

THEME 3
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 in a series of numbers.

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 in the following districts and corridors:

Lincoln Ave.					(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
<i>Mean = 1.8</i>	<i>Median = 1</i>	<i>Mode = 1</i>			
N. Lake Ave.					(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
<i>Mean = 1.85</i>	<i>Median = 1.5</i>	<i>Mode = 1</i>			
E. Washington Blvd.					(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
<i>Mean = 1.8</i>	<i>Median = 1</i>	<i>Mode = 1</i>			
E. Colorado Blvd.					(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
<i>Mean = 1.76</i>	<i>Median = 2</i>	<i>Mode = 2</i>			
Other	<hr/>				

- *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?*

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.*

THEME 3
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 in a series of numbers.

Theme 3 – Reduced Capacity

Yes or no

a) What is more appropriate for the Central District?

	Yes	No
Allow total remaining development capacity to be built?	14	24
Allow 50% of remaining development capacity to be built?	18	21
Cap development to the amount that is currently built?	17	21

- *This is a completely unacceptable alternative. See comments on reverse about Great Park.*
- *Maybe yes, maybe no—cannot make conclusion without holistic view—quality—you can have poor low density and high quality high density.*
- *Yes and more (Allow total remaining development capacity to be built)*
- *No no no (Allow 50% of remaining development capacity to be built; Cap development to the amount that is currently built)*
- *There is a very small amount of residential units within the cap about 500 units. This should be increased. The remaining commercial is 4.2 million which is enough to be spread to other areas.*
- *What is total remaining capacity?*
- *Increase housing capacity.*
- *(Allow 50%)—? or less—maybe 25% of 4.8 million that remain.*
- *[yes remaining development capacity to be built] For residential*
- *[yes allow 50% of remaining development capacity to be built] For commercial.*
- *Maybe 25%. 50% is too much—but this is the right basic idea.*

THEME 3
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 in a series of numbers.

Theme 3 – Reduced Capacity

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

The Reduced Capacity alternative should include the following policies:

1. Allow no new development project that would result in a “net increase” in automobile trips, water use, or demand on infrastructure.

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

Mean = 3 Median = 2 Mode = 2

- *This needs to be appropriate – are they being multi-use and low income and allowing people to walk and bike.*
- *This sounds good, but it is unrealistically restrictive?*

2. Reduce heights in the Central District (downtown area) so there will be greater investment in areas outside the Central District with development opportunities.

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

Mean = 3 Median = 3 Mode = 5

- *Heights should be appropriate to the neighbors and buildings, context sensitivity.*
- *Too inflexible*
- *Where is economic advantage?*
- *The Central District has the land mass, public transit and compatible uses. Stopping growth in the Central District will not spur development to other areas of the city – development will go elsewhere outside of Pasadena.*
- *No cause and effect here.*

3. Allow absolutely no demolition of bungalow court housing.

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

Mean = 2.3 Median = 2 Mode = 1

- *“absolutely” is too strong; not every bungalow court is necessarily historically sound or economically viable.*
- *Wow! Never knew that was an option!!*
- *Who is asking for this?*
- *Where is this? Could be moved? Depends on bungalow.*

- *Too little flexibility*

4. Allow no legal deviation (variance) from zoning code standards (for example, height limits).

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

Mean = 2.9 Median = 3 Mode = 5

- *Only under the most rare and unique circumstances. This should be the policy!*
- *Vague question*
- *Right to apply for reasonable variance is a basic principle.*

5. Time all nonresidential development so it matches population change or the needs for local institutions.

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

Mean = 2.8 Median = 3 Mode = 2

- *The marketplace, not the city, controls this to a great extent, but it is a good goal.*
- *Who decides that – community or legislative?*
- *Not sure what this means – up to a maximum? With some limits? Too open-ended sounding.*
- *Not sure how this is possible – future projections are unpredictable.*
- *Really? How would the city do that?*
- *Developers should build when the market is ready. This is not a city determinant.*
- *Change after! Not “build and they will come.” It doesn’t work that way it is based on demand.*
- *How would that happen?*
- *That sounds impossible to implement unless the city has huge budget.*

6. State density bonus law allows an increase in the number of units that can be built on a site when the development includes some affordable units. The Reduced Capacity alternative should reduce the basic allowable number (“downzone”) in higher density zoning districts, so use of the density bonus would result in no more units than were allowed by the original zoning.

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

Mean = 3 Median = 3 Mode = 5

- *We need to keep the density bonus and allow for affordable housing.*
- *I do not approve of this – we need affordable housing.*
- *-or less!*
- *Confusing question*
- *Many homeowners are adding or remodeling. This is healthy for the city. But the permit process, and the ordinances it embodies, are a major barrier. There must be flexibility. Remodel, or move out of Pasadena?*

- *Simplify the permit process for renovation for existing housing that makes efficiency oriented renovations. Make the permit process less opaque for renovations. Fear snowballing requirements discourages upgrades.*

Other Comments:

- *This option does not address workforce housing, affordable housing, sustainability, or economic vitality.*
- *One dimensional alternative – doesn't address amount of housing, jobs needed for future population, economic outlook, walkability, sustainability. Doesn't address guiding principles – circulate without cars, etc. & State / Housing & greenhouse requirements.*
- *If Parsons wants to develop housing on its parking lot – this is what we would want – people walking to work.*
- *Theme 3 – Reduced capacity – a.k.a. Fantasyland Alternative*
- *Where are the public schools in this discussion/scenario?*
- *What about community concerns for education. Good schools means city will retain higher-income workers who will spend money here, as well as enhancing lower income opportunities*

Reduced Capacity Alternative

Residential Development (Units)

Question: Should the Proposed Alternative be higher (↑), lower (↓), or is it good (=)? Circle your answer below.						
	Constructed Since 1994	Remaining Development (Ex.)	Remaining Development (Proposed Alternative)	Circle Your Answer		
				↑	=	↓
Central District	3250	756	150	21	5	10
East Colorado	0	745	745	10	21	4
East Pasadena	204	116	116	16	14	4
North Lake	4	495	150	25	8	3
South Fair Oaks	134	166	100	19	12	4
West Gateway	0	42	0	18	14	4
Fair Oaks/Orange Grove	205	317	317	6	22	8
Multi-Family (Outside Specific Plans)	735	2,306	2,306	8	14	11
Total	3,797	2,637	1,578	21	3	8

Commercial Development (Square Footage)

Question: Should the Proposed Alternative be higher (↑), lower (↓), or is it good (=)? Circle your answer below.						
	Constructed Since 1994	Remaining Development (Ex.)	Remaining Development (Proposed Alternative)	Circle Your Answer		
				↑	=	↓
Central District	1,328,329	3,743,011	500,000	19	6	9
East Colorado	373,335	197,673	197,673	16	4	1
East Pasadena	41,061	2,041,099	Average = 319,503	3	7	1
North Lake	52,075	121,542	121,542	8	22	3
South Fair Oaks	606,879	551,521	275,000	16	9	6
West Gateway	800	390,495	0	18	13	2
Fair Oaks/Orange Grove	93,702	465,937	465,937	3	20	11
Commercial Zones (Outside Specific Plans)	295,838	2,215,253	1,250,000	10	12	9
Total	2,792,019	9,726,531	2,810,152	17	5	8

** East Pasadena - Development cap will match existing development sites with a 2-3 story height limit.

Other Comments (from chart):

- [Residential Development Chart: West Gateway] – *does this assume Westgate and Ambassador Campus W. development is complete?*
- [Commercial Development Chart: Commercial Zones (Outside Specific Plans)] – *Where are these commercial zones that are outside specific plans?*
- [Commercial Development Chart: Fair Oaks/Orange Grove] – *This looks like most of the commercial development is being directed to Fair Oaks and Orange Grove.*
- [Residential Development Chart: Central District – Remaining development (proposed alternative): 150] – *150 units over 20 years? Are you kidding?*
- [Commercial Development Chart: North Lake – Remaining Development (proposed alternative): 121,542] – *So, they can build, but use no water?*
- [Commercial Development Chart: West Gateway – Remaining Development (proposed alternative): 0] – *not realistic; selfish. WG is an appropriate place for good development.*
- *There is no growth or low growth. There is no income to pay for city amenities, where will fees come from?*
- *People drive less in Central District.*
- *If you want more life in East Pasadena, plant trees – it feels barren and hot.*
- *Single family houses are, I submit, bad for one's health, physical & psychological. They use land, force people to work harder to promote community, discourage walking.*
- *How do you define "artist"? Typically people romanticize the word. I am in a profession with some connection to it, but would never consider leaving East Pasadena. It's not urban, not vital enough, nor enough of the rich mixture manifests itself in the Central District, which is closer to downtown and points west.*
- *In contrast to I guess many others, I support more development in Central District.*