

ATTACHMENT D
Community Comments

Attachment D.1

General Plan Policy Workshop

Flip-Chart Notes

Saturday, February 1, 2014

Pasadena City College, Creveling Lounge

Community Services, Education, and Public Participation and Involvement

Session 1

- Mention health services
- 16.4 Support shelters (especially bad weather)
- 16.5 Child care with child development programs – need affordability
- 17.5 Funding focus on public schools. Reduce inequity of funding between public and private schools
- 17.1 City libraries should support public schools, partner with them
- 17.3 Encourage lifelong learning, education, training, and career development
- 17.3 Include P.C.C. in long range planning (K-14)
- 17.4 public access to private school facilities, including Cal Tech, JPL, access expertise
- 17.2 Support/encourage business community to embrace students/internships/vocational training. Tap into resources. Goes both ways.
- 20 Target outreach for youth, teens, and those in their 20s and 30s. Go beyond Neighborhood Connections for outreach – e.g. schools. Develop action plan for outreach. Shift overall approach to outreach to reach more people and those as not used to participating. Use KPAS, public information office.

Session 2

- 17.1 See public schools as a community asset and use their facilities for public activities (e.g. blood drives)
- 17.1 City can use schools (e.g. P.C.C.) to partner to develop technologies (e.g. apps)
- 16 + 17 Health Department use schools as outreach tool for their programs (e.g. for basic nutrition education)
- 17.5 Promote schools as a resources, where people can pay for services (e.g. P.C.C. developing phone app.)
- 20 More neighborhood meetings that are not focused on a single issue. Attract participation from those not normally participating
- 16 Affordable access to health services
- 17 More public access to schools; act like neighborhood centers

Session 3

- Health services
- Child care services. Location/available. Reasonable prices.
- Aligning services (#16) and education (#17)
- Public schools not used for most of the day/weekends. Better-efficient use of schools
- Focus on joint use such as adult education
- Churches are diversified and schools should be too
- 17.1 There should be a priority list of shared/joint uses
- 17.1 Build off existing examples of joint use/partnerships
- 17.1 Streamline/simplify insurance process-currently this discourages joint use
- 20 Lack of communication. Best way to get word out is through the schools. #20 and #17 both need each other
- 20 Explore innovate ways to share information
- 20 Not everyone has Internet, cell phones, etc. There are multiple ways to get the word out. Make sure you capture everyone. New technologies that aren't even developed.
- The City and School network is available to get the word out
- Intervention with new and continuing systems
- Identify
- Attract all groups – diversity – old, young, ethnic, race, etc.
- Partner with other groups for outreach.
- Policies incorporate things from other plans
- Effort for constant outreach. Database, infrastructure, reach out on a regular basis. Should be early in the process
- Community effort/forum to improve public schools
- 17.6 Look at that on a Citywide basis
- 17 Safe routes to school – walkability. Safety of kids.
- Education – share data and needs. School and city – for joint use, it should be based on the needs, supported by data, of the community.

Sustainable Environment, Sustainable Economy, and Parking

Session 1

- Expand parking limit to areas outside CD & Gold Line stations
- De-couple or unbundle parking requirements from dwelling units (apartments, condos) & businesses
- Unbundling parking from the land use would lead to transparency of parking cost
- Strengthen policies 19.3, 19.4, 19.5
- Revisit parking standards (minimum required parking)
- Add policy statement to prevent overflow of parking to residential streets
- Allow consolidation of parking space among businesses
- Allow for gradual lowering of parking standards over time
- Allow converting parking structures/facilities to other uses (addressing physical constraints, e.g., ramps, i.e., allow conversion with minimal required changes to the structure)
- Allow transferring parking rights or use among businesses, will limit required parking
- Link alternative modes of travel to parking requirements
- Add policy relating to energy production, e.g., get off coal
- Add environmental policy to use new technologies, noise pollution (from motorcycles, etc.)
- Environmental policy regarding infrastructure
- Noise pollution from motorcycles
- State that Pasadena is a green city
- Walkability – explicitly which streets, corridors, etc.
- Preservation – add green areas among existing developments (e.g. connect commercial to residential)
- Economic Vitality
 - Emphasize opportunities for job creation
 - Link business with education and training institutions (e.g. CalTech, PCC, etc.)

Session 2

- The policies overlap. What is the link among environment, economy, and social equity?
- 710 Freeway extension: three options. Consider the consequences to Pasadena.
- Policy on housing affordability – reduce barriers to affordable housing (Policy 11.4)
- State a balance between environmental sustainability and economic sustainability
- Add sustainable landscaping (native plants) standards in residential properties
- Educate/strengthen public outreach regarding best practices for sustainable gardening, constructions, etc.
- Limit/control the number of concentration of restaurants in a given areas to promote a mix of uses.

- Tie policies regarding mobility to economic policies (see policies 12.1-12.6)
- Introduce flexibility in adaptive reuse of existing buildings and spaces
- Add angled parking design and placement next to sidewalk
- Relax/re-evaluate restrictions on overnight street parking
- Each transit area is different – one standard does not fit all TOD's
- Adopt parking standards for each TOD area according to their respective characteristics. For example, Sierra Madre Villa, Allen, and Lake Stations need more parking. Strengthen flexible parking in TOD, when additional parking is for public use.
- Under Mobility Element – Emphasize linkage between public transit modes (bus, etc.) to connect to Gold Line Stations.
- Put more thought on concepts on TODs mixed-use parking requirements, accessibility (case by case basis)
- Where do parking ticket fines go?
- Parking once, connect/link to sustainable environment (Policy 19.4)
- Provide means/way for those who need parking – annual parking pass in parking restricted streets.
- TOD Areas: Current limit on parking (max/caps) negative impact on certain areas (East Pasadena). Destination area, where people do not rely on public transportation.
- Need parking at Gold Line stations other than SMV station.
- Relate transportation modes to where people live (point of origin)
- Revisit/relate air quality to location of housing/residential. No air quality studies.
- Use lands along freeway for commercial offices instead of housing (e.g. Wilson and Corson site)
- Lack of/absence of air quality studies to address location of residential
- Develop health policies – relate to land use policies (specifically air quality)
- Increase city incentives for solar panel cost for residents
- Coordinate infrastructure (streets, public trees, storm drains, etc.) work with private development projects
- Take out charges for underground utilities (Water and Power), or build it. Related to environmental quality and economic health (create jobs) in neediest area (Northwest)
- Support environmental and economic sustainability with education – relate to job creation
- Flex Space – affects parking demand
- Strengthen sustainability in all city actions – priority consideration
- Address water supply (drought) in policies, practices. Low water use, etc.
- Emphasize education/academic programs that lead to viable jobs (sciences, engineering, etc.)

Session 1

- Focus development near freeway ramps
- Expand transit radius beyond a quarter mile
- Maintain quality in neighborhoods and protect them development
- Wayfinding Signs should not be placed in residential areas
- Instead of Wayfinding, use GIS applications
- Balance quality architecture with innovative architecture
- Identify districts where contemporary architecture is appropriate
- Not a good idea to limit types of architecture to specific areas
- Santa Barbara is an extreme example of restrictive design guidelines

Session 2

- Size and scale of development is already determined by the time new projects reach the Design Commission
- Zoning envelopes give developers the form and size of building
- Preliminary Consultation has been working well, consider lowering the threshold for projects subject to PC.
- Concern about mansionization in single family neighborhoods
- Increase number of historic neighborhoods
- Single family homes are not being sensitively treated
- Better education for homeowners about preservation
- Better education for non-DHP Planning Staff concerning preservation
- Recommend a specialized unit in code enforcement for preservation enforcement
- Transitional Zoning adjacent to historic districts should be developed
- Design staff is AMAZING!
- Concern about SB1818 and taller buildings adjacent to neighborhoods
- Transition to neighborhoods is very important, but difficult in cases where mixed use development is adjacent to single family
- Period of “development turmoil” after the adoption of a form-based code (e.g. City of Los Angeles) when downzoning occurred due to context studies
- Replace “tolerance” with sympathetic or encourage

Session 3

- Embrace modern architecture
- Consider applying road diet to portion of East Colorado, outside the Central District
- Policy 6.3 should state directly, “Form Based Code”
- Public Art that is sustainable or forms that are themselves, capable of producing sustainable effects (fountains the use reclaimed water).
- Architecture that is sustainable
- Re: Policy 8.5 should have a concept related to sustainable new building design
- Washington Theatre should be preserved and adaptively reused
- Lack of parking is a barrier to the reuse of some existing historic structures, more allowance for parking
- North lake need quality, walkable development
- High parking requirements prevents lots of good changes.
- Create hubs near historic resources, i.e. diversity of activities around historic resources
- “Compatibility” is a land-mine word-means different things to different people-could prevent good new architecture because it is not in scale or character with existing buildings.
- Preserve view of the mountains
- Central District needs to fill vacant storefronts

Growth, Land Use Mix, Compatible Land Uses and Correlation of Land Use with Mobility

Session 1

- Impact of Mixed-Use on SFR-SB1818
- Definition of Neighborhood Village is not clear
 - More information on Lower Density
- Policy 21.1. Adequate Housing
 - Central District is already impacted. Housing cap is too high in Central District.
- Need policy on Air Quality Near Freeways
- Transitions of Density in Orange Grove + Los Robles
- “What’s happened with the previous General Plan?”
- “This is the first time I’ve heard of Neighborhood Village.”
- “I’m fine with density in Central District. We don’t drive as much.”
- Policy 1.2. Central District is a residential neighborhood.
- Pasadena was a destination. Don’t want to be a bedroom community.
- Don’t want West Gateway to be a place for people only want to travel.
- SB1818 next to SFR

Session 2

- How to address Senior Housing
- Senior Housing should be integrated into neighborhoods (Affordable Housing)
- Housing for families with children is needed
- Supportive of 2nd units expand to smaller lots
- People living in garages allow 2nd units. But take care of comdat. Make it safe.
- Allow 2nd units in Lower Density with sensitive Historic Preservation issues.
- Not unanimous
- Work/Live should allow for family-sized units.
- Need housing for people who work here
- Dividing up SF homes into MF student housing
- Courtyard housing supportive of parking
- Parking makes housing expensive, unbounding
- Shared parking
- Improve public transit faster, less headways.
- Getting to jobs takes too much time.
- Buses add traffic though.
- Maintain High Densities next to Neighborhood Villages + Transit Villages
 - Light + Shadow?
- Los Robles + Orange Grove are examples of parking drawing bad transitions

- Modern Design
 - That's good, appropriate. Locations (?)
- Update parking policies
- Take into account water usage

Session 3

- Policy 1.5. Reduction duration same as 5-year Review (otherwise spot zoning?)
- Policy 1.4. State what percent of conversion is allowed
- Policy 1.4. State how it applies to non-specific plan areas
- Policy 21.4. Discourage mansionization, especially in non-hillside areas. Update zoning code
- Support entry-level family housing (townhouses, e.g.), small-lot housing
- Greenspace - ways to aggregate between projects
- Affordable housing – stronger incentive replacement of existing housing
- Less onerous development review
- Use development to pay for transit
- Creative office use development transit
- Flexibility in adaptive re-use
- Support non-covenanted affordable housing

Attachment D.2

General Plan Policy Workshop

Comment Card Responses

Saturday, February 1, 2014

Pasadena City College, Creveling Lounge

COMMUNITY SERVICES, EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & PARTICIPATION GOALS AND POLICIES

1. Indicate your general level of agreement or disagreement with this statement, "The draft **Community Services, Education and Public Involvement & Participation** goals and policies generally reflect and are consistent with my vision for the future of the Pasadena."
 - 1) Somewhat Agree. Need to create database/information sharing infrastructure to encourage community participation.
 - 2) Somewhat Agree. Just a bit more language signifying synergy between elements.

2. Are there any policies that are inconsistent with your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 17.5. Make sure that funding (grants) goes to public schools and public facilities.
 - 2) Policy 20.1, 20.4 & 20.5. Please include further language about using multiple methods of communication and assessing periodically for effectiveness.

3. Are there any policies that most closely represent your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 16. Create a holistic approach and uniformity in order to provide community services equitably.
 - 2) Policy 17.1 through 17.6. Education.

4. Identify any ideas for policies guiding Pasadena's development that you consider are (1) **missing** and need to be added to the draft goals and policies, or are (2) there polices that should be **modified**? Please indicate which specific subsection your comment(s) pertains to.
 - 1) *[No Response]*
 - 2) *[No Response]*

SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY GOALS AND POLICIES

1. Indicate your general level of agreement or disagreement with this statement, “The draft **Sustainable Environment and Sustainable Economy** goals and policies generally reflect and are consistent with my vision for the future of the Pasadena.”
 - 1) Somewhat Agree.
 - 2) Strongly Agree.
 - 3) Somewhat Agree. Not all the policies are ready for implementation at this time or in the future.
 - 4) Somewhat Agree/Somewhat Disagree. What does “adequate parking” mean? Best to let the market decide rather than imposing minimums. Abundant free parking kills walkability.

2. Are there any policies that are inconsistent with your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 19. The policy should not be focused on providing “Adequate” parking. Rather, it should be focused on regulating parking in a manner that is CONSISTENT with the mobility, land use, urban form, and sustainability goals of the General Plan. Establishing “adequacy” as the baseline may be inconsistent with those goals.
 - 2) Policy 1.6. Should be every year, not every 5 years, for flexibility.
 - 3) Policy 10.6. Too limiting
Policy 19.2. Parking limits would reduce park once and walk.
Policy 19.4. First the City needs to have a strong bicycle friendly roadway.
 - 4) Policy 19.1. Standards should ensure that there is not too much parking. Any minimums imposed should be based on adequate parking at market rates, not free parking.

3. Are there any policies that most closely represent your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) *[No Response]*
 - 2) Policy 18.3. Less car traffic would result
Policy 2.6. Don’t waste valuable land. Require housing above commercial. Require a minimum FAR.
 - 3) Strongly Agree with the following...
Policy 10.11 more walkable city parks.
Policy 10.16 all new projects over one acre proved water retention.
Policy 12.1 to 12.5. Necessary for a sustainable city.
Policy 13.1 to 13.5. Streamline and reduce the permit process
Policy 19.1. Each transit station needs are different; therefore each station needs a specific policy. (Example: 3202 E. Foothill Blvd. is 8.5 acres and has only 4 adjacent on street parking spaces, therefore parking onsite should not be capped.)

Agree with the following: 10.3, 10.4, 10.8, 10.9, 10.12, 10.13, 10.15, 10.16, 10.17, 14.1 to 14.13, 15.1, 19.3 a, and 19.3 b except East Pasadena.

- 4) Policy 19.2 and 19.3. Allow parking to be unbundled from use so that those who choose to walk/take transit don't have to subsidize parking. Excess parking could then be leased at market rates to those that want to drive.
4. Identify any ideas for policies guiding Pasadena's development that you consider are (1) **missing** and need to be added to the draft goals and policies, or are (2) there polices that should be **modified**? Please indicate which specific subsection your comment(s) pertains to.
- 1) Parking! Needs to establish a goal to TRANSITION parking expectations/norms/regulations/goals from the outdated auto-centric parking standards (ideas about "adequate" parking) of the past to modern recognition that an emphasis on "adequate" parking can be harmful to affordability, historic preservation, walkability, transit use, etc.
-- Add a policy to make the economic costs of parking transparent. De-couple parking from residential units and commercial square feet so that parking is not falsely perceived to be "free."
 - 2) Policy 2.1. As written, it ignores affordable housing and says it could all be for the rich. Add word, "costs" after "densities" in the first sentence.
 - 3) See responses to questions two and three.
 - 4) Policy 19.2. Should include Neighborhood Villages as well as the Central District and Transit Villages.

GROWTH, LAND USE MIX, COMPATIBLE LAND USES AND CORRELATION OF LAND USE WITH MOBILITY GOALS AND POLICIES

1. Indicate your general level of agreement or disagreement with this statement, “The draft **Growth & Land Use** goals and policies generally reflect and are consistent with my vision for the future of the Pasadena.”
 - 1) Strongly Agree
2. Are there any policies that are inconsistent with your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) *[No Response]*
3. Are there any policies that most closely represent your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 21.6. We need more walking and biking.
4. Identify any ideas for policies guiding Pasadena’s development that you consider are (1) **missing** and need to be added to the draft goals and policies, or are (2) there polices that should be **modified**? Please indicate which specific subsection your comment(s) pertains to.
 - 1) Policy 21.5. Has wrong emphasis on “equitable distribution” and ignores how affordable housing contributes to our City’s diversity and economy. Add “promote construction and preservation of sound quality affordable housing to maintain the City’s diversity, improve our economy, reduce congestion, and provide for less fortunate.
Policy 22.2. Change “allow” to “promote.”
Policy 23.6. Our code encourages green, unusable open space. We should change that. Say “amend codes to encourage active open spaces where neighbors meet and play.”
Policy 23.2. Parking drives up the cost of housing. Add, “to reduce housing costs, allow innovative parking strategies such as tandem parking, uncovered parking, and car sharing in new developments.”
Policy 25.4. Does new development have to respect the scale of all adjacent buildings? This is implied here. What if a one story building exists in the CBD [Central Business District]?
Policy 28.1. Add “expand these mixed-use areas when possible.”

MOBILITY & PARKING GOALS AND POLICIES

1. Indicate your general level of agreement or disagreement with this statement, “The draft **Mobility & Parking** goals and policies generally reflect and are consistent with my vision for the future of the Pasadena.”
 - 1) Strongly Agree
2. Are there any policies that are inconsistent with your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why. *[A numbering error occurred on the list of Draft Mobility Policies handed out at the Workshop. The following numbers have been converted to the correct numbers in the Draft Mobility Element Policies]*
 - 1) Policy 3.10 Too much emphasis on an inefficient program.
3. Are there any policies that most closely represent your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why. *[A numbering error occurred on the list of Draft Mobility Policies handed out at the Workshop. The following numbers have been converted to the correct numbers in the Draft Mobility Element Policies]*
 - 1) Policy 1.24. Do stuff to make busses more popular.
Policy 1.6. We need bus stops that say when the next bus will come.
Policy 1.11. Need bike only paths. Convert defunct rail to bike paths (e.g. along Walnut)
Policy 2.5. More bike paths.
Policy 2.9. Yes!
4. Identify any ideas for policies guiding Pasadena’s development that you consider are (1) **missing** and need to be added to the draft goals and policies, or are (2) there polices that should be **modified**? Please indicate which specific subsection your comment(s) pertains to. *[A numbering error occurred on the list of Draft Mobility Policies handed out at the Workshop. The following numbers have been converted to the correct numbers in the Draft Mobility Element Policies]*
 - 1) Policy 1.18. Another way is bike-sharing at transit stations.

URBAN FORM AND PLACEMAKING, SENSE OF PLACE, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND ARTS & CULTURE GOALS AND POLICIES

1. Indicate your general level of agreement or disagreement with this statement, “The draft **Urban Forum, Sense of Place, Historic Preservation, and Arts & Culture** goals and policies generally reflect and are consistent with my vision for the future of the Pasadena.”
 - 1) Strongly Agree.
2. Are there any policies that are inconsistent with your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 6.5. Wayfinding signs are cluttering our streets and foreign to our character.
3. Are there any policies that most closely represent your vision for the future of Pasadena? If so, identify the policy(ies) by number and explain why.
 - 1) Policy 5.2. Good definition and ideas.
Policy 6.1. Good points to consider.
4. Identify any ideas for policies guiding Pasadena’s development that you consider are (1) **missing** and need to be added to the draft goals and policies, or are (2) there polices that should be **modified**? Please indicate which specific subsection your comment(s) pertains to.
 - 1) Policy 4.6. Specify that villages should maximize use of land by having housing above commercial uses.
Policy 4.11 and 4.12. Add, “Understand that development in different zoning districts, even though adjacent, may have different densities, intensities, and heights.
Policy 7.5. Is a good one. We don’t want Santa Barbara here.