THEMES 2 & 6
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 1, NOVEMBER 11

After day one of the Charrette, the City collected 47 surveys. Below are the questions, comments and answers. The mean average is found by adding up all the numbers in a set and dividing by the total number of entries. In a series of numbers, ordered from least to greatest the median is the middle number. The mode is the most commonly found number is a series of numbers.

Themes 2 & 6 – Major Corridors & Housing Opportunities
Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

a) Which of the following locations should accommodate additional housing?

Central District (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 2.71 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

- *Especially Playhouse district underutilized, infill lots with medium to high density potential.*
- *Need a high quality hotel.*
- *Playhouse – mixed use.*

E. Colorado Blvd. between Allen Ave. & Sierra Madre Blvd. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.66 *Median = 1* *Mode = 0*

N. Lake Ave. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.77 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

Lincoln Corridor (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.98 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

Washington Corridor (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.66 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

Other _____

- *Get rid of the excessively restrictive 2-unit and live work ordinances.*
- *Hotel development in Central District*
- *S Fair Oaks*
- *Development/Housing should be centered around transit.*
- *Stop over development.*
- *South Fair Oaks specific plan area.*
- *South Fair Oaks area.*
- *The themes of major corridors and housing opportunities should not be combined. They are separate and distinct. If the desire is to serve the housing needs of all, we should look at more than major corridors.*

- *Not all of them together necessarily.*
- *Housing aligned with transit.*
- *Need to tailor type of housing to character of neighborhood.*

b) If you plan to stay in Pasadena long term (i.e. 65+ years old), what sort of housing do you want to live in?

Single-Family detached (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.72 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

Townhomes (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.66 *Median = 1* *Mode = 0*

- *Opportunities for this within Playhouse District*
- *In the Central District*

High-Density Multi-Family (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 2.37 *Median = 2* *Mode = 0*

- *Opportunities for this within Playhouse District*
- *In the Central District*

Mixed-Use Multi-Family with Retail (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.91 *Median = 1* *Mode = 0*

- *Opportunities for this within Playhouse District*

Live-Work Space (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 2.13 *Median = 2* *Mode = 0*

- *Opportunities for this within Playhouse District*

Other _____

- *People over 65 have diverse interests and life styles. Life without a car and goods and services need to be within walking distance.*
- *Senior apartments/independent and assisted living.*
- *Senior apartments.*
- *Bungalow Court*
- *Second units.*
- *I plan to stay in my home and make it into part of a community land trust.*
- *Granny flat/houses.*
- *Live/work doesn't work. It ends up being live only- none seen in other cities.*

- *What is more important than type of housing is what amenities are close by and how are they accessed?*
- *I am a young parent.*
- *Senior housing – if different. Near medical and public transportation.*
- *Courtyard or bungalow court intentional community.*

c) What other land uses should be co-located with multi-family housing along the major districts and corridors?

Education (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.76 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

- *Public schools*

Medical (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.7 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *For nurses and hospital staff.*

Work-Live (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.15 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

Institutional (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 1.68 *Median = 1* *Mode = 0*

Other _____

- *Within a walkable transit served environment in the Central District. Stop treating the Central District as a single homogeneous area – it is composed of separate districts with a different character and capacities. They are also "neighborhoods" too.*
- *Prefer sustainability plan 4*
- *All as appropriate – look at niches and symbiotic uses.*
- *Don't understand the question.*
- *Pocket parks*
- *Retail, office.*
- *Retail*
- *Open space, public art.*
- *Neighborhood serving commercial.*
- *All*
- *Retail; neighborhood commercial.*
- *Small businesses that folks can walk to – consider N Fair Oaks the few blocks South of Woodbury. Support 2nd units, allow this to at 5,000 sq ft if attached to home, and 7,000 if detached.*
- *Look at R&D for N Fair Oaks (Just S Woodbury).*

- *Parks/transportation. The key is use to a more livable city is a combination of a multi-use (housing/retail) properties with small parks near good transportation. A good example is the Fair Oaks housing project done by Heritage Housing Partners.*
- *Retail to support walkability.*
- *1.) light retail, oriented to serving the immediate neighborhood. 2.) green space, pocket parks*
- *parks*
- *neighborhood retail/parks*
- *retail, restaurant, cultural*
- *commercial that serves residents. Parks or open space of some kind.*
- *Park/open space.*
- *Villa Esperanza Services provides low income housing in East Pasadena between Lake and Altadena north of 210 fwy; houses nicely merged into neighborhoods. Villa would like to continue and possibly increase low income housing in this area.*

d.) Other comments

- *How is public education for all students and families addressed in this planning process? How will the city work in partnership with the school district to create a positive partnership with the school district to create a positive partnership for all of Pasadena. There needs to be an 8th guiding principle – A vibrant public education system will be valued and supported as the shared responsibility of our community.*
- *I came tonight to advocate fir my public school students in Pasadena. I am looking at what kind of impact each theme would have on their lives. I want and hope the following are included in the plan: 1.) public education will be valued, supported, and promoted as a shared responsibility of the community – part of the principles, 2.) work force housing for PUSD employees so that PUSD can retain staff, 3.) when I ask the city staff how their plan will impact the lives of my students, I think everyone should have an answer since the decisions being made now will determine many factors in their lives. Thank you.*
- *I support adding a Guiding Principle that values public education in our city. Housing/land use, transportation, open space/parks all are connected to public education. None of the plans address public education and the city's support of it. A vibrant public education system will be valued and supported as the shared responsibility of our community.*
- *I think #6 should be split off on its own.*
- *Public education needs to be a focus to create a vibrant community that includes all citizens from children to seniors and the working parents in the middle!*

<u>MAJOR THEMES/SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS (#2 & 6)</u>

a.) Central District can accommodate more housing and mixed-use. There are opportunities in the Playhouse District specifically, and in transit areas. South Fair Oaks another location for additional housing. Some comments were "no growth"/"growth in context"/no growth in all locations at same time comments as well.

b.) Desirable housing for those planning to stay long term include Senior housing and granny flat/2nd unit types, housing with walkability, and accessibility to both transit and amenities. Again, Central District (and Playhouse District specifically) were mentioned as good areas for Townhomes/High Density MF/mixed-use MF retail/live-work.

c.) Neighborhood-serving commercial/retail, open space and parks/pocket parks, were main themes for land uses co-located with MF housing in major corridors.

d.) Public education needs to be addressed; should be part of the planning process.

THEMES 3 & 5
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 1, NOVEMBER 11

Theme 3 – Reduced Capacity
Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

- *This is a great alternative!*

a) Development should be limited in the Central District and encouraged it the following districts and corridors:

Lincoln Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**
Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*
N. Lake Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**
Mean = 1.85 *Median = 1.5* *Mode = 1*
E. Washington Blvd. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**
Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*
E. Colorado Blvd. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**
Mean = 1.76 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*
Other _____

- ***Lincoln****-mixed use, neighborhood servicing*
  N Lake*- mixed use and retail, neighborhood servicing*
  E. Washington*-*
    - *Light retail, mixed use*
    - *neighborhood servicing*
    - *Village here*

  E. Colorado*- Light office and retail, okay for office near Gold Line Station*
  Other*- South Raymond for clean tech! N. Fair Oaks (South of Woodbury). Development should be encourage in the CD, especially the Playhouse District which has opportunities for greater density, sustainability, walkable development.*
- *Depends on type of development- not all areas are well suited for office, some are better suited to small light retail.*
- *Also at scale- should not be a 1:1 shift.*
- *"Limited in the Central District"- except Old Pasadena and Playhouse for hotel and multi-family housing!*
- *Maybe different kinds of development in different areas, but yes, move out from CD.*
- *A freeway cap should be extended to Lake.*
- *Trail along Eaton Canyon good.*
- *"limited in the Central District" –NO*
- *Central District is to be nurtured. Forcing development to where it won't thrive as much will force development to go to another city.*
- *Development in the CD should NOT be limited.*
- *I don't agree with limiting development in the Central District.*
- *Except Playhouse District for housing and boutique hotel.*

- *Colorado- Foothill from Lake to City Limits.*
- *It can be done in all districts but on a small scale.*
- *Not limited in the CD.*
- *Generally, reduce capacity city-wide, particularly in the Central District.*
- *"Development should be limited in the Central District"- slanted*
- *Should align from disagreement.*
- *Limited height development.*
- *The city should make the public schools its first priority. The city should pay for all of the yearly costs of school fields and libraries.*
- *Development should NOT be limited in Central District.*
- *Stop overdevelopment in the Center City area.*
- *NO! It should not be limited in the Central District*
- *Development in Central District should not be limited.*

b) Development capacity should be reduced evenly citywide:
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 3.49 *Median = 5* *Mode = 5*

- *Any growth or reduction must be considered within the context of the surrounding area, and take into consideration unique needs of that area.*
- *This should be combined with above (ie, reduce citywide and redistribute where makes sense).*
- *Yes, we need to be able to walk to local stores.*
- *NO!! We need increased capacity to achieve walkability, sustainability, affordable housing, economic development.*
- *Not an acceptable alternative.*
- *FARs must go →mass/scale/height, some other way to determine these such as Form-based codes.*
- *This theme is fundamentally flawed. We should increase capacity.*
- *Simple proportions do not represent good policy.*
- *Pasadena alone should not be taking on housing for entire San Gabriel Valley—how about Arcadia, San Marino, Etc.*
- *Development should be encouraged at density/transit hubs.*
- *No-some areas are underutilized.*
- *"Evenly"-problem word.*
- *Why reduce capacity in Central District?*

Theme 5 – Economic Vitality

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

- *Public schools need to be addressed when speaking about growth, transit, parks, etc.*
- *Do we "need" office development of flexible development?*
- *Don't know enough about these very specific intersections to comment.*

a) The following sites/corridors should be considered for office development uses:

E. Foothill Blvd. & Sierra Madre Villa Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**
Mean = 1.6 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*
E. Colorado Blvd. between Old Pasadena and Lake Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 2.37 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

S. Fair Oaks Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 2.15 *Median = 2* *Mode = 0*

E. Walnut St. near N. San Gabriel Blvd. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 1.98 *Median = 1.5* *Mode = 1*

N. Lake Ave. and Villa St. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 2.14 *Median = 2* *Mode = 3*

- ***E. Foothill and Sierra Madre Villa Ave***
  - *Already well developed*
- ***E. Colorado Blvd. between Old Pasadena and Lake Ave.***
  - *Where?*
  - *Playhouse District especially*
- ***S. Fair Oaks Ave-***
  - *+ N. Fair Oaks, N Fair Oaks (South of Woodbury).*
  - *Near hospital with mixed use and retail.*
- ***Walnut St. near N. San Gabriel Blvd-***
  - *allowable, not desirable.*

- ***Lake Ave. and Villa St-***
  - *Traffic issues at this location, if lower scale OK.*
  - *Mixed use with ground floor retail only.*
  - *Site near Gold Line*
- *+ Lincoln and N. Fair Oaks*
- *Office along with other uses will create a more balanced area.*
- *"Limited height, sustainable" office development*
- *At transit hubs.*

b) The following sites/corridors should be considered for flexible research and development uses:

E. Foothill Blvd. & Sierra Madre Villa Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 1.79 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

E. Colorado Blvd. between Old Pasadena and Lake Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 2.85 *Median = 3* *Mode = 5*

S. Fair Oaks Ave. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 1.75 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

E. Walnut St. near N. San Gabriel Blvd. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 1.68 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

N. Lake Ave. and Villa St. **(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)**

Mean = 2.53 *Median = 3* *Mode = 3*

- *Clean technology should be encouraged!*
- *South Raymond (1)*

c) Accommodating additional development is acceptable as a means to generate revenue to fund new parks and community services:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 2.32 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

- *The need for new parks/services because of development- so development isn't the source, but the catalyst. We need to develop funding sources separate from development and instead encourage development to consider inclusion of parks as an integral part of their plans.*
- *Depends on quality, fit, blend, location.*
- *With limits.*
- *How would these get funded?*
- *Support education.*
- *Do not understand the question (additional as of what baseline?)*
- *And public education.*
- *Reduce city Government not add more.*
- *So long as additional development is compatible/high quality.*
- *Depends on design.*
- *"High Tech" development.*
- *The old high-rise towers are obsolete.*

d) Increasing development around the transit routes is acceptable as a means to generate revenues to fund the construction and operation of a new trolley system:

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Mean = 2.27 Median = 2 Mode = 1

- *Depends, need to clarify "increasing development".*
- *Depends upon location and compatibility with adjacent areas.*
- *Makes sense to concentrate on transit routes. Trolley sounds good but not convinced yet.*
- *Parking garage on Lake Ave. church property for out-of-town visitors to access Old Town/ Playhouse with trolley S. Lake districts.*
- *(1) since the bulk of transit is in the Downtown.*
- *So long as additional development is compatible/high quality.*
- *Increasing "limited height" development*
- *No new trolley- bad concept.*
- *Trolley is unrealistic!*

OTHER

- *Get rid of FARs*
- *Consider form-based codes*
- *Reduce height in commercial areas across the city.*
- *I strongly agree with these themes but public education needs to be addressed as it goes hand in hand with sustainability and economic vitality.*
- *Schools- public education should be valued by the city one of the assets of a vibrant community (city) is a strong and healthy public education system. The city should place public education as a value and priority in the City of Pasadena.*

<u>THEMES 2 & 6</u>
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 2, NOVEMBER 12

After day two of the Charrette, the City collected 50 surveys. Below are the questions, comments and answers. The mean average is found by adding up all the numbers in a set and dividing by the total number of entries. In a series of numbers, ordered from least to greatest the median is the middle number. The mode is the most commonly found number is a series of numbers.

Themes 2 and 6

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree

a) The existing buildings in the Central District are appropriate in height.

Mean = 2.7 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

- *Buildings at Lake and Freeway are too tall, too "Glendale-y"*
- *Some could be higher and we could do green roofs*
- *They are appropriate, but future development can exceed 3-4 stories along Colorado*
- *Not all*
- *Newer development has been out of context/scale, older/historic buildings should guide adjacent development*
- *There are a mix of heights in the Central District reflecting the time of building construction and use*
- *Depends upon the District. Some on South Lake are too tall (and ugly)*
- *Many are too high*
- *Some but not all*
- *Some are, some aren't*
- *They're too big!*
- *Some are; some are <u>not</u>!*
- *Agree*

b) Height limits should be reduced in the Central District to 3 to 4 stories.

Mean = 3.2 *Median = 4* *Mode = 5*

- *Density should be encouraged in Central District*
- *Desnity should be encouraged*
- *40 feet OK*
- *No*

c) Height limits should vary in consideration of the surrounding environments.

Mean = 2.0 *Median = 2* *Mode =1*

- *True! Provide visual interest and differentiate areas, like NYC*

- *No tall office buildings*
- *Yes within reason. All kinds of arguments are made about <u>what is</u> the environment*
- *No*

d) Shift half (i.e. 2 million square feet) of potential commercial development from the Central District to other commercial areas in the city.

Mean = 2.9 *Median = 3* *Mode = 1*

- *Do <u>not</u> limit development densities or heights in the Central District.*
  1) *Encourage development along the Gold Line*
  2) *Encourage development, employment, and housing opportunities in the Central District*
- *Frankly, I <u>like</u> a dense Central District—high energy*
- *No—this is unnecessary*
- *Central District is where density feeds transportation and walkablility*
- *The infrastructure is in the Central District*
- *Leave 25% at the most*
- *Or just eliminate it from the Central District*
- *No*

e) Within the Central District, focus multi-family residential development in the Playhouse District.

Mean = 2.6 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

- *<u>Throughout</u> Central District*
- *Need jobs/housing mix. We have surface parking lots on Coloardo! Colorado should have more retail/office.*
- *Need jobs <u>and</u> housing in Playhouse District to allow people to walk/bus/bike to work which assists in affordability*
- *What type architecture?*
- *Old Pasadena and Civic Center*
- *Mixed use on Colorado Blvd.*
- *But <u>only</u> if the City acquires <u>significant</u> park space. We must create a park in the Playhouse District*
- *No*

f) Limit future office development in the Playhouse District.

Mean = 2.8 *Median = 3* *Mode = 1*

- *Mix of uses is important to the success of the Playhouse District*
- *Need a boutique hotel in the Playhouse District!!!*
- *No*

g) Encourage residential development in these following corridors:

	Mean	Median	Mode
Washington Blvd. (Marengo and El Molino Avenues)	*2.0*	*2*	*1*
Los Robles (Villa Street)	*2.1*	*2*	*2*
Lincoln (North of Forrest Avenue)	*1.9*	*2*	*1*

- *But not excluding commercial development*
- *But not by discouraging development in Central core*
- *South Marengo and South El Molino*
- *Height limits*
- *Don't care*

h) Allow residential development along the South Fair Oaks corridor in proximity to Huntington Hospital to provide housing opportunities for the workforce in the area.

Mean = 2.4 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *And on N. Fair Oaks—north of Washington*
- *Depends on what would be "displaced." Isn't this the "BioTech" Corridor??*
- *Entire and affordable*
- *Need to look at non-standard housing options:*
    - *Bungalow courts*
    - *Multi-generational housing with shared facilities (think dorm concept)*
- *Mixed use*

General Comments

- *I support an 8th Guiding Principle that would focus on the value of public education in our city. Principle 6 does <u>not</u> address this at all.*
- *I support an 8th principle that focuses on the importance of <u>public education</u> to all sectors of Pasadena. Principle 6 does <u>not</u> address this!*
- *<u>Vital</u> to retain high percentages of affordable housing—that is, affordable housing—so that Pasadena doesn't become a boring, earnest ghetto. We need to embrace our diversity as a blessing.*
- *However, what is <u>most</u> important to me in this regard is to develop a rich "necklace" of retail opportunities, low scale, that connects Northwest Pasadena to <u>all</u> the rest of Pasadena. It is way too isolated, and has a lot of potential for vibrant <u>enrichment</u>. Right now, a lot of retail there feels temporary, underfunded—Super King and 24-Hour Fitness are great but discourage pedestrian use.*
- *Residential (families)/work-force housing near schools!*
- *Add urban open space to Playhouse District—2 parks over parking on municipal lots at Union/El Molino and Madison below Colorado. Supports housing/residents. No green space in District now.*
- *Lack of housing emphasis around Central District Gold Line stations—missed TOD/SB375 opportunities*
- *For multistory buildings, consider increasing setbacks so buildings do not force narrow sidewalks*
- *If we proceed with the freeway cap park we must <u>increase</u> the density and height limit of the adjacent Maple/Villa St residential zoning, so that more people can take advantage of the new (very expensive) freeway cap, and so that housing will be affordable, not just for the wealthy*

THEME 1 & 2
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 3, NOVEMBER 13

After day three of the Charrette, the City collected 57 surveys. Below are the questions, comments and answers. The mean average is found by adding up all the numbers in a set and dividing by the total number of entries. In a series of numbers, ordered from least to greatest the median is the middle number. The mode is the most commonly found number is a series of numbers.

Theme 1 & 2 - Major Corridors, East Pasadena & East Colorado
Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

a) The following land use should be considered for East Pasadena in proximity to the Sierra Madre Villa Gold Line Station.

Multi-Family Residential (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 1.9 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*
Retail (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 2.1 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*
Office (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*
Mixed Use (50% Commercial 50% Residential) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 1.6 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

b) The following land use should be considered for East Colorado (Sierra Madre to Halstead)

Low Industrial (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 2.3 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*
Retail (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 2.2 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*
Research and Development (Startup Companies) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 1.5 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*
Live/Work (i.e. Artist lofts) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
Mean = 1.6 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

b) Moderate increased vehicle travel times are acceptable to provide bike and pedestrian friendly environment.

Yes_*(44)*_ No_*(8)*_

- *What's moderate? Also, bikes must follow the road laws.*
- *OK! Slows down traffic ok.*
- *Only a 2 min delay*
- *Not sure*
- *Increased travel times are more acceptable if you can maintain continuous movement, rather than stop & go. Suggestion: signs that indicate "The signals on this street are timed for 35 MPH" so that drivers know what their optimum speed will be. Less frustrating for drivers, allows for speed reduction and lowers GHG (no stop/start driving if you follow the speed recommendation).*
- *Worried about air quality but do support bike and pedestrian friendly environment.*

Other Comments:

- *Where is any mention of public education?*
- *Where are the public schools in this scenario?*
- *Make corridor below Sierra Madre station pedestrian friendly and safe!*
- *No more liquor stores in E. Pasadena*
- *Increase police presence in residential as well as retail areas*
- *Entertainment (theaters, restaurants) area in E. Pasadena, near Target where Pacific Theaters was.*
- *Please build tree canopy impacts analysis*
- *De-emphasize the street (use complete streets) on Washington Blvd. between Lincoln and Lake. Road diet, bike lanes, wide sidewalks, etc.*
- *Create the Great Park. Link the parks in the city with high quality bike and pedestrian corridors*
- *Situate medium-high density housing (2-4 stories) mid-corridor, between commercial nodes*
- *Use color on streets, sidewalks, etc. to aid way-finding and implement changes to corridors (adding bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, linkages, etc.) at a reliably low cost.*
- *If/when there is consensus on the kind of commercial/light industrial/R&D, then housing should be tailored to coordinate with those kinds of uses.*
- *I supported further development of E. Pasadena but not to the exclusion of both commercial/retail and housing growth in the Central District.*