



# THE TIME HAS COME

*The Campaign For All Saints Church*



# Project Description

All Saints Episcopal Church has applied to the City of Pasadena for a Master Development Plan, which is a 15-year framework for expansion of the church. The project has been redesigned twice after prior review by the Planning Commission and Design Commission. The proposed project is described below as depicted in the application submittals and the preliminarily designed may change during design review. Graphics showing the proposed improvements and site location are in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.



## The proposed improvements are:

- Demolition of a commercial building, a building used for Sunday School/day care purposes, and a trailer used for office and meeting space. Demolition of the steel canopy and cupola structure added between the Parish (Regas) Hall and the Rectory building.
- Interior renovation of the existing Rectory and conversion of the existing parish hall.
- Construction of a columbarium
- Construction of a subterranean parking level
- Outdoor spaces including a forecourt between the existing Rectory and West Building, a pre-function garden, an outdoor seating area on the north side of the West Building, two play yards, and a garden with a labyrinth on the east portion of the site.



## The proposed improvements continued:

- Construction of a multiple-story, four building complex in two phases consisting of the following buildings:

**Building A: West Building.** A 14,300 square foot, two story building with offices, conference rooms, (social hall with kitchen) and a kitchen for an outdoor café. Adjacent to the West Building would be the outdoor dining commons. Gates would provide access from Euclid Avenue to the entrance of the courtyard café. A wrought-iron fence is proposed to connect the gates to the front of the building. The preliminary design proposes metal panels, a stone wall with cast-stone details for the northern portion of the building facades. The building facade would be composed of glass doors and windows, a freestanding cast-stone colonnade, and perforated copper-mesh sunscreens.

**Building B: Forum - Alternate Worship.** A 6,700 square foot, two-level assembly building would be circular in plan composed of four slightly curved walls: one to the north, one to the east, and two to the south. It would be constructed with cast-in-place concrete and include glass windows along the west-facing facade. The space would open into a plaza that could be used as supplemental outdoor seating for large events.



## The proposed improvements continued:

**Building C: East Building.** An 18,000 square foot, three-story building would house a youth program, daycare, and classroom areas.

**Building E: North Building.** Two options are under consideration for the building at the northwest corner of the site:

*Scenario 1:* A 47,500 square foot, eight-story, 45 unit residential building for senior citizens. The proposed building would be of cement plaster construction.

*Scenario 2:* A two-story, 13,000 square-foot youth recreation building.



## Alternatives:

Four alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration, as described below.

- 1. No Project.** This alternative assumes that the proposed project would not be developed and that existing development on the project site would remain. Under this alternative, the visual character of the project site would remain in its current state.
- 2. Retain the Maryland Hotel Wall.** This alternative retains the historic Maryland Hotel wall in place. It avoids the Class 1, *significant and unavoidable*, impact to historic resources.



## Alternatives continued:

- 3. Retain Maryland Hotel Wall and Relocate Building “A”.**

This alternative retains the historic Maryland Hotel wall in place and relocates Building “A” to the east. These changes to the site plan avoid the Class 1, *significant and unavoidable*, impact to historic resources.
- 4. Retain Maryland Hotel Wall and Rotate Building “A”.**

This alternative retains the historic Maryland Hotel wall in place and reconfigures Building “A” by rotating it 90 degrees and combining it with Building C. This alternative avoids the Class 1, *significant and unavoidable*, impact to historic resources.



## Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Significance After Mitigation

# Aesthetics

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact AES-1</b> The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	None required.	Less than significant.
<b>Impact AES-2</b> The proposed project would not alter views of the mountains as compared with current conditions.	None required.	Less than significant.
<b>Impact AES-3</b> The proposed project has the potential to contribute to increased light and glare. The impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	<b>AES-3a Glare Minimization</b> Compliance with the intent of minimizing light spillover shall be determined during the review process.	Less than significant.



# Air Quality

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact AQ-1</b> Air pollutant emissions generated by construction of the proposed Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds.</p>	None required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Impact AQ-2</b> Demolition of existing structures could release asbestos into the environment; however, compliance with existing SCAQMD regulations would ensure that impacts would be Class III, <i>less-than-significant</i>.</p>	None required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Impact AQ-3</b> Operation of the proposed project would generate air pollutant emissions, but emissions would not exceed SCAQMD operational significance thresholds under either scenario. Therefore, the project's operational impact to regional air quality would be Class III, <i>less than significant</i>.</p>	None required.	Less than significant.



# Cultural Resources

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact HR-1</b> Implementation of either Scenario 1 or 2 would result in the demolition of Scott Hall in addition to steel framing and a cupola structure. These structures are later additions to the campus and are not historic resources. The removal of additions would result in Class III, <i>less-than-significant</i> impacts.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact HR-2</b> Implementation of the development facilitated by the project would require the reconstruction and encroachment onto the setting of the Maryland Hotel wall, which is a contributing element to a designated historic district. No mitigation is available to reduce impacts resulting from the loss of this resource. Therefore, impacts are Class I, unavoidably significant.</p>	<p><b>HR-2(a) Conformance with Standards.</b> <b>HR-2(b) Historic Documentation Report</b></p>	<p>Unavoidably significant.</p>



# Cultural Resources

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact HR-3</b> Development that would occur under Scenarios 1 and 2 would result in the construction of new structures within the setting of an NRHP Historic District. The project conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation in terms of size, scale, proportion and massing in comparison to the district. A city design review would be required.</p>	<p><b>HR-3 Independent Assessment Report.</b> Prior to issuance of building permits, the Planning Director shall select a historic preservation professional, at the project applicant’s expense, to conduct an independent assessment of compliance of the final project design.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact HR-4</b> Demolition of structures and project construction could temporarily generate ground-borne vibrations on and adjacent to the site which have the potential to affect historic resources. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts of Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>HR-4 Construction Vibration</b> The applicant shall retain a structural engineer to prepare a detailed construction vibration reduction plan which must be approved by the Building Official prior to construction and contractor shall comply to the plan during throughout construction.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Transportation/Parking

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact T-1</b> The increased operational traffic levels would not cause an exceedance of adopted significance criteria at any of the nine intersections under either Scenario. Therefore, the proposed project's traffic impacts would be Class III, less than significant for both Scenario 1 and 2.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact T-2</b> The proposed project would cause an incremental decrease in ADT on Euclid Ave. between Walnut St. and Corson St., and would cause a 3.5 to 4.5% increase in ADT along Euclid Ave. between Union St. and Walnut St. under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. The street segments impact is Class II, significant but mitigable for both scenarios .</p>	<p><b>AT-2 Street Segment Mitigation.</b> The proposed project shall contribute funds to the City of Pasadena's Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program, and complete a Transportation Demand Management Plan in accordance with the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance requirements.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Transportation/Parking

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact T-3</b> Based on project parking demand, the project has a surplus of four parking spaces during weekdays and 500 spaces on typical Sundays under Scenario 1. The project has a surplus of seven during weekdays and 510 spaces on typical Sundays under Scenario 2. Therefore, impacts to parking supply would be Class III.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact T-4</b> On Sundays, the proposed project would incrementally increase traffic operational levels at intersections under Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. The increased traffic operational levels would not cause an exceedance of adopted significance criteria at any of the nine intersections for either Scenario. The project's traffic impacts with respect to Sunday mid-day peak hour traffic volumes would be Class III.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

# Transportation/Parking

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact T-5</b> The proposed project would not generate trips exceeding CMP criteria at CMP locations under either Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. Impacts to CMP routes are considered Class III for both Scenarios.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact T-6</b> The preliminary designs showing access and circulation within the subterranean garage under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 indicate there are impediments to free circulation. This is a class II, significant but mitigable impact for both Scenarios.</p>	<p><b>T-6(a) Ramp Alignment</b> The drive ramp shall be aligned with the parking aisle or designed to ensure safe passage and that queuing shall not impede circulation.</p> <p><b>T-6(b) Parking Reconfiguration</b> For Scenario 2, the parking spaces shall be reconfigured to ensure unimpeded passage. Additional off-site parking may be provided in accordance with city policies regarding shared parking. All above must be approved by City of Pasadena Dept of Transportation.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Water Supply

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact W-1</b> The proposed project would generate increased demand for water. The PWP would be able to supply the projected demand based on existing entitlements provided that the proposed project incorporates conservation. Impacts to water supply would be Class II.</p>	<p><b>W- 1 Water Efficiency</b> In accordance with LEED NC prerequisites, the applicant shall employ strategies that in aggregate use 20% less water than the water use baseline calculated for the building (not including irrigation) after meeting the Energy Policy Act of 1992 fixture performance requirements.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Land Use and Planning

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact LUP-1</b> The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land-use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project... The project would not conflict with the city of Pasadena’s General Plan, Central District Specific Plan, or Zoning Ordinance. The project layout implements the objectives of the Specific Plan to provide active uses and a comfortable pedestrian environment along the street edge. The site plan has already been modified in response to direction from the Planning Commission and Design Commission.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Initial Study

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Initial Study Section 6d.</b> The project will require the removal of 44 non-protected trees. This is a Class II impact.</p>	<p><b>BIO 1:</b> Construction of the property shall comply with the provisions of the Federal Migratory Bird Act.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Initial Study Section 7b.</b> If archeological resources are unearthed during construction, the project could have the potential to adversely affect such resources. This is a Class II.</p>	<p><b>CR 1:</b> Archeological Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until a certified archeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance and recommends a course of action.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# Initial Study

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Initial Study Section 7c.</b> If paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, the project could have the potential to adversely affect such resources. A mitigation measure (CR 2) is included.</p>	<p><b>CR 2:</b> Paleontological Resources. If Paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the area of the find shall halt and not resume until the site paleontologist states in writing a course of action.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Initial Study Section 19e.</b> The increase in density associated with the project would require upgrades to wastewater conveyance infrastructure. A mitigation measure (Utilities 1) has been included that will require the developer to make the appropriate infrastructure upgrades or pay fair share fees. A Class II.</p>	<p><b>UTILITIES 1:</b> The applicant shall either correct the sewer deficiency on Colorado Blvd. between Euclid Ave. and Los Robles Ave., and in Los Robles Ave. between Marengo Ave. and 315 feet north of Marengo Ave. or pay their share of a fee that the City will use to correct the deficiency.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



# THE TIME HAS COME

*The Campaign For All Saints Church*