

NOTES FROM 2008 COMMUNITY MEETING DISCUSSIONS

ATTACHMENT C

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
June 10th Community Meeting
Discussion of Policies**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Housing and Neighborhood Quality

Make policies specific about preserving the character and scale in a neighborhood (e.g., protecting views in hillside area from second stories)

Adopt policy for “no net loss” of affordable housing

Three ways of defining “no net loss”:

1. No net reduction in the number of affordable units (i.e., replacement or protection) – supported by large majority of group
2. No household paying an affordable price is displaced without an immediately available unit to move to – supported by majority of the group
3. No structure that is providing housing at an affordable price may be demolished – supported by some in the group

Need citywide inventory of affordable housing, including all housing that is priced at levels that are affordable

City should focus on protecting existing affordable housing, because supply is diminishing and construction of new housing is costly

Include maps showing where there are houses in disrepair or are substandard

Diversity should be discussed in Housing and Neighborhood Quality goal

Affordable housing should include housing for “workforce”

Diversity should include age, income, race, ethnicity, and building type

Do not destroy older homes and replace them with more units

Get rid of density bonus

Housing Production

Pasadena is an old city and is nearly built out

In region, Pasadena has built housing; let others in region catch up

Housing Element should comment on performance of adjoining cities

How much of affordable housing stock is occupied by Pasadenans and how much by people who come here from somewhere else?

Other cities should provide their share of housing, especially affordable housing

How do Arcadia, San Marino, Sierra Madre, La Canada get their housing elements certified without affordable housing?

State in the housing element that other cities are not doing their share, while Pasadena is

Housing element should comment on the failure of other cities to meet RHNA numbers

City will lose its character if there is an emphasis on tearing down existing housing and building new

Directing new development to transit corridors raises air quality risks for residents

Why does city require parking at TOD areas when others (e.g., Tokyo, NY) do not allow parking?

Policy 2.1 should specifically include very low and extremely low

Add policy for employee housing to be more affordable

Some areas of Pasadena are just for the rich and some are for the poor

Should support affordable housing

Emphasize Policy 2.5 supporting adaptive reuse for housing

People who purchased homes years ago are losing their homes; Latinos are neither poor nor rich but are working people

Include policy supporting universal design

What are "incompatible uses and intensity" (Policy 2.9)

Housing Assistance

City should be proactive in assisting people to relocate when a developer is constructing a project that displaces people

City should increase amount of redevelopment set aside; delete the word "available" in Policy 3.2 concerning resources for the production of housing

Amend Policy 3.9 to explore employer assisted housing

Policy 3.10 should prohibit discrimination based on income level

Special Needs

Does goal include group housing with supervision?

Sober living, group homes, assisted living for seniors -- over concentration in some areas

Board and care needs to be monitored

Provide "accessibility," meaning both ease of movement into and through the structure and also nearness to transit

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
March 25th Community Meeting**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION – HOUSING PRODUCTION

WHAT IS THE CITY DOING RIGHT IN PRODUCING AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

1. PASADENA'S VISIBLE COMMITMENT TO ADDRESS THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROBLEM
2. USE OF CREATIVE ZONING TECHNIQUES TO PRODUCE AFFORDABLE UNITS, E.G. INCLUSIONARY ZONING, DENSITY BONUS INCENTIVES
3. HERITAGE PARTNERS PROJECT – AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP, REFLECTING PASADENA'S HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION OF EXISTING HOUSING
4. BUILDING HIGHER DENSITY HOUSING AND MIXED-USE NEAR TRANSIT
5. FOSTERING PEDETRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
6. PROVIDING AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS
7. CITY'S COMMITMENT TO INCLUSIONARY ZONING
8. PROVIDING HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE TO FIRST-TIME BUYERS
9. DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING THAT IS AESTHETICALLY PLEASING

WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE THE CITY DO DIFFERENTLY IN THE FUTURE IN PRODUCING AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

1. CONCURRENT UPDATING OF ALL GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS SO THAT IMPACTS ARE CONSIDERED AND BALANCED IN AN APPROPRIATE MANNER, E.G. OPEN SPACE AND HOUSING; LAND USE AND HOUSING; CIRCULATION AND HOUSING
2. ALLOWANCE FOR SECOND UNITS IN SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES BY RIGHT. ELIMINATION OF CURRENT 15,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOT SIZE
3. SECOND UNITS REPRESENT MORE EFFICIENT USE OF SPACE - "ECO-FOOTPRINT" OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES WITH 1 TO 2 OCCUPANTS IS TOO HIGH
4. ELIMINATE THE IN-LIEU FEE OPTION FOR INCLUSIONARY – ONLY ADDRESSES 75% OF THE AFFORDABILITY GAP, REFLECTING ABOUT 50% OF COST RECOVERY. IF CITY MUST KEEP FEE, INCREASE TO AMOUNT NECESSARY TO FILL 100% OF THE AFFORDABILITY GAP
5. INCREASE THE CITY'S INCLUSIONARY REQUIREMENT TO 20% ALONG TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS AND REDUCE THE PARKING REQUIREMENT. INCOME DISTRIBUTION SHOULD INCLUDE 5% EXTREMELY LOW, 5% VERY LOW, 5% LOW AND 5% MODERATE.

6. EXPANDED FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE TO ENABLE RESIDENTS WHO GO THROUGH HOMEBUYER CLASSES AND THE APPLICATION PROCESS TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE
7. REDUCED PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, CONSISTENT WITH CITY'S POLICIES TO REDUCE VEHICLE TRIPS AND PROMOTE GREEN, ECO-FRIENDLY DEVELOPMENT
8. FLEXIBILITY IN SINGLE-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS (2 COVERED SPACES) TO BETTER ENABLE ADDITIONS IN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING. NOT PRACTICAL IN MANY OLDER HOMES.
9. BETTER RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE – MANY NEW BUILDINGS TOO BULKY AND DENSE. INCOMPATIBILITY OF GROUND FLOOR RESIDENTIAL ON BUSY STREETS.
10. FOLLOW-UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOUSING AFFORDABILITY TASK FORCE – WHAT IS THE STATUS?
11. FORMATION OF ROUNDTABLE OF HOUSING EXPERTS AND COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS TO DEVELOP INNOVATIVE HOUSING SOLUTIONS FOR PASADENA
12. SUPPORT MANUFACTURED HOUSING AS AN ALTERNATIVE, AFFORDABLE TYPE OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING
13. REVISIT CITY OF GARDENS ORDINANCE. IMPEDES DEVELOPMENT OF INCREASED NUMBER OF SMALLER UNITS WITHIN SAME BUILDING ENVELOPE.
14. EVALUATE SMALL LOT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, SUCH AS CITY OF LA'S ORDINANCE WHICH PROVIDES FOR 30'X60' FOT LOTS. ACCOMMODATES ADDITIONAL UNITS ON A PARCEL IN A BUNGALOW COURT FORMAT.
15. AWARENESS OF THE INTER-RELATEDNESS OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES AND ACTIONS IN ADJACENT CITIES – LA/GLENDALE/PASADENA. IF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS MADE TOO DIFFICULT IN 1 CITY, DEVELOPERS WILL SIMPLY BUILD IN ANOTHER.
16. ELIMINATE CITY'S ANTIQUATED PROVISIONS IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE WHICH RESTRICTS RENTING TO COLLEGE STUDENTS WITHIN SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES
17. CODE VIOLATIONS ON THE PART OF THE PROPERTY OWNER SHOULD NOT RESULT IN DIPLACEMENT OF TENANTS, E.G. WASHINGTON THEATER
18. NEED HONEST REPORTING OF INCLUSOINARY ACCOMPLISHMENTS – IDENTIFY 179 OF AFFORDABLE UNITS PRODUCED AS BEING LIMITED TO FULLER SEMINARY STUDENTS
19. CITY'S DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING PROCEDURES TOO LONG AND ADDS TO COST OF DEVELOPMENT– NEED TO STREAMLINE TO BETTER FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
March 25th Community Meeting**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION – RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

LIMITING RENT INCREASES

1. NEED POLICY TO DEAL WITH GENTRIFICATION AND RENT INCREASES
2. FOR SOME RENTS ARE INCREASING RAPIDLY, I.E., EVERY YEAR OR SIX MONTHS (THREE SPEAKERS)
3. NEED RENT CONTROL (FIVE SPEAKERS)
4. SURVEY CITIES FOR EFFECTS OF RENT CONTROL
5. CAP RENT INCREASES
6. ALLOW NO MORE THAN ONE RENT INCREASE PER YEAR
7. ESTABLISH PROTECTIONS AND ALLOW NO RENT INCREASES FOR SENIORS
8. CONSIDER RENT RATE INCREASE MITIGATION, AS ALTERNATIVE TO RENT CONTROL

RENTAL HOUSING AND ASSISTANCE FOR PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS AND AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS

1. NEED AFFORDABLE RENTAL BUILDINGS WITH DECENT LIVING CONDITIONS, BOTH MAINTENANCE AND NEIGHBORS, ESPECIALLY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
2. CONTINUE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS SUCH AS SHELTER PLUS CARE AND EXPAND THEM
3. DEVELOP HOUSING THAT IS AFFORDABLE TO SINGLE PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY THOSE AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS
4. PROVIDE MORE SRO HOUSING FOR THOSE AT RISK FOR HOMELESSNESS
5. CREATE HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION PROGRAM FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM SHELTER PLUS CARE
6. PROVIDE CASE MANAGEMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH SECTION 8 AND PROTECTION FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

7. INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF SRO HOUSING AND ALSO EFFICIENCY UNITS
8. DEVELOP INCENTIVES FOR DEVELOPERS TO BUILD SRO HOUSING, INCLUDING SRO UNITS WITHIN MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
9. INCREASE SHELTER PLUS CARE OPPORTUNITIES

ISSUES RELATED TO SECTION 8

1. WAITING LIST FOR SECTION 8 IS LONG
2. A MATCH PROGRAM TO INCLUDE ASSISTANCE WITH MAINTENANCE FOR LANDLORDS; NEED INCENTIVES FOR LANDLORDS TO OFFER HOUSING TO HOUSEHOLDS WITH SECTION 8
3. INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING THAT IS DECENT AND AFFORDABLE TO TENANTS WITH SECTION 8
4. ENFORCE ACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOR OF TENANTS WITH SECTION 8 THROUGH SUPERVISION, TO REDUCE EFFECTS ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES
5. THERE IS NO ONE TO TURN TO OR AVENUE FOR RESOLUTION WHEN TENANTS WITH SECTION 8 ARE SELLING DRUG AND CREATING OTHER SAFETY CONCERNS—NEED ENFORCEMENT

OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING

1. FOR A SINGLE- SUPPLY AND DEMAND PROBLEM: SHARED HOUSING PROGRAM WOULD ALLOW REASONABLE RENTS FOR A TENANT AND INCOME FAMILY HOMEOWNER
2. REVISIT "GRANNY FLATS" ORDINANCE; PERHAPS VARY REQUIREMENTS BY ZONING DISTRICT (TWO SPEAKERS)
3. EXPLORE OPTION OF PROVIDING MAINTENANCE IN EXCHANGE FOR RENT

OTHER COMMENTS

1. NEED A PROFESSIONAL SURVEY TO IDENTIFY PROFILE OF WHO WORKS IN THE CITY AND THEIR HOUSING NEEDS
2. IN MULTIFAMILY HOUSING UNITS, NEED ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR MAINTENANCE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SHOULD REQUIRE COMPLIANCE
3. SOME LANDLORDS DO NOT ALLOW PETS
4. PARKING IS A CONCERN
5. ELIMINATE THE IN-LIEU FEE OPTION IN THE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROGRAM; REQUIRE LANDLORDS TO ACCEPT LOW-INCOME TENANTS
6. PUT EMPHASIS ON FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AS WELL AS ON SENIORS
7. DEVELOP INCENTIVES FOR LANDLORDS TO KEEP RENTS DOWN: EXAMPLE, FUNDING FOR MAINTENANCE

8. INCREASE AFFORDABILITY OF SMALLER MULTIFAMILY UNITS
9. CREATE BOARD TO ARBITRATE RENT INCREASES IN LANDLORD/TENANT DISPUTES
10. SURVEY WHAT INDIVIDUAL COUNCILMEMBERS ARE DOING IN THEIR DISTRICTS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING –LIST INVENTORY BY DISTRICT
11. REVIEW JUST CAUSE EVICTION (TWO SPEAKERS)
12. ALLOW CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION ONLY WITH NO NET LOSS OF AFFORDABLE UNITS

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
March 25th Community Meeting**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

**SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION –
REHABILITATION/PRESERVATION**

Most important priorities for housing in Pasadena should be:

- Preservation of single family housing. To this end, Historic Preservation programs should be continued
- Rehabilitation of abandoned/deteriorated buildings
- Providing/producing more housing for families
- More rehabilitation of multi-family and increased inspections to ensure quality of housing, particularly for Section 8 programs

Programs the City should continue:

- Assist low-income families with monies and services for property maintenance (I.e MASH)
- Encourage preservation of affordable housing ...
- Mills Act is a good program for preservation of housing that is part of neighborhood's character

Changes to programs offered:

- Low-income housing should be dispersed throughout the City (e.g., east or south Pasadena) rather than concentrated in the Northwest
- Condominium Conversion Program. There should be no net loss of affordable housing through condominium conversions. We are losing affordable housing to condo conversions and demolitions faster than they can be replaced
- Acquisition and/or Rehabilitation. Provide programs that allow non-profit organizations to undertake housing rehabilitation for affordable housing
- Inclusionary Housing. Inclusionary Housing requirement should be higher than 15% in those instances where there is public assistance/investment that raises property values and the property owner benefits
- Lead Based Paint Hazard program. Address lead-based paint hazards in the City's housing stock with stronger standards and enforcement of requirements. The presence of lead should be considered a substandard housing condition that prevents a landlord from increasing the rent level

- Crime Free Multi-Family Program. Need extra efforts to maintain rehabilitated apartments free from drug dealing activities
- Quadrennial Inspection Program. Make the quadrennial housing inspection an annual inspection program like Section 8

New Programs the City should consider:

- Acquisition and Rehabilitation. A program that provides for the City or non-profit organizations to acquire properties with buildings in need of repair, rehabilitate them and offer as affordable units.
- Housing Authority. Create a Housing Authority entity that takes over substandard buildings, finds financing for rehabilitation and creates affordable housing. (There is shortage of will but not of monies to produce affordable housing!)
- Energy Conservation Programs. Consider energy conservation grants for rehabilitation and production of affordable rental/ownership units
- Inclusionary Program. Provide for raising in-lieu fees to the maximum allowed, every year.
- Single-family Rehabilitation. Expand rehabilitation program to include single-family units that are not owner occupied.
- Dispersion of Affordable Housing. Create incentives to disperse affordable housing and avoid concentration
- Rent Control. Current programs does not seem effective on protecting affordable housing. City needs rent control measures to adequately protect affordable housing. Glendale's "rent control" program is one that should be explored. High rents affect our community: I.e. diversity, schools, etc.

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
March 25th Community Meeting**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION - SPECIAL NEEDS/HOMELESS

EMERGENCY HOUSING AND OTHER HOMELESS SERVICE NEEDS

1. FAMILY CENTER WITH TRANSITION TO OTHER HOUSING
2. COLD WEATHER SHELTER ONLY OPEN AT CERTAIN TIMES – NEED ADDITIONAL SHELTER
3. PROVIDE A SAFE HAVEN TO HELP PEOPLE MAKE CONNECTIONS FOR SERVICES (SAFE HAVEN HAS A LOW THRESHOLD FOR ENTRY)
4. WHAT HAPPENED TO RACHEL'S CENTER? (REPLACED BY THE FAMILY CENTER RUN BY UNION STATION FOUNDATION)

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS

1. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES AND SINGLE WOMEN
2. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WHO DO NOT HAVE SUBSTANCE ABUSE OR ALCOHOL PROBLEMS.
3. CLEAN AND SOBER LIVING - NEED AFFORDABILITY AT THE NEXT PHASE, AFTER GRADUATION FROM THE PROGRAM

RENTAL SUBSIDY NEEDS

1. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RENTAL SUBSIDIES
2. RENTAL SUBSIDIES AND SECTION 8 – PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT THOSE RECEIVING SECTION 8 IN PASADENA ARE FACED WITH MOVING TO PALMDALE AND OTHER LESS EXPENSIVE MARKETS
3. NEED TO HAVE OUTREACH TO LANDLORDS TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION IN SECTION 8

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION NEEDS

1. PRODUCTION OF MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING
2. PERMANENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING
3. NEED MORE PROGRAMS LIKE NAVARRO HOUSE, A PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
4. "HOUSING FIRST" MODEL IS GOOD, BUT NOT ENOUGH HOUSING TO SUPPORT THE PROGRAM – NEED TO SUPPLEMENT THE HOUSING
5. NEED TO DISPERSE HOUSING THROUGHOUT THE CITY, NOT JUST IN THE NORTHWEST
6. NEED HIGHER RATIO OF PERMANENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO TRANSITIONAL HOUSING – DIFFICULT FOR PEOPLE TO TRANSITION TO PERMANENT HOUSING IN PASADENA
7. NEED MORE SENIOR HOUSING
8. NEED HIGHER DENSITY ZONING; REDUCE SETBACKS TO PROVIDE MORE LAND FOR HOUSING UNITS.

REHABILITATION/PRESERVATION NEEDS

1. ENLIST CORPORATIONS TO BUY EXISTING HOUSES (OLDER BOARDING HOMES) AND REHABILITATE TO CREATE HOUSING FOR SEVERAL COMPATIBLE FAMILIES; GIVE CORPORATIONS TAX BREAKS

OTHER ISSUES/CONCERNS

1. HOUSING SHOULD BE PROVIDED THROUGHOUT THE CITY, INCLUDING HOUSING WITH SOCIAL SERVICES NOT RELATED TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE. CHILD CARE SHOULD ESPECIALLY BE PROVIDED FOR SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES
2. NEED ENTRY LEVEL PROGRAM FOR YOUTH – ASSISTANCE FOR EMANCIPATED YOUTH COMING OUT OF FOSTER CARE SYSTEM
3. HOUSING PRIORITY FOR U.S. CITIZENS
4. NEED TO EXPAND EXISTING PROGRAMS/HOUSING THAT IS REALLY WORKING – NOT ENOUGH HOUSING FOR ANY CATEGORY OF NEED, SO NEED LOTS MORE HOUSING
5. ELIMINATE INCLUSIONARY IN-LIEU FEE AND REQUIRE ALL DEVELOPERS TO PROVIDE AFFORDABLE UNITS ON-SITE
6. IF KEEP IN-LIEU FEE, MAKE IT EQUAL TO THE TOTAL AFFORDABILITY GAP FOR A UNIT. FOCUS EXPENDITURES ON EXTREMELY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS
7. NEED TO USE DESIDERIO ARMY RESERVE CENTER SITE FOR HOUSING THE HOMELESS
8. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF VACANCIES IN ALL NEW HOUSING (WORK WITH OWNERS TO MAKE THE UNITS AFFORDABLE). THE EXAMPLE GIVEN WAS HOUSING IN PASEO COLORADO OVER GELSONS
9. NEED MORE ACCOUNTABILITY OF FUNDING FOR HOUSING, E.G. HOW IS IN-LIEU FEE BEING USED?
10. NEED ONE AGENCY THAT IS IN CHARGE OF HOUSING
11. NEED RENT CONTROL

**City of Pasadena
2008-2014 Housing Element Update
February 28th Community Meeting**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION - "BLUE GROUP"

Attendees in the room are not a fair representation of Pasadena community. Need better community outreach to lower income populations, including Section 8 residents. Provide childcare at community meetings to increase accessibility to families.

STRENGTHS OF PASADENA'S HOUSING:

1. RANGE AND QUALITY OF HOUSING STOCK
2. DIVERSITY OF RESIDENT POPULATION – SOCIOECONOMIC, ETHNIC, OWNER/RENTER. AS HOUSING PRICES INCREASE, LOSING THIS DIVERSITY
3. DO NOT SEE A LOT OF STRENGTHS – CURRENT DEMAND PUSHING UP PRICES
4. NEIGHBORHOOD IDENTITY, HOUSES HAVE HISTORY, SENSE OF PLACE
5. SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS ARE PROTECTED FROM GROWTH AND WELL MAINTAINED. NO REAL BLIGHTED NEIGHBORHOODS.
6. CULTURAL STRENGTHS OF PASADENA (E.G. HIGHER EDUCATION, ROSE BOWL, MUSEUMS). HOUSING IS NO LONGER ONE OF CITY'S STRENGTHS AS BECOMES MORE EXPENSIVE AND HOMOGENEOUS.

CONCERNS ABOUT HOUSING IN THE CITY:

1. HOW CAN EXISTING, MODEST INCOME RESIDENTS AFFORD TO STAY IN THE COMMUNITY AND NOT OVERPAY FOR RENTS?
2. HOW CAN AFFORDABILITY BE MAINTAINED FOR EXISTING HOMEOWNERS?
3. HOW CAN PEOPLE WHO WORK IN THE COMMUNITY, AND PERSONS WHO PROVIDE SERVICES TO PASADENA RESIDENTS (E.G. HOUSEKEEPERS, NANNIES, LANDSCAPERS, RESTAURANT WORKERS, ETC) AFFORD TO LIVE HERE?
4. CONCERNS ABOUT TRAFFIC ASSOCIATED WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT. CONCERNS ABOUT LEFT TURNS.
5. CONCERN ABOUT MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPED IN THE PAST WITHOUT SUFFICIENT PARKING.
6. CONCERN ABOUT COMMUNITY GENTRIFICATION, LOSING THE DIVERSITY THAT MAKES PASADENA UNIQUE.

WHAT DO YOU MOST WANT TO SAY ABOUT HOUSING IN PASADENA?

1. HOUSING AFFORDABILITY KEY – IMPORTANT FOR FAMILIES TO BE ABLE TO AFFORD TO PURCHASE HOUSING IN THE COMMUNITY.
2. DEMOGRAPHICS OF PASADENA SUPPORT THE NEED FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING – NEED TO LOOK AT THE NEEDS OF OUR RESIDENTS.

3. PLANNING FOR HOUSING ELEMENT DOES NOT OCCUR IN A VACUUM. OVERLAPPING DEMANDS – E.G. NEW MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS NEED TO BE COORDINATED TO PROVIDE SMALLER POCKET PARKS ADJACENT TO EACH OTHER.
4. IMPORTANT TO CREATE A SENSE OF PRIDE AND COMMUNITY IN WHERE YOU LIVE. CITY OF SEATTLE PROVIDES EXCELLENT EXAMPLE OF COMMUNITY BUILDING PASADENA CAN DRAW UPON.
5. IMPORTANT TO HAVE STRONG PROPERTY MANAGEMENT FOR AFFORDABLE AND MIXED-INCOME HOUSING, PARTICULARLY NEAR VIOLENT AREAS. STRONG MANAGEMENT AND PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CAN AMELIORATE THE NEGATIVE VIEW MANY HAVE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
6. IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN ARCHITECTURAL EXCELLENCE IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. GREEN SPACE EVEN MORE IMPORTANT IN HIGHER DENSITY PROJECTS – DON'T LIKE BUILDING RIGHT UP TO SIDEWALKS WITHOUT SETBACKS.
7. CONCERN ABOUT INADEQUATE HOUSING SAFETY NET FOR FOSTER CHILDREN RELEASED FROM THE SYSTEM AT AGE 18 (EMANCIPATED FOSTER YOUTH). PASADENA PLANS FOR SENIORS – NEED TO ALSO CONSIDER THIS SPECIAL NEEDS GROUP.
8. PASADENA NEEDS MORE PLANNING AND ACTIVITIES FOR YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS IN THE COMMUNITY, INCLUDING INTEGRATION OF SERVICES/ACTIVITIES WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.
9. SIGNIFICANT NEED FOR HOUSING FOR VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME POPULATIONS. HARD TO FIND PASADENA LANDLORDS TO WORK WITH THESE GROUPS – NEED TO ESTABLISH BETTER RELATIONSHIPS.
10. NEED TO HAVE SOME CONTROL OVER RENT INCREASES TO MAINTAIN CITY'S DIVERSITY, BE IT RENT CONTROL OR OTHER MECHANISM.
11. NEED FOR MORE PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING – PASADENA CURRENTLY HAS ONLY ONE FACILITY.
12. CITY DOESN'T APPEAR TO CARE ABOUT THE RENTER. LIST OF AFFORDABLE RENTALS PROVIDED BY THE CITY HAS ZERO VACANCIES.
13. REQUIRE PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE UNITS (NOT IN-LIEU FEE) THROUGH INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROGRAM.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION - "GREEN GROUP"

STRENGTHS OF PASADENA'S HOUSING:

1. DIVERSITY OF HOUSING IN TERMS OF INCOMES AND TYPES OF HOUSING
2. STRONG NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS – FOSTER COMRADERIE
3. HIGH LEVEL OF PROPERTY MAINTENANCE
4. MATURE TREES
5. STREET SIGNS & LIGHTING – CONTRIBUTE TO OVERALL LOOK AND SAFETY

CONCERNS ABOUT HOUSING IN THE CITY:

1. TOO MANY NEW HOUSING UNITS BEING BUILT ARE LIMITED TO THE VERY WEALTHY, IGNORING THE NEEDS OF MODEST INCOME RESIDENTS
2. EMPLOYERS FIND IT DIFFICULT TO RECRUIT OR RETAIN EMPLOYEES DUE TO PASADENA'S LACK OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING
3. CODE ENFORCEMENT CONTRIBUTES TO DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS, YET NEED TO FIND WAYS TO LIMIT HOUSEHOLD OVERCROWDING
4. NO EFFORT TO CONSERVE/PRESERVE AFFORDABLE UNITS, RESULTING IN LOSS OF PASADENA'S WORKING CLASS POPULATION

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE OF HOUSING IN THE CITY:

1. CODE ENFORCEMENT – HELP SOLVE PROBLEM PROPERTIES
2. FORECLOSURES – PURCHASE & RE-SELL OR RENT AT AFFORDABLE PRICES
3. RE-USE OF INSTITUTIONS (E.G., ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL, CLOSED PUSD SCHOOL SITES) – CONVERT TO HOUSING
4. RENT SUBSIDIES FROM COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES FOR STUDENTS (E.G. ART CENTER, CALTECH, PCC)
5. CITY ACTION NEEDED TO MAKE VACANT UNITS AVAILABLE AS HOUSING, E.G., CALTRANS PROPERTIES
6. NEED GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN THE REGION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS
7. PARKING REQUIREMENT FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT TOO HIGH
8. INCREASE OPPORTUNITIES FOR SECOND UNITS IN SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS BY: A) REDUCING CURRENT MINIMUM LOT SIZE OF 15,000 SF, AND B) ALLOWING IN HISTORIC/LANDMARK DISTRICTS
9. EXPAND & IMPROVE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROGRAM BY: A) EXTENDING TO ALL PROJECTS (E.G., NON-RESIDENTIAL & MIXED-USE PROJECTS); B) DISALLOWING BUYOUT (IN-LIEU FEES); C) FACILITATING SHARED EQUITY, LEASE/PURCHASE OPTIONS TO RESIDENTS
10. AMEND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN – INCREASE AFFORDABLE SET-ASIDE FUNDS
11. USE CODE ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES FOR INTERVENTION: SEIZE, REPAIR/REHAB, RETAIN UNITS & RESIDENTS
12. INCREASE DENSITY – WITHIN CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. LINK MULTI-FAMILY IN SPECIFIC PLAN AREAS TO TRANSIT – CREATE MORE INCENTIVES TO DECREASE CAR USAGE.

WHAT DO YOU MOST WANT TO SAY ABOUT HOUSING IN PASADENA?

1. REVERSE/AMEND SECOND UNIT RULES
2. ADOPT A NO NET LOSS HOUSING POLICY
3. NOT ENOUGH HOUSING FOR VERY LOW INCOME RESIDENTS
4. DISPEL THE MYTH OF WHO NEEDS AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND WHAT AFFORDABLE HOUSING LOOKS LIKE
5. UTILIZE VARIETY OF RESOURCES TO INCREASE AFFORDABLE HOUSING
6. PRESERVE PUBLICLY ASSISTED HOUSING AT-RISK OF CONVERSION TO MARKET RATE

City of Pasadena
Housing Element Workshop
June 10, 2008
Comments on Policies

Name (optional) CHRISTOPHER SUTTON

Please comment on the policies that should be included for each of the four goals. Space for Goals # 3 and 4 is on the back.

Goal #1: Housing and Neighborhood Quality

1. The "targetting" of all housing development in a few downtown areas has become a traffic disaster.
2. The goal should include "diversity" as a quality to be preserved; diversity as to race, gender, ethnicity, income, unit size.
3. No net loss of affordable housing.
4. No displacement of residents by code enforcement.

Goal #2: Housing Production

1. The second unit ordinance must ensure the creation of additional housing in all neighborhoods.
2. The "off-site" affordable units required by the inclusionary housing must be "on-site" in all cases.
3. "Transit oriented" development is a fraud when new units are allowed 2 or 3 parking spaces and open-ended use of automobiles.
4. Comment on the success and failures of adjoining cities.
5. Analyze unintended market consequences of "affordable covenants" causing a polarized market: rich and poor only, no middle.

Goal #3: Housing Assistance

1. Identify the practical limits of spending our way out of housing shortages.
2. Increase the "2#M" set aside in all redevelopment plans from 20% to 50% of all "tax increment funds"
3. Every site or building owned by the City must include housing units for city employees.
4. Use receivers under Health & Safety Code 17980.6 to seize rents, repair units, and displace tenants.

Goal #4: Special Needs

1. Note the result in McClure vs. City of Long Beach U.S. District Court, 2006.
2. Note Attorney General Bill Lockyer's letter to the City dated May 15, 2001.

Other comments?

1. Use the taxing power with voter approval for commercial housing impact tax on commercial projects and a tax on parking spaces within half mile of transit stations.

Was there adequate opportunity in the meeting to make the comments you wanted to make?

1. The meetings should take place on Saturdays and Sundays.

2. Please mail me a copy of my comments:
Chris Sutton, 2181 E. FOOTHILL #202, PASADENA, CA
91107-6825