



PASADENANS ORGANIZING FOR PROGRESS

CARMEL HOUSING PROJECT TALKING POINTS

Nobody knows what Carmel's project looks like. Would the Planning Commission buy a house without seeing what it looks like?

Carmel is seeking green light from the Planning Commission to move forward with its proposed housing project, however, no one knows what those plans are. Carmel is asking the Planning Commission to approve a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), but no one knows, not even the Planning Commission, whether this report matches Carmel's actual project. How can the Commission then ask for public input on a project that is not actually described in the EIR?

How can Carmel ask for the approval of a project they are not planning to develop?

Carmel is currently engaged in separate and distinct sales of individual parcels that comprise the proposed project site for which it is seeking approval, but which Carmel seems to have already given up. The DEIR fails to mention any imminent transfer in land ownership, yet Carmel is in contract to sell a 93-unit lot located on North Los Robles. The Commission is either not aware of this or is choosing to turn a blind eye. Without a clear showing of ownership, Carmel does not have the legal authority to request discretionary entitlements.

Review of Carmel application is premature. Carmel is asking the Commission to bypass the law.

The property described in Carmel's DEIR must first be removed from the Master Plan and Development Agreement that Fuller Seminary has already initiated proceedings for. Fuller Seminary entered into a 20-year Development Agreement with the City to develop the disputed site for affordable student housing. Under this agreement, Carmel's plan to develop luxury housing is prohibited. The City cannot approve a project without first deciding whether the Master Plan and Development Agreement can be revised. Doing so will be a clear abuse of discretion.

Fuller incorrectly sold property to Carmel before revising the Master Plan with the City.

City officials warned Fuller's previous leadership to amend its masterplan before it sold part of its property to Carmel, but they failed to do so. In April, this Commission instructed Fuller and Carmel to meet with the community to resolve this issue. Carmel is yet to meet with stakeholders to negotiate a solution that can benefit us all, and is instead trying to bully this commission to review and approve its project application separately from Fuller's application. Doing so will constitute a willful disregard for the true impact that releasing the project site from the previously intended use will have in our community.



PASADENANS ORGANIZING FOR PROGRESS

The Planning Commission and the Community are being deceived by Carmel.

Carmel improperly characterized its project as distinct and separate from the Fuller-Initiated Amendments. Furthermore, this project's environmental impact analysis is based on a string of assumptions and wishful thinking. First, it eliminates the existence of Fuller's Master Plan, without having the certainty that it can be amended. Then, it compares its project with an identical hypothetical project, which is not only disingenuous on Carmel's end but it leads to an erroneous determination that the project will not have a significant environmental impact. This goes against current environmental requirements and the City should not allow Carmel to get away with this.

Carmel is trying to deprive the community of a chance for a meaningful and transparent review of a project that will result in the displacement of more local residents.

Approving this project will result in the loss to the City of 197 affordable housing units, the highest loss since the 210 freeway came through Northwest Pasadena. Yet, the DEIR fails to disclose the displacement of residents from what had been affordable housing. How can the Commission allow Carmel to try to put a blindfold on our eyes?

The DEIR fails to address the negative impact on the City's affordable housing crisis

The DEIR fails to address the impact to the City's current 23,000+ low income households already in need of affordable housing. Typical rents in Pasadena for a tiny one-bedroom apartment — not big enough for families with children — are between \$2,000 and \$3,000 a month, about double the national average. When rents keep rising much faster than local salaries and household incomes, we need real solutions in the form of more affordable housing.

Moreover, current law requires that a project's DEIR discuss alternatives and ways to mitigate the negative impact of a proposed project. Carmel's DEIR failed to consider any alternatives under which existing affordable units could be preserved.

I work in Pasadena, but I cannot afford to live here . . .

One consequence of Pasadena's housing crisis is that many people who work in Pasadena cannot afford to live here. Even some of the City's employees live outside of the City because of the rising rent prices.

The housing crisis is pushing our families, neighbors, and friends out of our community, out of our state.

The high cost of housing has led 56% of Californians to consider moving, with one in four considering moving out of state due to the high cost of housing.

We need to stop pushing children out of Pasadena. Our children need stable, safe, affordable housing.

The Pasadena School District has identified about 750 students who are considered homeless because they lack stable housing. In California, 200,000 K-12 students are considered homeless – many of them living in cars, motels, shelters, in crowded homes shared with other families, or even the streets. With sky high rents in our city and our state, it is expected that more and more students will end up with no place to call home.

Our housing crisis is pushing families with children out of the city, leading to a declining enrollment in PUSD public schools, which in turn undermines the school district’s financial health.

We’re prepared to take legal action to prevent the City and the Community from being taken advantage of.

Carmel’s actions demonstrate their intent to undermine current law and to bully the City to approve something that is based on assumptions and hypotheticals. We are ready to take legal action, if needed, to protect our City and our Community from any negative impact.