated pride in its history which includes historic buildings. Since then one-by-one many of the structures have been demolished; Craftsman style houses once prevalent in certain parts of the city have disappeared. Now, in spite of the The Historic Preservation Commission **unanimously voting for a project alternative that incorporates the historic Craftsman into a new housing project**, the developer insists on demolition! And in spite of feasible preservation alternatives!

Please respect and support the work of the Historic Commission and save this “increasingly rare example of early residential development in Tropic”, “an excellent example of the Craftsman style.” Once lost it cannot be resurrected.

Please vote against the appeal from the developer to allow demolition of this historic 1913 Craftsman in the Tropic area of South Glendale. New housing should not be at the expense of losing Glendale’s heritage; our children and grandchildren deserve an opportunity to appreciate examples of a bygone era. There are plenty of non-historical properties in South Glendale where housing, especially that is affordable, can be built.

Let not the Glendale residents who celebrate the city's 200 years in 2106 be deprived of not having tangible evidence of the City's heritage.

Thank you for your consideration.

Zuzka P. Eggena

1724 Cleveland Rd.

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please preserve the historic 1913 Craftsman house at 1642 S. Central Avenue  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 11:47:19 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** dorsieb@aol.com <dorsieb@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2023 9:39 PM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov>; Devine, Paula <PDevine@Glendaleca.gov>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov>; Najarian, Ara <ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov>; Asatryan, Elen <EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov>  
**Subject:** Please preserve the historic 1913 Craftsman house at 1642 S. Central Avenue

You don't often get email from [dorsieb@aol.com](mailto:dorsieb@aol.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Dear Council Members,

I am writing you as a member of the Glendale Historical Society to urge you to decide at your April 11 meeting NOT to permit the demolition of the historic 1913 Craftsman house located at 1642 S. Central Ave. as part of a project to build modern housing at this location. I understand the Historic Preservation Committee recommended that the house could remain in place and other units could be integrated into the space without demolishing this historic property. I don't understand why the Council would vote against the HPC recommendation that this house could be preserved at the same time some new housing could be built on the lot. It just seems that in Glendale too often greed is winning out over preservation of our diminishing historic resources. We already have many units of ugly condominiums and apartments that quite frankly are unaffordable for a large percentage of residents, so adding more unaffordable units won't do much to provide affordable housing, if this is the argument. Please follow the recommendations of your own HPC rather than bow down to the already too powerful developers.

Sincerely,

Dorothy J Black  
1492 Melwood Drive

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please retain the Craftsman Home at 1642 S. Central  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 11:45:07 AM

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | Follow us!

-----Original Message-----

From: Marcia Hanford <[marcia.hanford@gmail.com](mailto:marcia.hanford@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 8:46 AM  
To: Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Subject: Please retain the Craftsman Home at 1642 S. Central

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Honorable Councilmembers:

The opportunities to create housing projects that incorporate historic Craftsman structures are diminishing. Here is a chance to deviate from the trend of scraping the land to build something generic to replace a building with character.

As Glendale increases its housing stock, it can do so in ways that retain charm. There's ample opportunity for all-new construction, such as that proposed for 1642 S. Central, but it doesn't need to happen here. Collectively, Glendale's replacement construction is an indistinguishable blur. 1642 S. Central is an opportunity to add to the City's character in an area that is being slammed with projects.

I watched both meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission, where discussion of the Environmental Impact Report, specific facts, figures, and details parsed critical information that most residents are not versed in. I appreciate their expertise and the recommendation to preserve this Craftsman house, and I encourage you to support this option.

Thank you.

Marcia Hanford

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Preservation Observations  
**Date:** Monday, April 10, 2023 12:04:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Adryan Russ <[adryanruss@gmail.com](mailto:adryanruss@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 8, 2023 11:12 AM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Preservation Observations

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [adryanruss@gmail.com](mailto:adryanruss@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

Dear City Council Members...

It always seems to be a fight to help preserve some of the City's most historic buildings as they are destroyed in order to put up new housing.

As I drive through Glendale traffic, trying to get into and out of the City, I wonder why on Earth we need more housing — more people, more drivers, more square and uninteresting units — unless, of course, you plan to house the homeless there, which I think would trigger country-wide notoriety.

Why destroy this one small property — against the wishes of so many — when you have so many more opportunities to take down properties that are not considered historic? Especially when this Craftsman is valued by so many who consider it a “rare example” of early development in the Tropic area.

I love Glendale — the best Police, the best Fire Fighters — but with every new housing project that goes up, I love it a bit less. Why not be more sensitive to the many who value this property and look elsewhere to put up yet another square building?

I appreciate you all...

Adryan Russ

[adryanruss.com](http://adryanruss.com)

818 425 0443

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golanian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [Garcia, Michael](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Preservation of Historic 1913 Craftsman  
**Date:** Monday, April 10, 2023 11:44:04 AM  
**Attachments:** [image007.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2023 11:40 AM  
**To:** Adjemian, Aram <[AAdjemian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AAdjemian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Preservation of Historic 1913 Craftsman

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | [Follow us!](#)

---

**From:** [bob.nicksin@gmail.com](mailto:bob.nicksin@gmail.com) <[bob.nicksin@gmail.com](mailto:bob.nicksin@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2023 10:13 AM  
**To:** Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>;  
Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>;  
Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Preservation of Historic 1913 Craftsman

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [bob.nicksin@gmail.com](mailto:bob.nicksin@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.**

I write to encourage you to vote against the appeal that would allow demolition of a historic 1913 Craftsman in the Tropico area of South Glendale.

Glendale once boasted a large number of Craftsman-style homes. However, the numbers of such homes have been dwindling for years. The City Council now has an opportunity to ensure that a prime example of this style of building will be preserved

well into the future.

Reasonable proposals exist that would both add new housing and preserve this Craftsman home. Such a compromise should be the goal of the Council. The developer's claims that a smaller project will not be profitable should not be a determining factor in your decision. There are other properties in South Glendale that are not historic resources where such a project could be sited.

Again, I urge you to vote no on this appeal. Thank you.

Bob Nicksin

[bob.nicksin@gmail.com](mailto:bob.nicksin@gmail.com)

818-795-2093

**From:** [Abajian, Suzie](#)  
**To:** [Golianian, Roubik](#)  
**Cc:** [van Muyden, Gillian](#); [Calvert, Bradley](#); [Adjemian, Aram](#); [Shahnazarian, Renia](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Preserve Historic 1913 Craftsman as Part of New Housing Project  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 11, 2023 4:06:27 PM

---

Suzie Abajian, Ph.D. | City Clerk | City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 110 | Glendale, CA | 818-548-2090  
[sabajian@glendaleca.gov](mailto:sabajian@glendaleca.gov) | [www.glendaleca.gov](http://www.glendaleca.gov) | Follow us!

-----Original Message-----

From: Pam <[pmvasquez@sbcglobal.net](mailto:pmvasquez@sbcglobal.net)>  
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2023 2:52 PM  
To: Brotman, Daniel <[dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:dbrotman@Glendaleca.gov)>; Devine, Paula <[PDevine@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:PDevine@Glendaleca.gov)>; Kassakhian, Ardashes <[AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:AKassakhian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Najarian, Ara <[ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:ANajarian@Glendaleca.gov)>; Asatryan, Elen <[EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:EAsatryan@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Cc: Abajian, Suzie <[SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov](mailto:SAbajian@Glendaleca.gov)>  
Subject: Preserve Historic 1913 Craftsman as Part of New Housing Project

You don't often get email from [pmvasquez@sbcglobal.net](mailto:pmvasquez@sbcglobal.net). Learn why this is important  
<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply if you are unsure as to the sender.

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

As a longtime Glendale resident and advocate for preserving historic buildings, I ask that you please preserve the historic 1913 Craftsman home in the Tropic area of South Glendale. Our craftsman homes have historic beauty and Glendale appears to be losing more and more examples.

I understand that new housing is important but we cannot eliminate our past historic buildings.

Please preserve this beautiful Historic 1913 Craftsman as Part of New Housing Project.

Thank you

Pam Vasquez  
Glendale Rossmoyne resident



April 11, 2023

Mayor Brotman and Members of the City Council  
City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway  
Glendale, CA 91206  
RE: 1642 S. Central

Dear Mayor Brotman and Council Members:

The Glendale Homeowners Coordinating Council is grateful for the opportunity to provide comments on the project at 1642 S. Central. We ask that you approve a project alternative that adds housing but retains the existing house.

While we are intensely frustrated with the State's heavy hand in these matters, we do understand that new housing must be built, and that the logical place to increase density is around transit. As an organization, however, we are interested in ensuring some measure of compatibility of mass and scale between existing and new development, and we always advocate for high-quality design, which we struggle to identify in the proposed project.

We also believe it is critical that the City comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. The goal is to protect the built and natural environment. We believe that the project alternatives comply with CEQA, because they are feasible to build, would meet the project goals, and would greatly reduce the environmental impacts.

We note that the Staff Report claims that "the applicant has indicated that they have specific evidence supporting why the development of Alternative #3 would be economically infeasible." Where is the evidence and the independent analysis of it? Developers claim that projects will not "pencil out" all the time. Assertions simply aren't good enough. The GHCC urges you to approve project alternative #3 that adds housing but retains the existing house or produce evidence as to why the project is not feasible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Grant Michals". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Grant Michals, President



Montrose/Verdugo City/Sparr Heights  
Neighborhood Association

Montrose/Verdugo City/Sparr Heights Neighborhood Association  
P.O. Box 732  
Verdugo City, CA 91046-0732

June 11, 2019

The Honorable Mayor Najarian and Members of the City Council  
City of Glendale  
613 East Broadway, Suite 200  
Glendale, CA 91206

Re: Demolition of 1642 S. Central Ave.

Dear Mayor Najarian and Members of the City Council:

We formed our neighborhood association in 1997 with the mission of uniting our neighbors to protect our quality of life. One quality of life issue we follow is neighborhood integrity. The Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Neighborhood association (MVSNA) asks that you support the finding of the City's consultant who prepared the South Glendale Historic Resources Survey, the City's Historic Preservation Planner, and the Director of Community Development that the property at the above-listed address appears eligible for the Glendale Register of Historic Resources and as such that its proposed demolition would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), triggering preparation of a focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Many Architectural Historians including the Cities own staff evaluated the property and finds it to be a historic resource. We therefore request that the City Council reject the appeal; as the analysis of the property owner's consultant does not meet the burden of evidence required to find the property not to be historic.

The Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Neighborhood Association (MVSNA) is very grateful that City Council identified and took a quick and important step with The Historic Preservation Ordinance's passage last month to protect our historic resources and neighborhoods that contribute so much to all of Glendale's character and desirability. That was an important first step and this is the logical second one to protect that historic stock.

Having studied the reports and documentation, the MVSNA supports the denial of the demolition permit of 1642 S. Central Ave., a property that was identified as "Historically Significant" in July 2017 prior to the sale, and urges the City Council to vote for that denial of requested demolition permit.

Sincerely,

Grant Michals  
President, Montrose, Verdugo City, Sparr Heights Neighborhood Association