

Attachment I
Comments on Central District Specific Plan

On September 23, 2004, the City Council received comments on the Land Use Element, Mobility Element, Revised Zoning Code and Central District Specific Plan. Since then, the Planning and Development staff has organized the comments received on the draft Central District Specific Plan by chapter and made recommendations for changes based on those comments. The attached matrix provides the comments received and the associated response.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 1 – Document Overview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Authority • Relationship to the General Plan • Specific Plan • Boundaries map • Plan preparation process • Downtown Goals • Organization of the document • Application 	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Add a list of definitions, including downtown, and City of Gardens. And/or define terms when they are used. On page 9, when City of Gardens is mentioned, define or refer to the Zoning Code section where it is explained.</p>	<p>Agree. Terms will be defined on page 9 and elsewhere.</p>	<p>Plan should be understandable by all readers.</p>
<p><u>Chapter 2 – Contextual Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and Regional Setting • Historical Context • Physical Context: Land Use • Physical Context: Mobility • Physical Context: Urban Design • Socio-Economic Context • Policy Context • Community Values 	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Page 14 – under Historic Resources, reference map on page 16.</p> <p>Page 18 – Map is difficult to read, consider changing the dark shading to a crosshatch.</p> <p>Page 27 – Guiding principles do not reference support for K-12 education, affordable housing, or maintaining a diverse community.</p> <p>Page 28 – Add support for K-12 education, affordable housing, and maintaining a diverse community to the community aspirations.</p>	<p>Agree. Reference Map.</p> <p>Agree. Map will be changed as necessary.</p> <p>No change to Plan.</p> <p>Agree. Add a bullet point with these aspirations.</p>	<p>Clarifies the plan.</p> <p>Plan should be as readable as possible.</p> <p>These are the Guiding Principles from the General Plan and are not proposed to be changed.</p> <p>These issues were raised at the Summer 2004 community meetings.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 2 – Contextual Background</u>	Community Member	Exhibit 4 – Historic Maps (p. 15) map is difficult to read.	No change to plan.	These are scans of old documents and may not be able to be more readable.
	Community Member	Map 3 – Land Use Patterns (1999) (p. 18) is inaccurate.	No change to plan.	This map was not intended to be accurate for each parcel, but to provide information about the overall character of each block.
	Community Member	Provides additional information and maps of existing building heights.	Add a map or table of existing building heights in the background section.	Information on existing building heights could be added to the background section of the plan.
	Community Member	Questions about existing setbacks on El Molino and maps.	No change to plan.	Plan did not do a complete inventory of existing setbacks for each building.
<u>Chapter 3 – Policy Framework</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Statement • Planning Objectives 	Planning Commission	Add support for K-12 education, affordable housing, and maintaining a diverse community to this chapter.	Agree. Add these goals to the Central District objectives.	These goals were raised in community meetings.
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group	Preserving and enhancing historic buildings must be ensured.	See change to Objective 7 below.	Plan does not intend to weaken any citywide policy for protection of historic resources.
	Pasadena Heritage	Restoration of historic structures should be encouraged. Adaptive reuse should be considered favorably when original uses of a historic building are infeasible.	Add to Central District Objective 7 - <i>Adaptive reuse should be considered favorably when original uses of a historic building are infeasible.</i>	Will provide policy of support of adaptive reuse of historic buildings only if reusing the building for its historic use is infeasible.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-District Designation • Land Use Distribution • Residential Distribution • Land Use Intensity • Parking Considerations • Floor Area Ratios • Floor Area Ratio Bonuses • Residential Density 	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>More needs to be done to create affordable housing in the Central District. Expand this section. Reference the statute.</p>	<p>Expand this section and reference the statute.</p>	<p>Important to emphasize the creation of affordable housing in the Central District.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 39 – Change 4th bullet point to read: “Consideration has been given to assigning The assigned FARs that are consistent...”</p>	<p>Change as requested.</p>	<p>Adds clarity.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p><u>Map 10: Precinct Concept (p. 43)</u></p> <p>Change Old Pasadena Core Boundaries to include the STATS property and Green Hotel.</p>	<p>See Exhibit XX, which shows revised boundaries.</p>	<p>Boundaries of Historic Core should match the historic district.</p>
	<p>Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group</p>	<p>Redraw Old Pasadena Historic Urban Core boundaries to include Fair Oaks, Raymond and Arroyo Parkway.</p>	<p>See Exhibit XX, which shows revised boundaries.</p>	<p>Boundaries of Historic Core should match the historic district.</p>
	<p>Pasadena Heritage</p>	<p>Redraw Old Pasadena historic core to mirror the boundaries of the historic district or to reflect historic, current and future uses.</p>	<p>See Exhibit XX, which shows revised boundaries.</p>	<p>Boundaries of Historic Core should match the historic district.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 4 – District- Wide Land Use Concept</u>	Pasadena Heritage	Fair Oaks and Raymond south of Colorado Blvd., and north to Walnut and West side of Arroyo Parkway from Colorado Blvd., north to Holly should be in the historic core.	See Exhibit XX, which shows revised boundaries.	Boundaries of Historic Core should match the historic district.
	Community Member	Create an Old Pasadena South Transition Area – south of Green Street.	No change to Plan.	This precinct is not needed.
	Community Member	Change name <i>Old Pasadena Historic Core</i> to <i>Old Pasadena Core</i> .	No change to Plan.	Old Pasadena Historic Core accurately reflects this precinct.
	Community Member	Change name <i>West Downtown Transit Village</i> to <i>Old Pasadena Transit Village</i> .	See Exhibit XX. – change name of Transit Village.	Old Pasadena Transit Village is an appropriate name for this precinct.
	Old Pas. Sub- District Planning Group	<u>Mixed-Use Development</u> Improve mixed-use definition. Improve Urban Residential definition.	No change to Plan.	Mixed use and urban residential definitions have changed in the revised Zoning Code.
	Chamber of Commerce	Relax the percentage of commercial required in mixed-use projects.	No change to Plan.	Commercial will be required on the primary frontage of the ground floor for a minimum of 50' in depth.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u>	Transportation Advisory Commission	Mixed Use should be defined for each sub-district within the Central District with appropriate caps to achieve a balance between residential, service and commercial development.	No change to Plan.	Although there is one definition for mixed use development, the Central District Map # 12 requires that some streets not permit housing on the ground floor, others only pedestrian-oriented uses on the ground floor.
	Planning Commission	p. 44 – Confusion about the use of Precincts vs. Sub-districts.	Clarify sentence in first paragraph about precincts and subdistricts.	Adds clarity to plan.
	Community Member	Map 11: <u>Land Use Character</u> (p. 46)	Change boundaries to match Map 10 above – see Exhibit XX.	Boundaries of Historic Core should match the historic district.
	Community Member	Change to match Old Pasadena Historic Core changes recommended above.	Change text on Map 11 as requested.	This text change will clarify the intent.
	Community Member	Change <i>Transit Village</i> (Urban Residential & Mixed Use Emphasis) to Old Pasadena Transit Village (Mixed-use Commercial & Urban Residential Emphasis) .	Change text on Map 11 as requested.	This text change will clarify the intent.
	Community Member	Change <i>Regional Shopping Destination</i> (Retail/Entertainment and Mixed Use emphasis) to <i>Regional Shopping Destination</i>	Change text on Map 11 as requested.	This text change will clarify the intent.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u></p>	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p><i>(Retail/Entertainment and Commercial Mixed Use Emphasis).</i></p> <p>p. 47 – Add to first paragraph to read: "... 4) offer suitable housing, including affordable housing."</p>	<p>Agree. Change p. 47.</p>	<p>Adds emphasis for affordable housing.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 47 – Change first bullet point to read: "...However, the existing Pasadena Unified School District Property should be set aside zoned for public use..."</p> <p><u>Map 12 (p. 49) Housing Concept</u></p>	<p>Agree. Change p. 47.</p>	<p>Adds clarity to the Plan.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>It is unclear how this map overlaps with the pedestrian-oriented map and how mixed-use development is regulated.</p>	<p>Clarify this map. Add a reference to Map 24 – Pedestrian Oriented Use Concept.</p>	<p>Adds clarity to the Plan.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>No Housing on Ground Floor designation should be on the south side of Green Street between Pasadena Avenue and DeLacey.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Attachment XX for proposed revised map. • Change this map to enlarge the areas where housing is not permitted on the ground floor. 	<p>Green Street should have a commercial ground floor emphasis in Old Pasadena.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Not sure where the lines should be drawn on</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the name of the map to Ground Floor Concept. 	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 4 – District- Wide Land Use Concept		DeLacey – maybe both sides of the street should have the same designation.		
	Planning Commission	Add a reference on map to Zoning Code for definitions of what uses are permitted on ground floor and definitions of pedestrian-oriented uses.	Agree. Add a reference to zoning code for definitions of uses.	Adds clarity to Plan.
	Planning Commission	Changes to Map 12 should be reflected on Map 11.	Agree. Make changes on Map 11 to match Map 12.	Adds clarity to Plan.
	Staff	Add a requirement for a minimum 15' (floor-to-floor) ground floor in all areas where the ground floor is to be non-residential.		Will help to ensure that the ground floor supports commercial use.
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group	Prohibit housing on the ground floor within all areas of the Old Pasadena Sub-District and the Pasadena Playhouse Subdistrict.	No change to Plan.	Housing on ground floor is appropriate for many of the streets in Old Pasadena.
Community Member	Do not expand the prohibition of housing on the ground floor in Old Pasadena.	No change to Plan.	Housing on ground floor is appropriate for many of the streets in Old Pasadena.	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept		<u>Floor Area Ratios (FAR)</u>		
	Planning Commission	Concern that most projects will want an FAR bonus (Planning Commission.)	Findings for granting additional FAR on p. 53 are appropriate.	FAR bonus will be used only for projects that provide more than the minimum level of amenities.
	South Lake Business Association	Support: wide range of uses; ground floor uses should be pedestrian friendly, do not support a "blanket" prohibition of above floor residential on either Colorado in Old Pas or Lake Ave. north of Green – market should dictate.	No change to Plan.	Lake Avenue and Colorado Boulevard are intended to remain commercial in character with pedestrian oriented uses on the ground floor.
	South Lake Business Association	p. 52 - Remove 2 nd bullet point: <i>No parking structure or facility should exceed the height of the structure it serves.</i>	No change to Plan.	Above ground parking structures should not dominate and should be discouraged.
	Planning Commission	Above ground parking structures should be discouraged. Staff to make recommendations about counting a percentage of the structure in FAR. Maybe only above a certain lot size threshold.	No change recommended. Page 52 of the draft Central District Specific Plan outlines several rules to discourage above-ground parking structures and the Design Guidelines also address parking structure compatibility.	Including parking structures in the FAR could result in less intensity in the Central District than proposed by the General Plan.
Playhouse District	p. 52 – Continue to exclude aboveground	Agree. See above.	See above.	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept	Association	parking structures from FAR calculation.	No change to Plan. Continue to exclude aboveground parking structures from FAR calculation.	
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group, Community Member	Parking structures should be counted in the FAR calculation unless they provide public parking.		See above.
	Community Member	If parking structures provide additional amenities, they should only count the structure as 75% of FAR.		See above.
	Community Member	If a parking structure provides shared parking it should have a 25% reduction in the FAR calculation.		See above.
	Community Member	Do FARs give a developer permission to build to the allowed FAR by right?		FARs are one of many rules that are applied to new developments.
	Community Member	FARs have been interpreted and applied inconsistently. More analysis is needed.		FARs have been used in Pasadena's single family neighborhoods for more than 10 years. They are used in many cities' downtowns.
	Community	FARs are a useful allocation tool in		Plan recommends the use of FARs.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u>	Member	combination with design guidelines, height limits, and other concepts.		
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group	FARS are confusing and difficult to grasp. Do not support the use of FARS.	No change to Plan.	See above.
	Pasadena Chamber of Commerce	FARS are outdated and not the appropriate tool for judging mass in a mature city.	No change to Plan.	See above. FARS will not replace design review for judging mass of a project.
	Community Member	Proposed FARS allow a total development of more than two times the existing Central District caps.	No change to Plan.	Central District caps will remain in place.
	Community Member	FARS should be maximum limits rather than entitlements.	No change to Plan.	FARS are maximum limits and are combined with height, setback and other rules.
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group, Community Member	Retain Residential and Commercial Caps. Do not allow flexibility.	No change to Plan. Land Use Element will recommend keeping the residential and commercial caps with no flexibility.	In order to provide more certainty about the total amount of residential or commercial development, the current Land Use Element recommends no flexibility between the commercial and residential caps in the Central District.
	Chamber of Commerce, Community Member	Provide flexibility in the amount of commercial versus residential capacity that will be allowed.	No change to Plan. Land Use Element will recommend keeping the residential and commercial caps with no flexibility.	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u></p>	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>If staff recommendation is to keep the caps, what changes need to be made to the Specific Plan and to the EIR?</p>	<p>Add language to the Specific Plan in Land Use Intensity section to reference the caps in the Land Use Element.</p>	<p>This language will provide additional information to property owners that there are development limits in the Central District.</p>
	<p>Staff</p>	<p><u>Map 14 - FARS (p. 55)</u> Remove the Fuller Seminary footnote on the map.</p>	<p>Text changes will more clearly address the needs of Fuller Seminary.</p>	<p>This vague footnote will be replaced with more detailed text.</p>
	<p>Community Members, Pasadena Nbd. Coalition</p>	<p>Reduce the FAR on Lake Avenue south of Del Mar in accordance with proposed reduced height.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>The reduced height will ensure that new development is compatible with the existing scale of the area. FAR of 2.00 and 1.75 is appropriate for 2 and 3 story buildings with parking on a separate lot.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Shoppers Lane FARS and residential density could permit up to 440 units in 511.9 thousand sq.ft. Is this the density desired in this area?</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that Shoppers Lane will build out to the theoretical maximum due to height limits, setbacks, design guidelines, and the need to mitigate the traffic generated.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Parsons FARS and residential density could permit up to 1,322 housing units in 711.611 sq.ft.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that Parsons parking lots will build out to the theoretical maximum due to height limits, setbacks, design guidelines, and the need to mitigate the traffic generated.</p>
	<p>Playhouse</p>	<p>Increase FAR from 1.50</p>	<p>Increase FAR as requested.</p>	<p>This higher FAR is appropriate</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 4 – District-Wide Land Use Concept</u></p>	District Association	to 2.00 for eight properties on Union and Madison in the Playhouse District.	See revised FAR map, Attachment XX.	along Union Street.
	Community Member	Increase FAR from 1.50 to 2.00 or 2.50 on the northeast corner of Los Robles and Union Streets.	Increase FAR as requested. See revised FAR map, Attachment XX.	This higher FAR is appropriate along Union Street and is consistent with the south side of Union.
	Chamber of Commerce	Density should be increased around transit hubs.	No change to Plan.	FARs are higher around the transit stations.
	Planning Commission	Findings for 10% FAR bonus – Add that the Planning Commission may need to consult with the Design Commission before making the findings.	Agree. Add language to Plan.	Clarifies the procedure for reviewing the FAR bonus.
<p><u>Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit Mobility • Pedestrian Mobility • Bicycle Mobility • Auto Mobility <p>Chapter 5 – District-</p>	Planning Commission	<p><u>Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Issues</u></p> <p>p. 60 – Expand paragraph about the ARTS Bus Expansion and make more affirmative, i.e. - the system should be expanded and more routes should be added...</p>	Agree. Change text to be more affirmative.	Adds needed emphasis to ARTS bus system.
	Planning Commission	p. 61 – Under Convenient Transit Stops - Add that schedules should be posted	Agree. Add text.	Supports greater usability of the ARTS bus system.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Wide Mobility Concept</u></p>	Staff	<p>at each stop and maps of the routes should be available.</p> <p>Inconsistency between the definition of parking caps in the Central District Specific Plan and the Revised Zoning Code.</p>	Staff will provide alternatives that are a more incremental approach to parking caps when the Zoning Code is discussed.	Clarify inconsistency between Zoning Code and Central District Specific Plan.
	South Lake Business Association, Playhouse District Association, Chamber of Commerce	p. 62 – TOD: Remove the maximum parking requirement (caps) within the TOD areas.	Disagree.	Staff will provide alternatives to parking caps. The recommendation has not changed.
	Community Member	Parking caps should be carefully thought through and changed by very small steps.	No change to Plan.	Staff will provide alternatives to parking caps. The recommendation has not changed.
	Community Member	Food market uses should not be subject to parking caps in TOD areas.	No change to Plan.	Staff will provide alternatives to parking caps. The recommendation has not changed.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept	Community Member	Economic vitality depends on adequate and convenient public parking.	No change to Plan.	Staff will provide alternatives to parking caps. The recommendation has not changed.
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group	Adequate parking must be provided for public, retail, and entertainment uses and replace public parking lost to new development.	No change to Plan.	Staff will provide alternatives to parking caps. The recommendation has not changed.
	Community Member	Encourage businesses to provide an economical delivery service. Provide a means on the ARTS busses to accommodate large purchases.		
	Community Member	Shared parking – provide incentives for businesses to provide their parking facilities in the off hours.	No change to Plan. Zoning Code provides incentives for shared parking.	Issue is already addressed in the Zoning Code.
		<u>Map 17 – TOD Concept (p. 64)</u>		
	Community Member	TODs should be diamond shaped, not circles to more correctly reflect 5-minute walking time.	No change to Plan.	TOD area in the Central District is not limited to circles, but to an area which has a higher concentration of busses and rail.
Community Member	Some of the TOD areas are more than 40-minute walk from the transit	No change to Plan.	See above.	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept	Community Member	station. ¼ mile TOD radius is a 7 ½ minute walk, not a 5 minute walk.	No change to Plan.	See above.
	Accessibility & Disability Commission	Bus stop signs at public transit areas should include on the bus stop pole the number of the bus line in Braille and in large print with high contrast.	Add general language to Plan encouraging accessible signage. Add details to the Zoning Code and Mobility Element.	Bus stops should be accessible for those with impaired vision.
	South Lake Business Association	<u>Pedestrian Issues</u> p. 65-66: Place greater emphasis on pedestrian conveniences such as extending signal lengths, adding scramble crosswalks, heavily striped crosswalks, and illuminated crosswalks.	Add language to Plan to emphasize pedestrian conveniences.	Pedestrian mobility is a key to the success of the Central District.
	Community Member	Pedestrian network needs to allow for 3 separate types of pedestrian travel: retail, commuter, and recreation.	No change to Plan.	Most sidewalks in the Central District are designed to accommodate pedestrians of all types. Sidewalk width is also a function of historic buildings.
	Community Member	Street furniture and pedestrian amenities often take up sidewalk space and reduce pedestrian mobility.	Add language to Plan to balance pedestrian amenities with pedestrian mobility	Pedestrian mobility is a key to the success of the Central District.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept	Community Member	Outdoor seating for restaurants should not be on the public sidewalk.	No change to Plan.	Outdoor dining adds to the vitality of commercial districts. It will continue to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that it can be accommodated without impeding mobility.
	Community Member	Provide a true pedestrian network. Multimodal corridors emphasize automobiles, not pedestrians.	No change to Plan.	Mobility Element recognizes the need for all modes of travel in the Central District.
	Transportation Advisory Commission	Identify a program to improve pedestrian mobility and safety in commercial districts.	No change to Plan.	This program is in the Mobility Element.
	Accessibility & Disability Commission	Text information on directional signs to public restrooms should be in large print with high contrast.	Add general language to Plan encouraging accessible signage. Add details to the Zoning Code and Mobility Element.	Central District needs to be accessible for visually impaired persons.
	Accessibility & Disability Commission	On the fronts of retail and commercial establishments that can be seen from an adjacent street, the address of the establishment should be large enough to be visible to a driver on the adjacent street.	Add general language to Plan encouraging accessible signage. Add details to the Zoning Code and Mobility Element.	See above.
	Accessibility &	The address of stores	Add general language to	See above.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept</u></p>	<p>Disability Commission</p>	<p>should be labeled in Braille and in large print near the entrance to the store.</p>	<p>Plan encouraging accessible signage. Add details to the Zoning Code and Mobility Element.</p>	
	<p>Staff</p>	<p><u>Map 18 – Sidewalk widths (p. 67)</u> Amend sidewalk width map on page 67 to have all other streets minimum 10' minimum, no tree grates required.</p>	<p>Amend sidewalk width map on page 67 to have all other streets minimum 10' minimum, no tree grates required.</p>	
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Staff to provide additional information about existing sidewalk widths in the Central District to help the Commission determine if the proposed widths are adequate.</p>	<p>See Attachment XX with existing sidewalk widths.</p>	
	<p>Transportation Advisory Commission</p>	<p>15' minimum sidewalk width for main commercial corridors seems inadequate and needs to be justified.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	
	<p>Transportation Advisory Commission</p>	<p>Grouping all other sidewalks to 10' minimum does not improve the situation for pedestrians.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 5 – District-Wide Mobility Concept</u></p>	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>10-15 foot wide sidewalks are not adequate to cause a shift toward pedestrian mobility. Sidewalk widths should be 25-40 feet on principal mobility corridors. Existing wide sidewalk widths should be used as the minimum sidewalk widths.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Holly Street between Marengo and Garfield should continue to have a 30 foot wide sidewalk, not 10 feet as proposed.</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>Existing historic buildings and landscaping is not intended to be removed.</p>
	<p>Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group</p>	<p><u>Parking</u> New private parking should be fully underground or if above ground, should count towards FAR and should not be visible.</p>	<p>No change to plan.</p>	<p>Parking will continue to be encouraged to be underground, but not required and there are design standards to address the aesthetic concerns.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Shared parking should be encouraged in the Plan. Allow projects to construct public parking in excess of the caps.</p>	<p>No change to plan.</p>	<p>Zoning Code allows shared parking.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
	Community Member	Provide for the needs of paratransit users by ensuring that passenger loading and unloading areas are provided in major areas of the Central District.		
	Community Member	<p><u>Map 19 – Bikeway Concept</u></p> <p>Map is not consistent with map in the Mobility Element.</p>	Change Map 19 to be consistent with Mobility Element. See Attachment XX.	This map needs to be updated in the Central District Specific Plan.
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Linkages • The Public Realm • Public-Private Interface • The Private Realm 	Planning Commission	<p><u>Map 23 – Setbacks (p. 86)</u></p> <p>Clarify to show that the areas designated RM 32 and RM 48 will have setbacks as prescribed by the City of Gardens rules</p>	Revised map showing both Pedestrian Oriented Use and Housing Concept is confusing and should be revised for clarity, including distinct colors.	Adds clarity to Plan.
	Community Member	Eliminate or reduce the proposed 20-foot setback on Hudson between Walnut and Locust.	Change setback on Hudson between Walnut and Locust from 20 feet to 5 feet.	The 5 foot setback is consistent with current zoning and current development patterns on Hudson.
	Community Member	Existing landscaped setbacks in the Civic Center block along Green Street should not be replaced with buildings closer to the street.	No change to Plan.	Existing Civic Center could be replaced with buildings closer to Green Street if care is taken to protect the existing trees.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	Community Member	Greater setbacks should be required to facilitate grandstands for the Rose Parade.	No change to Plan.	<p>In most cases, proposed setbacks are greater than the existing setbacks.</p>
	Community Member	Proposed setbacks will encourage demolition of existing structures and encourage destruction of existing landscaped setback areas. Perform a block-by-block setback study and reassign setbacks.	No change to Plan.	
	Community Member	Theaters and churches should be required to have a courtyard and setback.	No change to Plan.	
	Community Member	Change maximum setbacks to minimum setbacks throughout the Central District.	No change to Plan.	
	Playhouse District Association	<p><u>Map 24 – Pedestrian-oriented streets (p. 87)</u></p> <p>Require pedestrian oriented uses on Colorado Boulevard, Lake Avenue and El Molino, between Union and Green Streets in the Playhouse District, but do not include other</p>	Agree. See Exhibit XX – Pedestrian Oriented Uses.	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	<p>Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group</p>	<p>north/south streets. Change ground floor pedestrian requirement to 100% of ground floor frontage, less the amount of frontage required for entrances, driveways, lobbies, and elevators for above floor uses.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	<p>Entire ground floor will be required to be non-residential, and 50% of the non-residential must be pedestrian-oriented.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Do not mandate ground floor commercial development south of Green Street in Old Pasadena. There is no demand for commercial uses far off of Colorado Blvd.</p>	<p>Agree. No change to Plan.</p>	<p>Off the major commercial streets in Old Pasadena, well-designed housing is appropriate for the ground floor.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission, Design Commission</p>	<p>The requirement for Pedestrian-Oriented development should be extended to include (1) El Molino, Oak Knoll and Madison Avenues between Green and Union, (2) Green Street between Oakland and Hudson and also between Pasadena and Arroyo Parkway, and (3) Union between Pasadena Avenue and Arroyo Parkway. Still considering area south of Green.</p>	<p>Agree/Disagree see changes to Map 24.</p>	<p>Not all of these streets can support pedestrian-oriented uses and may be appropriate for other uses. All non-residential uses will be required to have a minimum of 15' (floor-to-floor) height to allow a transition to pedestrian oriented use.</p>
	<p>Old Pas. Sub-District</p>	<p>Add pedestrian oriented uses requirement to:</p>	<p>Disagree. No change to Plan.</p>	<p>Not all of these streets can support pedestrian-oriented</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	<p>Planning Group</p>	<p>DeLacey Avenue between Del Mar and Union Streets Fair Oaks between Walnut and Del Mar Pasadena Avenue except between Del Mar and Valley The entirety of the following streets within Old Pasadena Sub-District: Holly Street Union Street Raymond Avenue Colorado Boulevard Green Street Dayton Street Valley Street from Fair Oaks to DeLacey Orange from Fair Oaks to DeLacey Arroyo Parkway, North of Colorado Blvd. Del Mar, except between DeLacey and Pasadena Avenue</p>		<p>uses and may be appropriate for other uses.</p>
	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Key pedestrian routes are not currently pedestrian friendly and the Specific Plan does not have appropriate policies to make them pedestrian friendly.</p> <p><u>Map 25 – Heights (p. 93)</u> <u>Height on Lake Avenue south of Del Mar:</u></p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	<p>Specific Plan and Mobility Element encourage pedestrian mobility through sidewalk widths, design guidelines, and requirement of pedestrian oriented uses.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	Staff	<p>Add a footnote to the height map to require that development within the view corridor on the north side of Union Street between El Molino and Oak Knoll Avenues may not block the view of the entire City Hall dome from the intersection of Hudson and Union Streets.</p>	Agree.	<p>Ensure that the existing view corridor is protected without being overly restrictive of property rights.</p>
	Staff	<p>Remove the Fuller Seminary footnote on the FAR map because text changes will more clearly address the needs of Fuller Seminary.</p>	Agree.	<p>Specific text provides more clarity than the footnote on the height map.</p>
	Community Member	<p>Height averaging concept should be permitted in the northern areas of the Playhouse District.</p>	<p>Change the height map to allow this area to have 50' (65') height limit which allows a height limit of 50' with some parts of a building up to 65'. Add a note that buildings may not block the view of the City Hall dome from the intersection of Hudson and Union Streets</p>	<p>Height averaging with appropriate protection for the view corridor is appropriate in this area.</p>
	Community Members, Pasadena Nbhhd Coalition	<p>Reduce the height limit on South Lake from 50 feet to 30-40 feet with no height averaging.</p>	<p>Agree. Change the height on South Lake Avenue, between Del Mar and California to 40 feet with height averaging up to 50'.</p>	<p>Height of average 40 feet is appropriate to respect the existing low-scale character of this part of South Lake Avenue.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept	South Lake Business Association	Retain the height limit on South Lake at 50 feet.	Disagree. See above.	Height of average 40 feet is appropriate to respect the existing low-scale character of this part of South Lake Avenue.
	Community Member	The Plan should provide guidelines on transitional areas from residential to commercial. Transition in height as well as density.	Disagree.	The Plan includes transition areas in height and FAR from residential to commercial areas.
	South Lake Business Association	Increase the height on the east side of Lake Avenue between Green Street and Del Mar from 50' to 75' to match west side.	Disagree. No change to Plan.	The character of the east side of Lake between Green Street and Del Mar Avenue is lower in scale and 50' height is appropriate.
	Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group	Reduce the height in the area between DeLacey and Pasadena Avenue between Del Mar and Dayton Street to 40' with averaging up to 52' with lowest heights at the periphery and higher heights at the center.	Disagree. No change to Plan.	These heights were developed with extensive community participation in the West Gateway Specific Plan and are not proposed for change.
	Community Member	Proposed heights will exceed current height limits in some areas.	No change to Plan.	Most areas of the Central District will either have reduced height or will not change.
	Community Member	Heights should be reduced to provide views	No change to Plan, except on South Lake Avenue.	Heights have been reduced throughout the Central District.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>of the mountains, especially during the Rose Parade.</p> <p>Height Averaging – p. 90-91 and map on p. 93: Change height averaging to allow height averaging over 50% of the site if additional open space is provided.</p>	<p>Disagree. No change to Plan.</p>	<p>Allowing 50% of a building to exceed the base height will result in buildings taller than the community desires.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p><u>District-wide Map 21: Linkage Concept</u></p> <p>Map on page 78, Linkage Concept should identify the intersection of Colorado Boulevard and Arroyo Parkway as a Primary Focal Intersection ("Big Dot")</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Arroyo Parkway/Colorado is a primary intersection.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Footnotes on p. 79, Arroyo Parkway Entrance Corridor Study, should refer to planning program for the Arroyo Parkway Entrance Corridor but should not say "conceptual"</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>More accurate description.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p><u>Open Space</u></p> <p>Concern that the Central District Specific Plan is not</p>	<p>See proposed changes to Implementation Section 11.</p>	<p>Open space/pocket parks is a major issue in the Central</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>		<p>strong enough in identifying and protecting land for new parks or pocket parks.</p>		<p>District and should be strongly stated in the Specific Plan.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Specific Plan should refer to preparation of Green Space Element and should provide inventory of City-owned property in the Central District</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Adds clarity.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 81 - Title should be <i>Urban Outdoor Spaces</i> rather than <i>Urban Spaces</i>; Move discussion of pocket parks to <i>Urban Outdoor Spaces</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Adds more clarity.</p>
		<p>p. 81 - Unclear whether consideration of "outdoor space for 10% additional floor area and/or credit toward communal open space requirements" refers to the Additional Floor Area Provision on page 53.</p>	<p>p. 81 - Clarify text concerning 10 percent additional floor area, with reference to p. 53.</p>	<p>Adds clarity.</p>
	<p>Old Pas. Sub-District Planning Group, Community Member</p>	<p>Central District Specific Plan must provide for new parkland and open space acquisition.</p>	<p>Add language to Plan with more specificity about parks and open space. Add implementation effort to work in concert with Green Space Element to quantify the need for parks in the Central District.</p>	<p>Recognizes the importance of parks and open space in the Central District.</p>
<p>Old Pas. Sub-</p>	<p>Identification of potential</p>	<p>No change to Plan.</p>	<p>Staff is working to identify sites</p>	

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 6 – District-Wide Urban Design Concept</u></p>	District Planning Group	sites for parkland and acquisition strategies must be in the plan.		and has begun exploring opportunities with property owners. Plan will not identify potential sites.
	Pasadena Heritage	<p><u>Districtwide Map 23 – Setback Concept (p. 86)</u></p> <p>The plan must identify areas where public parkland or green space is needed and stress acquisition of public green space.</p>	See comment above.	The plan will identify areas that are deficient in parkland.
	Community Member	Existing parking lots (such as Parsons) should be zoned for open space, not for higher density development.	No change to Plan.	Staff is working to identify sites and has begun exploring opportunities with property owners. Plan will not identify potential sites.
	Community Member	Civic Center open space areas around the auditorium should not be proposed for removal in the Specific Plan.	No change to Plan.	The improvements to the Convention Center will be subject to City Council approval. Current plans retain the open spaces adjacent to Green Street.
<p><u>Chapter 7- Sub-District Planning Concepts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Pasadena • Civic Center / Midtown • Walnut Housing 	Planning Commission	The term “Repair Street Edge” on numerous maps (pp. 96, 101, 106, 110, 115, 120) should be defined, so it will not encourage reduction in landscaping.	Agree. Define “Repair Street Edge.”	Adds clarity.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pasadena Playhouse • Lake Avenue • Arroyo Corridor / Fair Oaks • In-town Housing 	Planning Commission	p. 95 – Revisit the boundaries between areas a3 and a4.	Agree. Boundaries have changed – see discussion in Chapter 4 above.	More appropriate boundaries for the Old Pasadena Historic Core.
	Planning Commission	p. 96 – Arroyo Parkway and Colorado should be a primary focal intersection, also on page 101.	Agree. Change maps.	Recognizes the importance of Arroyo Parkway and Colorado.
	Planning Commission	p. 96 – Consider a safe crosswalk at Dayton or midway between Green and Del Mar to accommodate new residents in the Ambassador area in crossing to the park and the light rail station. Reference p. 98 #1 that supports such linkages.		Public Works and Transportation staff will consider this issue in the implementation of the Mobility Element.
	Planning Commission	p. 98 – Under South DeLacey corridor add #5 to encourage affordable housing.	No change to plan.	This was not identified as an issue during the West Gateway Specific Plan process, but affordable housing is a Central District goal.
	Planning Commission	p. 100 – Add a sentence to B-3 describing the existing plazas/open spaces in the Civic Auditorium block.	Agree.	Adds clarity.
	Planning Commission	p. 102 – Under last bullet point, also describe the two Civic Auditorium block public plazas.	Agree.	Adds clarity.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 7- Sub-District Planning Concepts</u></p>	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 106 – Is the midblock passage on the Fuller Seminary campus optional or required?</p>	<p>Optional. Change language to “Potential Mid-block passage.”</p>	<p>There may be circumstances where this mid-block passage is not desirable.</p>
	<p>Staff</p>	<p>Change Institutional Precinct (p.107) to read: “Development of the seminary should be accommodated in accordance with that institution's Master Plan, <i>provided that the overall development conforms to the underlying average building intensity (floor area ratio), average land use density (dwelling units per acre), and average height standards of this Specific Plan provided there is no conflict with this Specific Plan</i>; emphasis should be placed on maintaining the integrity and supporting the adaptive reuse of historic structures in this precinct.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword this to ensure that the city still has discretion in the Master Development Plan process to require changes to a project even though it may meet the average FAR or height or residential density. • Clarify that the project must comply with other sections of the Specific Plan. • Clarify that average height and FAR is of the underlying sub-district, not the entire Specific Plan. • Add that protection of the City Hall view corridor is a priority. 	
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 110 – typo “streetscape priority” is listed twice under Primary Pedestrian Connection.</p>	<p>Agree. Delete.</p>	<p>Error</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 110 and others – revisit whether the graphics can be</p>	<p>Agree. Will use color on cd-rom and web site versions.</p>	<p>Makes document easier to read.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 7- Sub-District Planning Concepts</u>	Planning Commission	changed to more distinguishable from each other – use color on web page and cd-rom versions of the document. p. 112 – 3 rd bullet point – add Madison Avenue, Green Street, Oakland to streets that need to have improved character.	Agree. Change text.	Recognizes the importance of these streets.
	Planning Commission	p. 116 – Add language about the importance of the mid-century architectural style of the South Lake shopping area.	Agree. Add language.	Adds clarity.
	Planning Commission	p. 117 – Change Housing Opportunity to read: “Potential exists for the redevelopment of rear surface parking lots with multi family housing and replacement retail parking that will strengthen the area.”	Agree. Change language.	Adds clarity
	Community Member	p. 111 – Pasadena should not have a street wall. Should emphasize scenic vistas.	No change to plan.	Street wall refers to a consistent setback for buildings. This term will be added to glossary.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 8 – Public Realm Design Guidelines</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Character • Street Environment 				
<u>Chapter 9 – Private Realm Design Guidelines</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Planning • Building Design • Urban Residential 	Community Member	There are no standards for parking garages in this chapter.	No change to Plan.	The design guidelines will apply to parking garages as well as buildings.
<u>Chapter 10 – Sub-District Design Guidelines</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Pasadena • Civic Center / Midtown • Pasadena Playhouse • Lake Avenue 				
<u>Chapter 11 – Implementation Strategies</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use Implementation Strategies • Mobility Implementation Strategies 	Staff	195 – Remove the footnote #7 from CD-3 under work-live units.	Agree.	Error
	Staff	p. 197 – Add the footnote #7 to the following uses: recycling, small collection facilities, transit terminal	Agree.	Error

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Design Implementation Strategies • Zoning Recommendations • Summary of Impacts 	Staff	<p>Add language to Section 11 (p. 179) as follows: "Master Development Plans: Support large downtown institutions (such as Fuller Seminary and Mayfield Junior School) in the development and update of Master Development Plans. <i>For large institutions, the Master Development Plan process may provide a process whereby an applicant may propose creative solutions to incorporate flexibility in the layout and design of building envelopes, so long as the end result is in compliance with the average building intensity, residential density, and height limits of the underlying development standards. The Fuller MDP shall comply with the goals, objectives, design guidelines, and other standards of the CDSP.</i></p>	Agree.	Add clarity for institutional uses.
	Planning Commission	<p>Implementation section needs to have more accountability. Add Responsible Agency to each task.</p>	Agree. Add more detail and specificity to the Implementation Section.	This will add more accountability to the implementation section.
	Planning Commission	<p>Add estimate of acreage of open space needed in the</p>	Agree. Staff will develop estimates of the amount of	This will add more accountability to the implementation section.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Chapter 11 – Implementation Strategies</u></p>		<p>Central District, especially in the Walnut Corridor.</p>	<p>additional open space that should be provided in the Central District.</p>	
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>Add estimated dollar figures to some implementation tasks to make it easier to transfer these tasks into the Capital Improvements Budget. (See North Lake Specific Plan for example.)</p>		
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 178 – Add to first paragraph that the 5-year review should also assess the balance of housing and commercial construction in the Central District and construction of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agree. Add text.</p>	<p>Adds clarity.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 178 – Reword Economic Development Plan section to either delete bullet points or to refer to the General Plan Land Use goals for Economic development.</p>	<p>Agree. Change bullet points to be consistent with General Plan.</p>	<p>Adds consistency with General Plan.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 178 – Change “Such a strategy should to could...”</p>	<p>Agree. Change text.</p>	<p>Strengthens the language.</p>
	<p>Planning Commission</p>	<p>p. 180 – Add inventory of city owned properties and inventory of park space.</p>	<p>Disagree. These inventories can be referenced without including in the Specific Plan.</p>	<p>City maintains a current inventory of city-owned properties and open space that should not be duplicated in the Plan.</p>

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
Chapter 11 – <u>Implementation Strategies</u>	Planning Commission	p. 180 – Add bullet point to develop incentives for the creation of publicly accessible open space.	Agree. Add bullet point.	Reflects community concern for additional open space.
	Planning Commission	p. 182 – Mobility Improvement Alternatives – Add more details and specifics to this paragraph. Reference the Mobility Element. Should start with "Enhance current and examine new alternatives..."	Agree. Add more detail and reference the Mobility Element.	Adds clarity and strengthens the connection with the General Plan.
	Planning Commission	p. 185 – Change first sentence to "Downtown Parks Planning Development."	Agree. Change language.	Adds clarity.
	Planning Commission	p. 185 – Make this section much more specific and detailed. Distinguish between private and public open spaces.	Agree.	Adds specificity and makes the plan more likely to be implemented.
	Planning Commission	p. 185 – Add benchmarks and acreage of parks needed in the Central District.	Agree.	Adds specificity and makes the plan more likely to be implemented.
	Planning Commission	p. 185 – Add 2004 cost to acquire additional parkland that is needed in the Central District.	Agree.	Adds specificity and makes the plan more likely to be implemented.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<u>Chapter 11 – Implementation Strategies</u>	Community Member	There are two maps numbered 27 in the draft plan and no map 26.	Change map on page 193 to Map 26. Recommended Zoning Districts.	Error.
	Community Member	Change footnote #4 on page 194-197 to read “Conditionally Permitted within 350 feet of the 210 freeway from the southerly property line of the Caltrans right-of-way of the 210 Freeway.	Agree. Change footnote #4.	Adds clarity.
	Community Member	Questions about the existing and proposed Central District boundaries. Some areas have split zoning designations between CD and other zoning designations.	No change to Plan.	Some Central District districts split parcels.
	Community Member	Zoning designation for southwest corner of Marengo and Del Mar.	Agree. Zoning designation for this area should be RM-32.	Error.

Central District Specific Plan Chapter	Comment From:	Comment or Recommendation	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
<p><u>Appendices</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Plan Consistency • Prior Downtown Planning Efforts • Civic Center / Midtown Development Guidelines • Community Participation Process • Acknowledgements 	<p>Staff</p>	<p>Delete Appendix C – Civic Center / Midtown Development Guidelines</p>	<p>Delete Appendix C – Civic Center / Midtown Development Guidelines</p>	<p>The rules for developing in the Civic Center/Midtown area are incorporated as appropriate into the Central District Specific Plan.</p>
<p><u>Other Comments</u></p>	<p>Community Member</p>	<p>Noise of subterranean parking garage ventilation fans needs to be attenuated.</p>		