

Jomsky, Mark

From: Laura Ellersieck <eewna@earthlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2011 3:25 PM
To: cityclerk; Bogaard, Bill; Eugene Masuda; Robinson, Jacque; Gordo, Victor; Holden, Chris; McAustin, Margaret; Tornek, Terry; Madison, Steve
Subject: Item 11 - parking maximums near Gold Line stations

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,

I write to you regarding item 11 on your October 24 City Council meeting agenda, which regards parking restrictions near Gold Line stations.

I can't speak to how well restricting available parking works near other stations, but many of my neighbors and I think it does not produce the desired outcome and only has negative effects near the Sierra Madre Villa station.

We would like serious consideration to be given to the recent request to eliminate or modify the parking maximums imposed on developments within a quarter mile of the Sierra Madre Villa station.

The staff recommendation for study seems to be reasonable.

I am President of East Eaton Wash Neighborhood Association, representing the single family residential neighborhood immediately north of Foothill and west of Sierra Madre Villa. We have not discussed the specific proposal before you, but we have often discussed the problems with business and student parking in our single family neighborhood of narrow streets.

We are increasingly seeing employees of the Kaiser Medical Offices located on the south west corner of Foothill and Sierra Madre Villa parking on our streets. (Their parking pattern is different than the PCC-CEC students who jam our streets instead of using the plentiful but inconvenient and costly PCC-CEC parking lot). Residents have followed people who are parking all day, every day, to learn they are going to Kaiser's facility. Some are parking as far as five to six blocks north of Foothill. (They come deep into our neighborhood in part because the outer edge has time limited parking and in part because others are already parked there.) They are walking much further to park on our streets than their walk to the Gold Line station would be.

Kaiser shuttles employees to parking spaces leased from a church about a mile away. Either employees are finding the shuttle too inconvenient, or they are taking rideshare incentives and then driving anyway and parking in our single family neighborhood.

We haven't made any attempt to check, but I would not be surprised to learn that some employees are also parking in the Gold Line Station parking structure (in spots that could otherwise be used by train riders going elsewhere), or in the Hastings Village Shopping Center (Bed Bath Beyond, Best Buy, etc).

If more businesses are developed under the parking restrictions, the parking and traffic problems on our streets, lack of parking for the Gold Line, and at times congested shopping parking will just be compounded. If desirable businesses go to other cities to avoid the hassle for their employees or visitors, the city as a whole suffers the lost opportunity.

As for multi-family residential restrictions, I would not be at all surprised to learn that there are quite a few of the residents of the apartments built next to the Gold Line structure who are using its parking. To some extent that will be off-peak hours. But consider that the common practice if you have cars beyond your reserved parking space is to park the least used car in the more difficult location. And if additional space will be needed at a peak hour, then you park your car in the public space so your reserved space will be available as needed.

While its great when people take public transit, trying to force them to do so by limiting parking at their destination or home only works when easier options are not available. And realistically, public transit is still just not viable for the vast majority of people. Restricting parking just doesn't work when there is free parking available nearby and/or alternative business locations that don't have the restrictions.

The free parking doesn't even have to be all that close. People would rather walk 5 to 10 minutes from/to free parking and the freedom of choosing where to go in a car then walk to a transit station, then spend possibly hours walking, waiting, and riding public transit to get to the places they need to go.

Requiring people to pay for parking has a similar effect as having too little parking, although to a lesser extent for those with good incomes.

Eliminating residential street parking punishes the residents to avoid the side effects instead of fixing the source of the problem. Forcing shoppers to pay for parking causes a lot of folks to just go somewhere without the expense and hassle. The businesses suffer and the city loses sales tax revenue.

Part of the charm of Pasadena, at least the residential neighborhoods, is a relaxed and quiet atmosphere. In part that comes from having enough parking. This was accomplished in large measure through the years by imposing sufficient minimum parking requirements. As opposed to a places that didn't require enough parking and where cars are jammed in along the streets and others constantly circling looking for a parking space. That situation is less safe and more unpleasant for walkers and bikers too.

I heard a developer/businessman mention that office space used per employee has gone down over time. That would mean more people per square foot. Are the parking standards of x parking spaces per y square feet even based on a current reality or are they decades old? That's another thing to be checked.

In short, I think maximums on parking spaces are a bad idea. Perhaps reduced minimums are reasonable near public transit hubs (though I think the developer should have to make that case for their project). If a developer/business believes they need additional spaces to be viable, they should be able to include them. They aren't going to want to pay to put in extra spaces if they don't think they are needed.

Historically they've tried to put in the absolute minimum required.

While additional spaces imply additional traffic, if that many cars are coming, that additional traffic and parking will happen nearby anyway.

So it might as well be accounted for in the environmental assessment and directed as expeditiously as possible to parking.

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura Ellersieck
3175 Del Vina St

eevna@earthlink.net

Mc Lemoire, Latasha

Subject: FW: Easing parking construction near Gold Line, Item 11--For Proper Distribution

From: "Bogaard, Bill" <bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net>

Date: October 23, 2011 10:19:34 AM PDT

To: "Jomsky, Mark" <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>

Subject: FW: Easing parking construction near Gold Line, Item 11--For Proper Distribution

From: smchu@juno.com [smchu@juno.com]

Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2011 8:44 PM

To: Bogaard, Bill; district1; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Sullivan, Noreen; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry

Subject: Easing parking construction near Gold Line, Item 11

Dear City Council members,

This Monday as you are discussing easing restrictions on building parking close to the Gold Line stations, please consider that Pasadena has many different populations, and that areas such as East Pasadena, with predominately single family homes are already adversely affected by Gold Line area parking construction restrictions. For example, Sierra Madre Villa/Foothill Kaiser facility employees park all over our neighborhood to the north, irritating and endangering our residents. Kaiser's current patchwork parking is inadequate and they should be allowed to build a multi story parking structure between their building and the freeway. This would bother nobody, and would improve traffic flow and safety in the SMV/Foothill area.

Regards,

Susan Chu

Vina Vieja Neighborhood Association member

Invest in Gold Today

Diversify your investment portfolio with Gold and Silver. Get a Free Investor Kit.

<http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3141/4ea38def83946d25255st06vuc>

10/24/2011
Item 11

Pasadena

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

& CIVIC ASSOCIATION

844 E. Green St., Suite 208

Pasadena, CA 91101-5438

(626) 795-3355

FAX (626) 795-5603



October 19, 2011

Mayor Bill Bogaard
Pasadena City Council
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109
VIA E-MAIL

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Pasadena City Council,

The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce appreciates your examining the Transit Oriented District parking regulations in East Pasadena. We urge you to ask your staff to look at amending the parking restrictions to allow for more parking spaces in the TOD in East Pasadena.

As you may recall, the Chamber raised this issue on behalf of our office development, management and leasing members in the White Paper we published in 2009. One of the recommendations in that report was examining and loosening the parking restrictions for office development in the TOD around the Sierra Madre Light Rail Station. We made that recommendation after recognizing the unique, distinctive and suburban quality of the Hastings Ranch area. The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce urges you to raise or remove the parking caps so that adequate parking can be provided for development in east Pasadena.

Further, we recommend that adjustment be made through an amendment to the Zoning Code. That is the most efficient, cost effective and appropriate means by which you can make the changes.

Finally, we would ask that you define a time period during which you expect to see a recommendation back from your planning staff. This is not an item that requires lengthy and delayed processes. Six months should be more than adequate to receive a recommendation for action from your staff.

Thank you,

Paul Little
President and CEO

Cc: M. Beck, V. Bertoni, D. Miller, M. Jomsky

10/24/2011
Item 11