

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 10:52 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Name: Richard A. McDonald **Email:** **Phone:** **Address:**
Pasadena, CA
91101

Comments:

We recommend directing staff to study the four General Plan changes set-forth in the staff report, and visually shown on page 10 of it. The impact of the pandemic on retail and office leasing has been severe with much of the impact still working its way through the market. Adding residential and mixed-use options to those commercial uses that are already permitted makes sense and will provide the City with more flexibility in addressing market changes going forward. The downside risk of not allowing such alternative uses is high vacancy rates in commercial office space and empty retail storefronts as we already can see along Colorado Blvd. and other commercial corridors.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 19, 2021 at 10:52 am

02/22/2021
Item 20

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 7:49 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Name: Erika Foy
Email:
Phone:
Address: Pasadena, CA 91106

Comments:

I agree with Pasadena Heritage that if a few of these General Plan amendments are selected, we should be looking at lowering heights and densities elsewhere like on South Raymond and East Pasadena to preserve the beauty, historic nature, small town feel and quality of life for all residents in our city. It is confusing we would be looking at just these four areas. Why not look at all low/medium commercial areas instead of these few selected areas? I am also curious about the term "community stakeholder." Isn't any Pasadena resident who calls this city home a "community stakeholder?" I have been concerned about the densities and heights proposed in our General Plan for years, so why do these four sites get the attention of the council for change when we have been calling for change and review for years? I am skeptical of what is happening here. It seems like spot zoning and preferential treatment for whoever this community stakeholder might be. Imagine the wealth created from this rezoning? It seems this decision should be part of the specific plan process where all community members have a chance to participate. Area 1 is especially troubling with height and density.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 22, 2021 at 7:49 am

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 9:42 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Name: Ken Perry **Email:** **Address:** East Pasadena, Pasadena, CA
91104

Comments:

In looking at the recommendations to revise the General Plan to squeeze even more housing onto existing commercial and office space, the phrases “under cover of darkness,” “smoke filled rooms,” and “under the table” come to mind. The retail and restaurants north of Foothill Blvd. in East Pasadena are some of the most crowded and popular in the city. We need more of these type of services for Pasadena residents – not fewer. Foothill Blvd. is already at capacity with all of the housing going in south of the Blvd. We can’t jam even more cars into the area by bringing in even more housing. If we are having problems filling office space with jobs in Pasadena – then why do we need so much housing? Let’s suggest the state put housing where jobs actually are and not continue to change Pasadena into city with only dense housing where residents still have to drive a long ways to their jobs.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 22, 2021 at 9:41 am

02/22/2021
Item 20

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 11:10 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20

Name: Rick Cole **Address:** Pasadena, CA 91104

Comments:

The staff report provides an excellent overview of the City's progress in implementing the General Plan and sensibly planning future growth. I support studying expanding housing opportunities in the four areas identified by staff, as a way to meet both the City's RHNA obligations and protect more sensitive areas from out-of-scale development.

I would underscore the importance of ensuring that "As part of the Housing Element update, the City will conduct an extensive outreach program through community workshops, online surveys, Planning Commission and City Council study sessions, and public hearings starting this spring. Per state law, the City Council is required to adopt the updated 2021-2029 Housing Element by October 15, 2021." This will require extensive participation to meet State law and balance the concerns of Pasadena residents.

The City Council should adopt Mayor Victor Gordo's call for an affordable housing task force or commission to lead this effort. No single policy, program or funding source will address the requirement to build 6000 affordable units in the next cycle. A task force could help develop a comprehensive and substantive effort to engage Pasadena citizens and find consensus to implement solutions to Pasadena's affordable housing and homelessness challenge.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

02/22/2021
Item 20

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 2:00 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20 - City Manager - GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20 - City Manager - GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Name: Shlomy Hillel, Albert Sharaf, Aitan Hillel, Oren Hillel
Email:
Phone:
Address: , Pasadena, CA 91105

Comments:

Dear members,

We have built, owned, and operated the Pasadena Auto Wash for the last 30 years, and love being great members of this amazing city and community. We have been proud to serve this community and always with the best service, which is what we intend to do in the future development of our property. We are in complete support of the proposed updates to the General Plan for the requested amendments in Area 1, 2, 3 and 4. Our property is located in Area 1 and the requested amendment to allow for high residential and high mixed-use (87 du/ac) would fit in perfectly for our properties.

Our property is a gateway to the city of Pasadena and this amendment will allow a project of the highest/best use to be built here that will enhance the streetscape for years to come. The connection in residential between both sides of Del Mar Blvd will allow for better walkability and livability.

We'd love the opportunity to work with the City of Pasadena in achieving our vision that aligns with these updated land use designations. We hope that the city which we've been long time business owners agree with us to update the South Fair oaks plan.

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 22, 2021 at 1:59 pm

Martinez, Ruben

From: City Web
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 2:49 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20 - City Manager - GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Public Comment for Meeting on February 22, 2021 about Agenda Item 20 - City Manager - GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Name: Albert Sharaf **Email:** **Address:** Pasadena,
CA 91105

Comments:

Dear honorable Mayor and council members of city of Pasadena

We just wanted to add that we would be happy to designate our project/property as the start of the arts district - including public art, sculptures, and any other items the city would support.

Thank you for the time and consideration

Consent given to read my comments out loud: Yes

Entry Submitted: February 22, 2021 at 2:48 pm

02/22/2021
Item 20